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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

There is much expert opinion which stresses the values of a well-articulated set of written school board policies. The following quotation is significant:

Since the policies of the board of education determine the nature and the extent of the educational program, it follows that sound, well-written policies can do much to improve local school programs. Such improvement often appears in the form of greater stability, continuity, and efficiency in the program. When policies are definitely stated, the program is less subject to the individual notions of administrators and board members and does not shift about with every change of personnel. Thus, the program becomes more a community school program, which is as it should be.¹

At the annual meeting of the National School Boards Association in St. Louis, Missouri, February 22, 1952, recommendations were made concerning written policies for boards of education. Major reasons for written policies were summarized:

There seemed to be unanimity of feeling that a written statement of school policies and working relationships is desirable for every school community regardless

¹Nebraska Department of Public Instruction, Division of Supervision and Curriculum, School Board Policies (Lincoln, 1953), p.2.
of its size and character. It was felt that such a statement would benefit all relationships to the schools, board members, administrators, teachers, other employees, patrons, and students.

Statements of policy were recognized as valuable in the indoctrination of new board members, and new executives, teaching, or other personnel. Such statements can avoid misunderstandings and confusion by defining responsibilities and authority, and by stating policies so they may be readily interpreted at any level of responsibility.

The public can better understand and appreciate its schools when authoritatively informed through written policy. Written policies give continuity and consistency to the boards' position and stand as a bulwark against pressure groups.

Written policies permit definite interpretation by the administration. Such policies also "give armor to the administration in controversial cases."

The immediate and ultimate objective should be improvement of education. To quote an apt expression, "A statement of policy might well be a 'Bible' for better school operation, but it should never become the entire library."2

Since written school board policies are so very important, a study in this area has practical as well as theoretical value. An investigation of the literature has revealed that several studies have been made relative to written school board policies, but none of these has attempted to present an analytic survey of such policies in the State of Illinois. Hence, the present study was undertaken.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to analyze the types of policies found in written school board policy books in certain districts in the State of Illinois. This analysis is to be in terms of philosophy expressed, administrative organization, personnel policies, pupil policies, curriculum policies, and building management policies. An evaluation of these policies will be made by comparing them to the recommendations of experts and by examining them in terms of internal criteria such as consistency, clarity, and possibilities for implementation.

Although the need for written school board policies is emphasized in educational literature, a secondary purpose of this study is to investigate the acceptance of this need among school boards in Illinois as manifested by the number of school districts which have such policies in written form.

A third purpose of this study is to investigate the historical and the legal backgrounds which sanction and make possible the formulation of school policies of school boards.

The following are examples of hypothetical conclusions which will be verified or rejected in terms of the results of the study:

1. There is general agreement concerning the important areas of school policy.

2. The policies include statements of a school philosophy and objectives.
3. The policies of a school district are consistent with each other and with the philosophy of education of the district.

4. The policies are stated as general principles which give sufficient direction to enable the formulation of consistent specific rules and regulations.

5. The policies include provisions for long range planning.

6. The policies are reviewed and revised periodically.

7. The policies are not significantly different in terms of geographic and district enrollment differences.

**Importance of Problem**

It is hoped that this study will be beneficial in focusing attention upon the situation as it exists in certain school districts in the State of Illinois. Those aspects of the study which reveal strengths may serve as a valuable positive guide for policy development, as well as an acknowledgement of a significant accomplishment. Those aspects of the study which reveal weaknesses, inconsistencies, and ambiguities in the written policies may serve as a valuable negative guide for those school districts which are seeking to avoid the common failings in the formulation and in the expression of their school policies.

**Scope and Procedures**

The policy books analyzed in this study were collected by requesting them from the superintendents of certain school districts.
in the State of Illinois by mail or by personal contact. A copy of the letter sent to the superintendents is included in the appendix.

The school districts which were contacted were selected as follows, using the 1957-1958 Illinois School Directory as a source of enrollment information:

- Enrollment of 2900 plus ... every district listed (58)
- Enrollment of 1000-2899 ... ¼ of all districts listed (87)
- Enrollment of 700-999 ..... ¼ of all districts listed (34)
- Total districts contacted 179

A 1957 report of the Fact Finding Group of the Illinois Citizens Education Committee stated that one hundred per cent of the school districts with 3000 or more pupils have policy books, whereas fifty-five per cent of the school districts with 750 or less pupils have policy books. This finding was the basis of the above breakdown of the districts which were contacted. The major emphasis upon the larger districts is evident.

Since 100% of the largest districts were reported to have policy books, all of these were contacted. No mention was made in the study cited above about school districts which are large, but are not among the largest. Hence, an arbitrary classification of districts of 1000-2899 pupils was established, and it was assumed that 50% of these would constitute a sufficient sampling. Since only 55% of the school districts with a pupil enrollment of 750 or less were reported to have policy books, it was decided that it would be impractical to contact even 50% of the more than 1500 school dis-
districts in this group. Hence, another arbitrary classification was established and this included districts with a pupil enrollment of 700-999. Twenty-five per cent of these were contacted because it was assumed that, as a group, school districts in this category would not be a fertile source of policy books for collection purposes, and therefore, no practical advantage would result in contacting a greater percentage of such districts. In general, it was assumed that a sufficient number of policy books would be obtained for the purpose of analysis with the breakdown listed above.

The county superintendent of DuPage County requested the cooperation of the county superintendents in the Wheaton block in developing a list of those school districts which had indicated in their state recognition reports that they have a policy book. Each school district in this block listing of ten counties was contacted regardless of enrollment. A copy of the letters sent to the county superintendents and to the district superintendents is included in the appendix. Eighteen school districts which were not included in the original breakdown of districts to be contacted were sent letters requesting a policy book as a result of the fact that they were included in the county lists. Thus, the total number of school districts contacted was 197.

The treatment of the data is as follows:

The policy books collected were analyzed in order to identify and to evaluate the policies contained therein. Strengths and
weaknesses of the policies according to expert opinion are discussed. Special attention is given to the similarities and differences relative to the general areas of policy. The emphasis and detail of each general policy area is evaluated. Many of the specific statements are analyzed for consistency, clarity, and possibilities for implementation. The most frequently mentioned policies are discussed analytically. Comparisons are made among the policies and the physical aspects of the policy books relative to the size and location of the district.

Definition of Terms

The term policy, or policies, as used in this study means a general statement of purposes, goals, or objectives which provides a broad structure or frame of reference within which the board of education and the school staff operate the schools. Although the policies should be a reflection of and in harmony with the philosophy of education of the school district, this concept is not a part of the definition because this is one of the hypotheses to be investigated in the study.

The terms rules and regulations as used in this study mean the specific statements or details which are guides to actions within the framework of the policies. In other words, the rules and regulations are specific implementations of the policies. As implied above, the hypothesis to be tested in this study will reveal whether or not this necessary consistency of rules and regula-
tions relative to policies actually exists.

The definitions of policy and of rules and regulations are in substantial agreement with the following:

An educational policy is a legal definitive plan of action in which general purpose, objectives, authority, and means are stated. 3

A policy of a school board is simply a statement of a rule or principle which the board agrees should be followed in deciding types of cases or problems that may confront the board. 4

Rules (and regulations) should stipulate and clarify the duties and relationship of all personnel, budgetary procedures, school plant operation, personnel policies, and regulatory conduct of the entire system.5

Review of Related Literature

An investigation of the literature has revealed several studies related to written school board policies, but the treatment, the procedures utilized, the scope, and the main purposes were different from the plan of the present study. Most of these related studies have investigated and/or established methods of policy development and codification either in one school district or on a regional or national level. Two recent doctoral dissertations


5Ibid., p. 42.
which emphasize the value of codified policies are as follows:


The purpose of this study was to develop and to try out a procedure for use in codifying the policies of a board of education in a local school district. The study sought to explore the ways in which policy statements may operate to improve education in a school district and to relate a codification procedure to the educational goals which written policies might help to develop. It was assumed that the procedure used in the development of policies is closely related to the understanding and acceptance of them by the individuals and groups concerned with them. The author utilized an experimental procedure in the Barrington Consolidated High School, Barrington, Illinois, to conclude that the codification of school board policies is a valuable aid to efficient administration.


The main purposes of this study are to show how a board of education can develop usable and functioning policies and to present a model set of board policies. Reasons are given for determining and codifying policies and the author presents a method of development and codification in which he stresses a review of the minute books, classification of policies, revision of existing
policies, draft of revised policies, and formal adoption by the school board. The study also contains a brief chapter on the historical development of school board control and a brief chapter on several national surveys of board of education policies. These two chapters have been used as sources of reference for this present study. The major emphasis in Smith's study, however, is the model set of codified board policies. Although this model set is valuable as a criterion for the evaluation of school board policies, Smith's main purpose and procedure are quite different from the plan of the present study.

A study by Kenneth P. Mallery, An Identification and Appraisal of Board of Education Policies in the Northwest and Selected Urban Areas in the United States, University of Washington, 1955, has one aspect which is similar to the present study in that school board policies in four states were identified and appraised, but this appraisal was only a part of the over-all scope and treatment. The study attempted to define policies for districts of various enrollments in terms of the results of opinion surveys of superintendents and school board presidents. Both groups favored written policies as a means of effective administration and school-community relations.

A study by Edwin G. Bartel, University of Wyoming, to which
Smith referred in the text based upon his doctoral dissertation, 6 included an analysis of school board policies in cities of 10,000 to 30,000 population throughout the United States. Five hundred superintendents were contacted and fifty-eight policy books were collected and analyzed. Several of the specific findings will be cited in the fourth chapter of the present study.

From 1954 to 1958 approximately twenty-five articles concerned with school board policies have appeared in The American School Board Journal, The Nation's Schools, and The School Executive. 7 These articles have usually been very brief and have added little content relative to the purposes of this study beyond what has appeared in the sources treated in the foregoing sections.

The American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association have prepared a pamphlet, 8 Written Policies for School Boards, to guide school boards in the


7An example of these is:

preparation and content of written policies. The outline of the points covered by these policies is substantially in agreement with the suggestions of Smith and Smittle and Bartel.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL AND LEGAL BACKGROUND OF
BOARD OF EDUCATION CONTROL

Background of Board of Education Control

A study of the history of education in the United States reveals clearly that there was a great diversity in school attitude and in school organization from the very beginning of the colonial attempts to provide an education for the settlers. These differences were embodied in the church-State attitude of New England, the denominational attitude of the Middle Colonies, and the private affair attitude of the South.

In spite of these distinctly different colonial attitudes towards the education of the youth, there was one attitude common to all colonies: the attitude of the local nature of education.

According to Cubberley:

(this development) has been from the community outward and upward, and not from the State downward. At first the schools were those of individual teachers, churches, philanthropic societies, towns, or districts organized and maintained without much if any thought of connection or state relationship. Even in Massachusetts
and Connecticut the local nature of the education provided was one of its marked characteristics.¹

The significant aspect of this local nature of the schools is that it established the precedent of the development of school policies on a local basis. In order to manage the schools of the times, policy formulation was necessary. In harmony with the democratic spirit of self-government, the autonomous school organizations were regulated by local laws and by permissive state legislation. With the heterogeneous patterns of school development mentioned above, these state and local laws varied, but insofar as the schools were concerned, each governing board, or committee, had the authority to establish school policies.²

After the Revolutionary War there emerged a very pronounced trend towards the acceptance of education as a State rather than a local function. The Ordinance of 1785 established the township and sectional type of land survey for the states which would emerge from the Northwest Territory. By virtue of the Tenth Amendment, in 1791, the authority of the States to control education was made clear, since education was one of the unmentioned powers of the Federal government. By 1820 several of the States had passed laws

¹Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (Boston, 1934), p. 212.

relating to the establishment of schools, the tax rate to support the schools, the certification of teachers, and the supervision of the schools. Although the specifics differed, the laws had the common characteristics of providing a measure of State direction, support, and authority concerning the schools within the State. New York, Ohio, and the New England States were the leaders in this type of legislation.³

It must be made clear at this point that the increased awareness of education as a State function did not weaken the local nature of the schools. The local district system, so common in New England, spread to many of the other States. Local school districts were popular because they were a reflection of the democratic and rather uncomplicated way of life during the early days of the nation. Self-government was the modus vivendi and this concept was embodied in the growth of the early schools. Moreover, the early State laws were generally permissive, and those communities which preferred local administration and were not interested in accepting State aid for the schools were free from State controls. In general, these controls related to special reports, meetings, curriculum, and teachers certification. These were not acceptable to many districts which preferred to maintain or to re-

³Cubberley, pp. 212-244.
frain from maintaining a pattern of local schools.

Although policies, rules, and regulations were the preroga-
tive of the local districts, in matters relative to special re-
ports, curriculum, and teacher certification, those districts
which accepted state aid were required to follow the state poli-
cies or laws. As the role of the state in education became more
evident and more common, it became equally evident that there was
a need for state administrative and supervisory control over the
districts which participated in the program of each state. This
realization of the need for a chief state school officer led to
the establishment of the position of the first State Superintend-
ent of Common Schools in New York, in 1812.

The importance of the position of chief state school officer
was recognized by the other States to the extent that there were
nineteen regular officers and nine ex-officio officers in the
thirty-four States which existed in 1861. This trend towards
supervisory and administrative control beyond the local level was
also evident in the cities where twenty-six city superintendencies
had been developed by 1861.

With the growth in the number of chief state school officers
there was a concomitant growth in the role of the State in educa-

4Ibid., p. 216.

5Ibid., p. 217.
tional matters. Cubberley describes the events in the long, controversial struggle for free, tax-supported, non-sectarian, State-controlled schools under the following headings:

1. The battle for tax support
2. The battle to eliminate the pauper-school idea
3. The battle to make the schools entirely free
4. The battle to establish state supervision
5. The battle to eliminate sectarianism
6. The battle to extend the system upwards
7. Addition of the state university to crown the system

The detailed account of these battles, included in chapters 6, 7, and 8 of Cubberley's text, is beyond the scope of this study, but the battles themselves are important to note because each victory brought with it mandatory legislation relating to education. This mandatory legislation is significant in that it enabled the local districts to develop educational policies in harmony with state provisions. Although the specifics differed, the patterns of legislation were similar among the States. The delegation of educational functions of the States to the growing cities has been noted on the preceding page. These cities were supervised by city-wide school boards which were "charged with the responsibilities of legislation, administration, policy making, and appraisal for the schools." The membership of these early boards was too large.

---

6Ibid., p. 177.
7Smith and Smittle, p. 13.
however, for efficient management of the schools. Smith and Smittle make the following quotation:

... prior to 1905, Boston had a board of twenty-four, elected by wards. In 1905, Philadelphia had a board of 559 members, made up of forty-three elected district boards. Pittsburgh, up to 1911, had a board of education of some four hundred members.8

The realization of the difficulty of administering the schools with such boards of education led to the establishment of the smaller boards with which we are now familiar. Although the composition of today's school boards is now more compact than those of the early city systems, the functions and the responsibilities are similar to those stated above.

This brief treatment of the history of education in the United States is designed to provide the background of the control of the public schools by boards of education which are delegated agencies of the State. It must be stressed that public education is a state function in spite of the local nature of our schools. As early legislation passed from the permissive type to the mandatory type, the role of the State became stronger and the role of the local board of education as a State agency became clearer. In order to perform the State authorized function of providing an education for its community, the local school board is empowered

with policy making duties. The specific policy making functions
of school boards in Illinois as derived from State law will be
treated in the following section.

Policy Making Functions of School Boards
in Illinois as Derived from Law

As was stated previously, the Tenth Amendment to the Federal
Constitution gave to the States the power to control public educa-
tion. In addition to this blanket authorization, there have been
many specific laws as implementations. A quotation from Reeder is
pertinent:

The source of the powers and duties exercised by
school boards is the state, not the school district.
... That the state has this responsibility is shown
by the state constitution, the hundreds of state statutes,
and the dozens of decisions of local, state, and federal
courts.⁹

The School Code of the State of Illinois contains the con-
stitutional and the statutory provisions for education within the
State. Included among these provisions are many general and many
specific duties and powers which are delegated by the State to the
local school boards. Some of these duties are mandatory and others
are permissive, and they provide the broad framework within which
the local school boards may manage the public schools. The basis

⁹Ward G. Reeder, School Boards and Superintendents (New York,
for this broad framework is stated in Article 8, Section 1 of the State Constitution of 1870:

The General Assembly shall provide a thorough and efficient system of free schools, whereby all children of this State may receive a good common school education.10

Because there are so many school districts in Illinois (more than 1600), it is convenient to classify the districts in terms of some criterion. In the School Code the districts are classified under four categories according to the population of the district:

1. School districts having a population of fewer than 1,000.
2. School districts having a population of not fewer than 1,000 and not more than 100,000.
3. School districts having a population of not fewer than 100,000 and not more than 500,000.
4. Cities of over 500,000 inhabitants.

Although it is obvious that the larger the district in population the greater the school board task of management and supervision of the schools, it is made clear in the Code that the powers and duties of school boards for each of the four general classifications are essentially the same. Certainly, the specifics are not the same for the largest of districts as for the smallest of districts, but there is a very high degree of similarity among all four categories relative to functions to be performed.

Every school board of districts within each successively larger classification has the same powers and duties as the school boards in the next smaller category, plus certain additional powers and duties. The most complete elaboration of these delegated powers and duties of local school boards is contained in Article 6 of the School Code, School Districts Having a Population of Fewer Than 1,000. In this Article there are specific statutes relating to the following areas:

1. Organization and meetings of the board
2. Length of the school year
3. Branches of study
4. Textbooks, apparatus, and equipment
5. School buildings and sites
6. Building management and maintenance
7. Employment, dismissal, and salary of professional staff
8. Finance
9. Discipline of pupils
10. Health and safety services
11. Transportation for pupils
12. Special education provisions

The relationship of these laws to the policy making function of the local school boards is quite evident. However, as though the Legislature were not certain of this obvious relationship, Article 6, Section 6-20 of the Code specifically spells out the mandatory duty of school boards "To adopt and enforce all necessary rules for the management and government of the public schools of their district." By virtue of this statute authority is granted by the State to each school board, regardless of the size of the district, to establish and to execute necessary policies, rules,
and regulations for the efficient management of the public schools under its jurisdiction. It must be emphasized that a school board has only those powers which are expressed by statute and those necessarily implied.11

The purpose of this brief section is to clarify the specific policy making function of school boards as derived from the statutes and the Constitution of the State of Illinois. The legal authority for school boards to adopt policies has been discussed and the relevant statute has been cited. A listing has been made of those aspects of school management and supervision covered by specific statutes which are in themselves a form of school policy.

That school boards have the right, in fact the duty, to adopt policies is incontestable. If these policies are necessary, it should be evident that they should be made known to all who are interested in or affected by the operation of the public schools. They should be written in an articulate fashion if they are to be understood clearly and if they are to be free from contradictions. The fact that a school board does have a policy book, however, does not insure the fact that the policies will be an aid to the efficient management of the schools. The policies, themselves, must be analyzed and evaluated. In the following chapters a critical anal-

ysis will be made of those school board policy books which have been collected for this study.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE POLICY BOOKS

With the introductory and the background data discussed, attention is now directed to the analysis of the policy books. A total of 197 school districts were contacted in order to receive the information upon which this study is based. The breakdown of these school districts according to size of enrollment is stated in Chapter I of this dissertation. Replies were received from 102 school districts, and this represents 51.8 per cent of the total number of districts contacted. From the 102 respondents seventy policy books were received, 68.8 per cent; thirty districts stated that they have no policy book, 29.4 per cent; and two districts stated that they have written policies which are not available for circulation, 1.9 per cent. Relative to the total number of school districts contacted, 197, the seventy books represent 35.5 per cent of the entire sample; the thirty replies from districts with no book represent 15.2 per cent; and the two districts with a policy which is not circulated represent 1.02 per cent. Whether or not the districts which did not respond to the original
contact have a policy book is a matter of sheer speculation. The only conclusion posited concerning these non-participating school districts is that they will not be considered in any way in the analysis in this study. No attempt will be made to extend the results of the analysis and evaluation beyond the scope of the seventy books of policies mentioned above.

The following table shows the results of the respondents in terms of size of district and type of response:

**TABLE I**

**NUMBER AND TYPES OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT IN ENROLLMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Enrollment</th>
<th>2900+</th>
<th>1000-2899</th>
<th>700-999</th>
<th>Less than 700</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books received</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter received;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District has no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book not available for circulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent from the table that the greatest response was from the larger districts. Of the fifty-eight largest districts
contacted, thirty-five replies (60.3 per cent) were received, including twenty-nine policy books, which represent fifty per cent of the sample in this category. Of the eighty-seven school districts contacted in the second largest pupil enrollment group, forty-five replies (51.7 per cent) were received, including thirty-one policy books, or 35.6 per cent of the sample in this category. Although thirty-four school districts were contacted in the 700-999 pupil enrollment group, only seven replies (20.6 per cent) were received, including three policy books, or 0.88 per cent of the sample in this category. The highest percentage of replies came from the school districts with enrollments of less than 700 pupils. It should be repeated that eighteen of these districts were contacted because the county superintendent in the county where each of these districts is located stated that these districts had indicated on their state recognition report that they have a policy book. Of the eighteen districts contacted, fifteen responded, and this number constitutes 83.3 per cent of the sample in this category. From the fifteen respondents, seven policy books were collected (46.7 per cent) and eight letters were received which stated that the district does not have a policy book (53.3 per cent). This lack of agreement between the information which led to the selection of these districts and the information contained in the eight letters presents a very interesting but exceedingly speculative matter for consideration. Similarly, the fact
that five of the largest school districts stated that they do not have a policy book is quite surprising in view of the findings of the Fact Finding Group of the Illinois Citizens Education Committee. In this report it is stated that one hundred per cent of the school districts in Illinois with 3000 or more pupils have policy books.\(^1\)

Although the cut-off point in this present study is 2900 pupils for the largest districts, the difference of one hundred pupils should not be a major difference in view of the enrollment changes during a school year. Of course, these changes in total enrollment may result in a decrease for a given school district, but in this era of increasing enrollments, this is not likely. Regardless of specific enrollment differences, however, the fact that five of the largest districts contacted do not have a policy book is important to note, especially if one grants the assumption that the largest districts should be the leaders in accepting and utilizing those administrative devices which have received almost unanimous support from experts. No attempt will be made in this study to reconcile these apparent contradictions in the results obtained and the findings of others. It is sufficient to point out that these apparent contradictions exist.

The seventy policy books which were collected were analyzed

\(^1\)Chapter I, p. 4.
from two major aspects: the physical composition of the books, and the contents per se. Although the physical characteristics of the books are far less important than the policies contained therein, it is necessary to consider the value of these physical characteristics as factors in effective school-community relations. The physical make-up of the policy books can do much to create a favorable or an unfavorable impression upon the community residents who have occasion to read the policy book of the local school board. Although first impressions are seldom, if ever, advocated as a guide for intelligent evaluation in any situation, all of us know that it is wise to put one's "best foot forward." The very fact that the seventy policy books were sent out from their parent district is at least an implicit admission that they are intended for more than private perusal. From this point of view, the physical features of the books merit analysis and evaluation. It is the purpose of this chapter, therefore, to analyze the physical composition of the seventy policy books which were collected.

County Represented

Policy books were received from school districts in twenty-nine different counties. Although the school districts which were contacted were selected because of size of enrollment and not because of geographic location, the twenty-nine counties represented include eighteen located in the Northern District and eleven lo-
icated in the Southern District of the State according to the division made in the Illinois School Directory.\textsuperscript{2} The books received from the four categories of school districts in relation to county location are as follows:

### TABLE II

NUMBER OF POLICY BOOKS RECEIVED FROM COUNTIES
ACCORDING TO SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT
IN ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Enrollment</th>
<th>2900+</th>
<th>1000-2899</th>
<th>700-999</th>
<th>Less than 700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSalle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWitt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnebago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermilion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piatt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals that seventeen of the policy books received came from Cook County and thirteen of the books received came from DuPage County. This heavy representation is due to the fact that more districts were contacted in these counties than in any of the others because there are so many school districts, large and small, in these heavily populated counties. Specifically, Cook County has 159 school districts and DuPage County has fifty-eight. Another reason for the frequency of policy books from DuPage County is the cooperation given by the County Superintendent in the collection of these books. As will be pointed out in the subsequent analyses of the entire collection of the seventy policy books, there is no striking pattern or similarity in physical characteristics among the books insofar as county representation is concerned. In fact, there are as great physical differences among the policy books collected within Cook and DuPage Counties as exist among the books from all the counties.

Printing, Cover, Size of Book

An analysis of the seventy policy books received revealed an almost perfect direct relationship among these three physical features. A total of fifty-six of the books, eighty per cent of the entire sample, are 8½ inches by 11 inches in size, and each of these was duplicated by either mimeograph or spirit duplicator processes. In a national study by Bartel, fifty-eight policy
books were analyzed as a part of the study. It was found that fifty per cent of these books were 8½ inches by 11 inches in size, and thirty-four (58.6 per cent) had been duplicated. Although the percentages found in this present study concerning the printing and the size of the policy books are higher than those found by Bartel, the preponderance of "home-made" policy books is corroborated. Since the standard size paper for mimeograph and spirit duplicator processes is 8½ inches by 11 inches, it is very likely that predominance of this size paper in the great majority of the books is the result of convenience as well as economy.

Of the fourteen policy books which are smaller than 8½ inches by 11 inches, all fourteen were printed professionally, and twelve of these fourteen have a stiff cover which was printed professionally. In each of these twelve books the pages are attached to the stiff cover by two staples. Of the fifty-six larger books, thirty-one have no cover and twenty-five have a cardboard cover with prongs inside for holding the pages together. No book was bound by sewing. The thirty-one books which have no cover represent school districts from all four categories of pupil enrollment: nine are from the group with 2900 pupils or more; eighteen are from the group with 1000-2899 pupils; three are from the group with 700-999 pupils (this represents one hundred per cent of the group); and one is from the group of the smallest districts.

It is stated above that fourteen of the policy books were
printed professionally and that twelve of these have a stiff cover which was printed professionally. Of these fourteen books, eleven are from the group of the largest school districts, and the other three are from the group of the next largest districts. It might be assumed that the larger the school district, the more professional the composition of the policy book since the larger districts often have financial and social advantages, as well as greater prestige, in comparison with the smaller districts. However, since these fourteen professionally reproduced policy books constitute only 23.3 per cent of the books received from the school districts in the two largest pupil enrollment categories, the assumption is highly speculative and inconclusive.

The professionally printed policy books came from school districts in eight different counties. There was no evidence that there was any difference in terms of the location of the county of the school district and a professionally printed policy book. In fact, there were great physical differences noted in these printed books which came from school districts which are geographical neighbors on a county basis.

Number of Pages, Index or Table of Contents, Preface or Forward

The over-all range of the number of pages in the seventy policy books is from five to 106. According to enrollment categories, the range among the districts in the largest group is from twelve
to 106 pages; the range in the next largest group is from five to ninety-two pages; the range in the next largest group is from ten to fifty-two pages; and the range in the smallest group is from five to thirty-six pages. It is evident that, generally speaking, the policy books of the larger districts contain more pages than those of the smaller districts, although there are individual exceptions. For example, one of the policy books from a school district in the 700-999 pupil enrollment category contains fifty-two pages and only six books have more pages than this one; whereas two of the policy books from the category of the largest school districts contain only twelve pages and sixty-one of the books have more pages than these.

It has been stated that every one of the fourteen policy books which was printed professionally is smaller than 8½ inches by 11 inches in page size. Relative to the total number of pages, it should be pointed out that since the total number of words per page in these professionally printed books at least equals, and in some cases exceeds, the number of words per page in the other books, the overall range of the number of pages would be different if there were greater similarity in the type of printing employed in the reproduction of the policy books.

Another factor which has a bearing upon the number of pages in a given policy book is the type and number of policies included. The analysis of the policies per se will be treated in the next
chapter, but it is pertinent to state at this point that many of the books contain items which do not belong in a policy book and many books do not contain policies which the experts agree should be included. In either case, the number of pages is affected.

An index or a table of contents or both are found in thirty-six of the seventy policy books. There are eight books in the sample which contain an index and a table of contents, and seven of these eight are books which represent school districts from the group of the largest districts. Of the fourteen books which were printed professionally, eight contain either an index or a table of contents and three contain both of these features.

Among the largest schools represented, sixteen of the twenty-nine districts (55.2 per cent) have an index and/or a table of contents in their policy book. The number of pages in these sixteen books ranges from twenty to 106. The other thirteen policy books in this category range in length from twelve to thirty-nine pages.

Among the schools in the second largest category according to pupil enrollment, sixteen of the thirty-one districts (51.6 per cent) include an index or a table of contents in their policy book. Only one of these sixteen includes both of these features. The number of pages in these sixteen books ranges from fifteen to ninety-two. The other fifteen districts in this category have a book which ranges from five to thirty-one pages.
Two of the districts representing the 700-999 pupil enrollment category provided a book which includes an index. One of these books contains fifty pages and the other contains fifty-two pages. The policy book from the third district in this group has ten pages and does not include an index.

An index is included in only one of the policy books from the group of seven which constitute the category of the smallest school districts. This book contains thirty-six pages. The other books in this category range from five to twenty-six pages.

It is apparent from these facts that the lengthier the policy book, the more likely it is to include an index and/or a table of contents, but there is a pronounced disparity among these books regardless of this generalization. There is a book of fifteen pages which contains an index and there is a book with as many as thirty-nine pages which has no index. These books represent the extremes regardless of the enrollment category, but as is clear by the range of the number of pages, which has been stated previously, there is a considerable degree of overlap concerning the books which do and do not include an index and/or a table of contents. This overlap reduces the above generalization from a one hundred per cent application, but it does not invalidate the finding regarding the direct relationship between the length of the policy book and the inclusion of an index or a table of contents.
Insofar as a preface or a forward is concerned, thirty-two of the seventy books include this feature. Of the twenty-nine policy books in the category of the largest districts, thirteen (44.8 per cent) include a prefatory section; of the thirty-one books in the next category, fourteen (45.2 per cent) include this feature; of the three books in the next category, two (sixty-seven per cent) include a preface; and of the seven books representing the group of the smallest school districts, three of the books (42.9 per cent) include either a preface or a forward. These sections range from a few sentences to one and one-half pages. In every case, these preliminary statements are intended to serve as an introduction to the purpose and nature of the policy book. The percentages cited reveal that except for the third category which comprises only three policy books, there is no significant difference in terms of the frequency with which a preface or forward appears in the policy books of districts of various sizes.

Date of Adoption

According to the seventy policy books collected for this study, it is evident that many school boards do not specify whether the date of the policy book is the adoption date or the revision date. Hence, it is very difficult to determine for all but ten of the books whether or not the date given is the date of original adoption or of the revision. In each of these ten exceptions,
there is a date listed for adoption and a date listed for the revision. Six of these ten are policy books from the group of the largest districts, and four are books from the group of school districts with pupil enrollments of 1000-2899. For these books, the earliest date of adoption is 1942, and four of the ten districts represented have made revisions in 1958, including the one adopted in 1942. There is no pattern of periodic revision in evidence among these ten books. The range for revisions is from one year (one school district) to sixteen years (one school district). Three of the districts revised their policy book two years after adoption, and two of the districts revised their book three years after adoption. The three remaining districts in the group of ten made revisions four, five, and six years after the adoption of the policy book.

Exclusive of these ten policy books, the range of the adoption dates, original or otherwise, is from 1950 (two books) to 1958 (ten books). Considering the entire collection of seventy policy books, the range of adoption dates is from 1942-1958, although four school boards have not indicated any date in their policy book. Three of these four are from the group of the largest school districts, and one is from the group of the next largest school districts. Ignoring the enrollment category to which the policy books belong, fifty-four of the books were adopted since 1954. In general, it may be stated that there is apparent differ-
ence regarding the date of adoption or revision of the policy books which represent school districts of various sizes according to pupil enrollment, but the difference is insignificant.

**Composite Picture**

In view of the foregoing statements in this chapter, a composite picture of the physical characteristics of the seventy policy books may be presented. In general, the books are duplicated rather than printed. They are held together by metal prongs contained in cardboard covers, or they have no cover of any type. Most of the books, eighty per cent, have pages which measure 8½ inches by 11 inches. More than one-half of the policy books, 54.4 per cent, do not contain a preface or a forward, and approximately fifty per cent (actually 48.6 per cent) do not contain a table of contents and/or an index. The number of pages ranges from five to 106, and, in general, the books of the larger districts have more pages than the books of the smaller districts. All of the books have been adopted or revised since 1942, and most of them, fifty-four books, have been adopted or revised since 1954. The four policy books which do not list a date are excluded from this statement.

In general, it may be stated that as school-community relations devices the policy books leave much to be desired in terms of eye appeal. The merits of these books, however, should be
interpreted in terms of the policies which they contain. An analysis and evaluation of these policies will be the basis of the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNAL ELEMENTS
OF THE POLICY BOOKS

Even a cursory review of the seventy policy books reveals a high degree of similarity in the general areas of policies included. In fact, four of the books are almost identical to four others. There are, however, many specific differences in the type and number of policies contained in the seventy books. The purpose of this chapter is to present a critical analysis of these similarities and differences, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of some of the policies.

One aspect of Smith's study on policy development included a survey of twenty-seven policy books from city school districts throughout the United States. Smith found that the following areas of policy were the most common among the twenty-seven books:

1. General Organization
2. The Board of Education
3. School Administration
4. Policies pertaining to Teachers
5. Policies pertaining to Pupils
6. Policies pertaining to the School Buildings
7. Policies pertaining to the Non-Teaching Employees

---

\(^1\)Smith and Smittle, Board and Policy Development, p. 18.
In a study by Bartel of fifty-eight policy books from school districts in various sections of the United States, the following items were listed as the first ten in frequency of occurrence:

1. Duties of teachers..................... 42 books
2. Powers and duties of superintendent..... 37 books
3. Board organization and procedure..... 37 books
4. Board officers and their duties......... 34 books
5. Pupils: duties, discipline, restrictions, and records.......... 34 books
6. Duties of principals and supervisors.... 31 books
7. Health and safety.......................... 31 books
8. Duties of janitor................. 28 books
9. Teacher salary schedule............... 23 books
10. Use of school buildings by non-school organizations.................. 23 books

A booklet from the Nebraska Department of Public Instruction and a booklet of the American Association of School Administrators specify similar areas of policy which should be included in policy books.

The general areas included in the seventy policy books analyzed in the present study are similar to the findings and recommendations of the aforementioned sources. The following table presents the breakdown of the results of the types of policies found in the books represented by the school districts of various enrollments:

---

2Ibid., pp. 21-22.

3Nebraska Department of Public Instruction, School Board Policies, pp. 6-8.

4American Association of School Administrators, Written Policies, pp. 21-22.
### TABLE III

**MOST COMMON POLICY AREAS FOUND IN POLICY BOOKS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF VARIOUS ENROLLMENT CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Pupil Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2900+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General Organization</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Board of Education</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Administration</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pupils</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Buildings</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-Teaching Employees</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transportation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Curriculum</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Public Relations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Business Management</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent from the table that there is a great similarity regarding the first seven areas of policies listed. As stated previously, this is in accord with the findings of Smith and of Bartel. It is interesting to note that among the two categories of the largest school districts, there are more books which contain policies relating to the non-teaching employees than those
relating to the pupils. The margin of difference is not great but, nevertheless, the numerical difference favors the non-teaching staff.

Smith states that in his study "there were no policies that deal directly with the curriculum." The table reveals that there is a total of twenty-five books which do contain policies dealing with the curriculum. This general area will be analyzed specifically in another section of this study.

Concerning the first seven areas listed on the table, Smith and Smittle make the following comment:

The order of organization in these reports was not the same but in general the administrative function was usually covered first, followed by policies relating to the other phases of school personnel and operation in various types of presentation.

This observation is applicable to the contents of the seventy books analyzed in this study. Although the table reveals that not all of the books contain policies covering the administrative organization, among those which did include such policies, in all but one these areas were treated first. In the one exception the contents were listed alphabetically regardless of the topic.

Since there is such a high degree of uniformity in the types of general policies contained, it is pertinent to specify some of

---

5Smith and Smittle, p. 18.

6Ibid.
the types of entries included under each of the first seven general headings. These entries are not all-inclusive but they represent the common elements found within each of the general areas:

1. General Organization
   Purpose or philosophy of education, educational hierarchy, organization of the board of education, legal basis, type of school district.

2. The Board of Education
   Election of members, officers, powers and duties, meetings, rules of order, committees, order of business.

3. School Administration
   Hierarchy of administrative staff, respective duties and responsibilities, relationships to school board and to others, requirements for appointment.

4. Policies pertaining to Teachers
   Requirements for employment, salary schedule, retirement, leaves of absence (sick leave, maternity leave, military leave, etc.) hours, health, holidays, attendance at professional meetings, dismissal, resignation, disciplinary procedures, clerical and recording duties.

5. Policies pertaining to Pupils
   Entrance requirements, conduct, health and safety, promotion, attendance, suspension and expulsion, care and use of school property.

6. Policies pertaining to the School Buildings
   Use of buildings and facilities, fees, types of activities.

7. Policies pertaining to the Non-Teaching Employees
   Requirements for employment, duties, salary, leaves of absence, dismissal, vacations, retirement.

In terms of the amount of space given for each of these general areas, the policies pertaining to teachers rank first and the
policies pertaining to the board of education rank second. This
generalization applies to the total number of books analyzed since
there is no striking difference in this regard among the districts
relative to size of enrollment. 54.3 per cent of the books devote
the greatest emphasis and detail to policies relating to the
teachers, and 28.6 per cent of the books devote the greatest empha­
sis and detail to policies relating to the board of education.

In almost all of the books there are specific statements which
are not policies according to the definition cited in Chapter I.
The number of these detailed regulations varies from book to book,
but obviously, in every case, they add to the length of the book
as well as to the amount of space and emphasis relative to a given
area. Outstanding examples of these minutiae are the inclusions
of teachers' schedules of time allotments for classroom activities,
samples of reports to be completed by the teachers, time of arrival
and departure for teachers, statements about the elevation of class­
room shades, building rental rates, detailed descriptions (not even
regulations) of the history of the school district, and a directory
of the school personnel. Although such details may be of value,
their inclusion in a policy book cannot be substantiated very
easily. Some of these items belong in a handbook for teachers and
others belong in a special brochure for special publicity purposes.

In spite of these statements about the similar features of the
policy books, it should not be interpreted that the books are sub-
stantially alike. There are many differences in the types of policies included within each general area in terms of detail and viewpoint, and it is these differences which indicate the implied philosophy of the individual school district. The promotional policy of a district, the sick leave policy, the salary schedule, the use of democratic procedures in administration, the use of standing committees by the school board, the policy on pupil discipline are but a few of the policies which indicate the attitude of a school district with which one has contact. These differences in policies are of great importance to the employees of a given school district, to the pupils, to the community, and to the school board members. In short, these differences are of great importance to all who have anything to do with the school district. Therefore, these differences warrant careful analysis and evaluation. Each of the following areas of discussion was selected because of its importance and because the policies relating to each area lend themselves well to analysis and evaluation.

Philosophy of Education

Because of its great importance, the first type of policy to be discussed is the philosophy of education of the school districts represented in this study.

Only twenty-eight of the policy books, forty per cent of the total sample, make any mention of the philosophy of education of
the school district. Ten of these twenty-eight are from the group of books representing school districts with a pupil enrollment of 2900 or more, sixteen are from the 1000-2899 pupil enrollment category, and two are from the 700-999 pupil enrollment category. Although this finding indicates that the larger the district the more likely its policy book will contain an expressed philosophy of education, it is clear that the majority of the districts, sixty per cent of the total sample, do not include an expressed philosophy of education. Moreover, the ten books of the first group cited above represent only 34.5 per cent of the twenty-nine books comprising this category, and the sixteen books of the second group cited above represent only 51.6 per cent of the thirty-one books comprising this category. Still further, of the twenty-eight books which include a specific reference to a philosophy of education three merely entitled a section Philosophy of Education and either a blank space or a terse "not completed" followed. Thus, only twenty-five books have an expression of what is termed the philosophy of education of the school district.

In terms of physical space allowed for this expression, the range is from one sentence to four pages. The reason for the length of several of these expressions is a confusion between philosophy and objectives, a point which will be given further comment and clarification.

It is very evident that no enterprise can be well directed if
it has no guiding principles nor a clearly defined purpose as its goal. Therefore, it would appear obvious that a definition of purpose, based upon the essential nature of the enterprise, is a first step in determining direction. In industry, this first step is very commonplace. The need for a definition of purpose applies to the enterprise of public education as well as to industrial endeavor. In order to find out where an enterprise is headed, the raw material with which it deals must be understood. In education, this raw material is man.

There is no doubt that there is no one American philosophy of education which guides all the public schools, but it is necessary for school boards to be concerned with the nature of the educand before they can establish the aims of education and the curricular offerings. Such a concern must lead to the formulation of a philosophy of education and this philosophy should be the foundation of all that is done within the school district relative to educational provisions. The validity of the philosophy expressed in terms of the interpretation of the one who analyzes it is very controversial, but despite this difficulty of evaluation, a philosophy which is stated in an articulate manner at least provides a framework of reference as well as a springboard for analysis and discussion.

The following quotations, contained in a text edited by Brubacher, are cited to show that in spite of differences in
philosophical views, the aims of education must be a reflection of the concept of the nature of man:

Every system of education is based on a philosophy of life. All education properly so-called is based on a complete philosophy of life. All true education is based on the true philosophy of life. (John D. Redden and Francis A. Ryan).7

... though individuals are different, they are also the same. The sameness is their human nature. If, as the Progressive Educators say they wish to do, we want to "socialize" our pupils, we are not likely to accomplish it by emphasizing their conventional against their natural characteristics. We do not wish, if this is our aim, to indulge individuality. We wish to develop humanity. Such a desire will require us to have a course of study which will emphasize the common qualities of man and the constant qualities of his nature rather than the accidents of an individual. (Robert M. Hutchins).8

There are two generic ways of teaching what are sometimes called "the ultimate" ends of education. One relies on an immediate, self-certifying intuition of the nature of man; the other on the observation of the consequences of different proposals of treating man. The first is essentially theological and metaphysical; the second is experimental and scientific.

When they are intelligently formulated both approaches recognize that the ends of education are relevant to the nature of man. The religious or metaphysical approach seeks to deduce what men should be from what they are. And what they are can only be grasped by an intuition of their absolute "essential" nature. Whatever the differences between Aristotle, Aquinas, and Rousseau on other points -and they are vast- all assert

8 Ibid., p. 42.
that from the true nature of man the true nature of education follows logically. (Sidney Hook).  

The final problem in ethics and the ultimate aim in education must be tested in terms of the realization of the rational self. (Arthur C. Fleshman).

The two points in a boy's training are, to keep his natural and train off all but that: to keep his natural, but stop off his uproar, fooling and horse-play; keep his nature and arm it with knowledge in the very direction in which it points . . . (Ralph Waldo Emerson).

The following quotation from Butler also emphasizes the necessity of considering the nature of man relative to a philosophy of education:

All philosophies are concerned with the nature of the self. . . . Is the self a physical, social, or spiritual unit? Whatever answer is given will go far in determining a person's attitude toward the pupil, in case education is one of his major interests. If the self is a physical unit, then pupils are biological organisms. If it is a social unit, then pupils are little pieces of society. If it is a spiritual unit, then pupils are souls with destinies which outreach both biological and social processes.

Regardless of the quotation which one may accept as most meaningful, it is evident from these that the nature of man must be considered before one can formulate a philosophy of education and its attendant aims and/or objectives. Whether or not the contents of the seventy policy books analyzed in this study reflect this

---

9 Ibid., p. 167.
10 Ibid., p. 182.
11 Ibid., p. 203.
concern with the nature of man relative to a philosophy of education is of major importance. A basic assumption is that every policy contained in the policy books must be evaluated in terms of its relationship to the philosophy of education of the school district. It is assumed that all statements of policy should be at least an implicit indication of the philosophy of education of the school district, but the analysis will concern itself primarily with the expressed statements of philosophy.

In general, the statements of philosophy of education and the objective of education are expressed in language so vague that the resultant glittering generalities lose their significance. Several examples follow:

The school's task is that of educating for intelligent and devoted American citizenship - citizenship broadly conceived.

Our educational philosophy is concerned primarily with providing the best possible educational opportunities for the students.

Pupils should be helped to adjust themselves to the environment in which they will work and live with a well-rounded life which will be marked by their interests.

The Board of Education believes in the Principles of Democracy and demands that the schools teach and encourage as well as practice the American Way of life.

In general, the policy of the Board of Education is to make its educational views function by meeting the educational needs of the children and young adults of the community.

The purpose of education in our schools is to guide the development of the whole child within the limits of
his capacity so that he may enjoy life fully and contribute his best to our democratic society in a changing world.

The Board of Education is committed to a philosophy of service to children. This objective is to help each child develop as a mature individual and as a contributing member of society.

It is evident from these typical examples that the twenty-five policy books which contain sections on philosophy of education do not concern themselves with the nature of man. The development of the "whole child" is a popular refrain, appearing in some variation in sixteen of the books. In eleven of these books there is no definition of what is meant by the "whole child." Nine of the policy books refer directly to the moral or ethical or spiritual aspect of man's education, and these references are contained in the objectives of education rather than in a statement of philosophy. In four of these references there is no elaboration, just a reference. The five remaining books with these references to the spiritual objectives of education include a statement that the school encourages church attendance of the pupils and church-school cooperation. These references are fraught with implications.

There is some confusion in the policy books between philosophy and objectives in spite of the fact that fifteen of the books refer to the objectives of education and to the philosophy of education in separate classifications. In four of these fifteen books, there is a statement of "philosophy" which expresses the fact that public
education is a function of the State, but it is the listing of objectives which implies the philosophy of the school. In seven of the fifteen books, the objectives are introduced with a statement of "philosophy" similar to the examples on the preceding page, and the list of these objectives is very similar to the four objectives of the Educational Policies Commission and to the Seven Cardinal Principles of Education.

In the policy books with these overlapping general objectives and vague philosophies there are four frequently mentioned objectives to be achieved by the pupils: good citizenship, development of American democratic values, social adjustment, and development of the individual's capabilities, interests, and attitudes. These objectives are not defined. Possibly there is no attempt at definition of these concepts because they are so vague, so general, so abstract.

Although more basic thinking is needed regarding the concept of the "whole child" in order to save it from a hackneyed death, serious consideration must be given to a possible explanation of these apparently innocuous statements of philosophy of education. There are divergent means to arrive at philosophical ultimates and at concepts of the nature of man because of the practical realization that we live in a pluralistic culture. Despite what may be acceptable goals, on the theoretical level, the means, on the practical level, are so varied that they almost defy description. More-
over, there may be all kinds and degrees of co-operation on the practical level even when the theoretical reasons and bases are different. In our pluralistic culture, our concept of freedom will not allow coercion to be exerted so that a monolithic philosophy of education will be enjoined upon the people. Thus, it becomes obvious that it is extremely difficult to state for the public schools a philosophy of education which will be sufficiently general, sufficiently articulate, and sufficiently acceptable unless one expresses innocuous generalities such as those cited previously.

The comments of Mahan and Maritain relative to this problem are interesting.

... the American concept of democracy implies the existence of diversities. It is not a monistic, absolutistic system. In its very essence it is pluralistic. ... This essential pluralism means that the United States is built upon what Maritain calls a "secular faith." In other words, it implies rational agreement by all to certain common goals and certain common principles such as the dignity of the individual, though the grounds for acceptance may differ. Thus, its aim is not one of absolute unity; its aim is one of agreement in diversity. There are basic tenets to be accepted by all, but beyond this there is freedom.13

Mahan states further:

The principle of the fundamental pluralism of our democratic charter is legally and philosophically sound.

Civic action requires unity only as regards the end and the practical means of obtaining that end. This unity can be guaranteed best through such a pluralism. The problem arises when we leave the practical level for the theoretical, as we must in education. Americans may disagree as to why American democracy is right, but they must agree that there are reasons why it is right. I do not know how public education can meet the demand upon it to insure that conviction. I do know that, if the public schools are allowed to swallow the philosophy of scientific humanism because of its purported neutrality, they will fail to meet their obligations to further the common good.\textsuperscript{14}

Maritain, who cited the latter portion of the above quotation in his treatment of the problem, introduced it this way:

... the fact remains that the teaching of the democratic charter is, today, one of the chief obligations of education and no practical solution is possible except along the lines of some pluralistic arrangement.\textsuperscript{15}

Curriculum

Because this general area is so closely related to a philosophy of education and because it is the essential ingredient of any school, an analysis of curriculum policies is included at this point.

Contrary to the findings of Smith,\textsuperscript{16} twenty-seven of the policy books, 38.57 per cent of the seventy collected, contained pol-

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 196.


\textsuperscript{16}p. 37.
icities relative to the area of curriculum. Thirteen of these twenty-seven books are from the group of school districts with 2900 or more pupils, eleven books are from the 1000-2899 pupil enrollment group, one book is from the 700-999 pupil enrollment group, and two books are from the group of small districts. Most of the policies included in these books which relate to the curriculum are very vague. The most common types of curriculum policies are similar to these examples:

- The curriculum will be under constant analysis and revision and in keeping with the modern curriculum concepts.

- The curriculum shall be designed to provide for the continuous development of pupils from kindergarten to high school.

- The curriculum shall be in process of continuous development to adapt the school program to the changing society.

The value of these policies as guides for curriculum development is dubious. Not only are the statements nebulous in themselves, but there is nothing stated in the policy books following these generalizations which gives an indication of implementation.

In three of the twenty-seven books which contain curriculum policies, there is a very explicit listing of the curriculum areas by grade level. In all of these the time allotment is listed for each curriculum area in the elementary school. Five of the high school districts represented in the twenty-seven books with curriculum policies specify the requirements for graduation under the
section on curriculum. Six of the twenty-seven books list curriculum policies in the section relating to the duties of the administrator or of the director of curriculum. Policies pertaining to textbooks are typically restricted to the care and availability of these. Thus, although four of the books state that the selection of textbooks is a function of the administrator, subject to the approval of the school board, these policies may be interpreted as curriculum policies only by the greatest stretch of the imagination.

It was mentioned in the section on the philosophy of education that nine of the policy books contain a reference to the moral or ethical or spiritual aspect of man's education. Five districts stated explicitly that their policy is to cooperate with the church to help to educate the child in matters which are spiritual. As one would expect, however, there are no curriculum provisions in any of the books which relate to these matters.

Based upon his analysis of twenty-seven policy books, Smith's comments on the area of curriculum policies are interesting:

It can be noted that there were no policies that deal directly with the curriculum. However, policies do form the basis for the orderly development of procedures relating to an effective curriculum.

An improved instructional program for children is central among the advantages that result from personnel policies which outline the functions, responsibilities, and compensations of professional educators.17

17Smith and Smittle, p. 18.
Regardless of this very charitable interpretation of the conspicuous absence of school board policies in the area of curriculum, the bald fact is that there are very few policies with an articulate reference to the curriculum. The results of Smith's study and the results of this present study are in substantial agreement on this point.

Homework

The relationship between the curriculum and homework should be very clear. If homework is assigned, it should be based upon some desired outcome of learning relative to the curricular offerings. That homework is assigned for various reasons is common knowledge. Many parents have probably experienced a feeling of repugnance towards the homework assignments given to their children, and perhaps these parents would be interested in knowing the policy of the local board of education on homework. It may be a surprise, therefore, to note that only seven of the seventy policy books analyzed in this study include a policy on homework. It may be true that many teachers assign homework regardless of school board policy and it may be true that many school districts have unwritten policies on homework, but these considerations are speculative and cannot be determined by the results of this study.

The seven books cited above represent school districts in each of the four classifications based upon size in terms of pupil
enrollment. One book is from the group of the largest school districts, three are from the next largest, one is from the third group, and two are from the group of the small districts. All seven of the books with policies on homework are from elementary school districts. Five of these books contain policies which prohibit the assignment of homework except on very special occasions. One of these five policies prohibits homework for pupils in the first six grades, except on rare occasions, but encourages "a certain amount of homework" for pupils in grades seven and eight. This "certain amount" is limited to one hour total time. Of the two policies which allow regular homework assignments, one stresses that the work must be meaningful and the other gives the teacher full discretion.

There is no uniformity nor consensus regarding policies on homework. Even if there were great similarity of policy, the fact that only ten per cent of the entire collection of seventy policy books include policies on homework would make any conclusions narrow in their application. The safest general conclusion is that the vast majority of the school districts represented in this study do not state any policy on homework. An implication in this regard is that many abuses in the quality and in the quantity of assignments perpetrated by the teachers may be due to a lack of a clear, effective policy concerning homework.
Pupil Promotion and Retention

Any consideration of pupil promotion and retention must be related to the philosophy of education and to the curricular offerings of the school district. It has been pointed out, however, that there are few well-articulated policy statements pertaining to the philosophy of education or to the curriculum. Therefore, the matter of pupil promotion and retention appears to be considered on its own merits in those books which include policies in this area.

A total of twenty-four books of the seventy representing the entire sample include policies on pupil promotion and retention. Ten of these twenty-four books are from the group of the largest school districts, twelve are from the group of the next largest school districts, and there is one each from the two remaining classifications. It bears repeating that twenty-eight of the seventy books include some reference to a philosophy of education and twenty-seven of the seventy books include policies relative to the curriculum. Although the three totals are similar, twenty-four, twenty-eight, and twenty-seven, there is no pattern evident nor strong relationship existent among the books which include policies on pupil promotion and retention, philosophy of education, and curriculum. Only nine of the books contain policies pertaining to all three of these areas. In general, these nine books advocate the social value of education as the philosophy of the
school district, the curriculum policies are similar to those quoted previously, and the policy on pupil promotion is very liberal. Six of these nine policy books are from the group of the largest school districts, and three are from the districts which have pupil enrollments of 1000-2899.

The policy on pupil promotion which occurs most frequently, eight of the books contain an almost identical policy, is as follows:

Promotion or demotion of pupils may be made by the teacher with the approval of the principal at times other than at the close of the school year. Conferences with the parents should be sought whenever there is an indication of probable non-promotion.

Five of the high school districts state a policy like this:

Graduation requirements will be four years of successful high school experience, with a minimum of sixteen units.

Several other interesting policies on pupil promotion and retention are these:

In general, children shall be kept with their own chronological age group. However, a pupil shall be retained when it appears that he will profit from retention. While the parents should be consulted, the final decision shall be made by the school staff.

The greater majority of pupils should be promoted but automatic promotion of all pupils cannot be justified. . . . Automatic retention because of failure to meet certain standards without regard to any other factor cannot be justified.

In grades four to eight no child can be promoted who fails in two of the content subjects. This statement is set up as a guide, but no pupil should be failed on this
statement alone. The teacher, principal, and parent should confer as to what is best for the child.

Students, to be eligible for promotion, must satisfactorily complete the prescribed course of study. ... Some students unable to complete satisfactorily the prescribed course of study may be given a "social promotion" for reasons other than academic achievement.

Although these statements are very ambiguous, they apparently indicate that pupils shall be promoted. According to these policies, seldom will a pupil be denied promotion even if his work has been of very poor quality. Even among those policies which specify the exact requirements for graduation in terms of credits or units, the implication is that the pupils will be promoted since in no instance is there a definition of what is meant by "successful high school experience." This viewpoint may be considered a reflection of the stated or implied philosophy that the school must help each individual to develop according to his own capabilities, interests, and attitudes. In harmony with this concept of meeting the individual needs of the "whole child," in fourteen of the policies on pupil retention a reference is made to the necessity of parental consultation. Three of these policies state that parental approval is not necessary if a pupil is retained. Actually, these policies on pupil retention are, in general, mere verbalizations because the emphasis in the policies in this whole area is on pupil promotion.

These liberal promotion policies are consistent with the em-
phasis upon the social progress and the social adjustment of the pupil, an emphasis which is made clear in the policies on the philosophy of the districts. Despite poor academic achievement, a child is often promoted for social, emotional, or chronological reasons if the policies as stated meet with compliance. Although there can be little doubt that the school should pay much attention to the social development of its pupils, it may be argued that to attribute greater importance to social development of a child than to academic achievement is to admit something rather incongruous. Since the school is but one agency of society, it is presumptuous for the school to assume the obligation of the entire task of providing for the social development of the pupil. Moreover, as is true of all agencies of society, the school has one primary purpose. This primary purpose is the provision for the academic development of the child. A school which does not stress academic development is relegating to an inferior level the very factor which is essential to it and which differentiates it from other institutions and agencies of society.18

Along the same line, it may be argued further that, granting the values of social development and social acceptability, social

promotions may not help one to achieve these goals. When we pre-
sume that social promotions - promotions based upon factors other
than academic to the degree that the academic is no better than
a secondary consideration- will make an individual socially accept-
able, we may presume too much. It would appear that few school
situations are as conducive to frustrating the pupils as the
attempts to make a grade of forty equal to a grade of eighty-five.
A low achiever in school is generally aware of his poor work. To
pat him on the back and to promote him when he knows that he does
not deserve the promotion may lead to the development of very poor
attitudes. More important, when we consider failure as satisfac-
tory, we are foresaking basic values.

This discussion is intended to be an evaluation of the pol-
icies on pupil promotion and retention contained in the seventy
policy books analyzed in this study. Although the speculative
nature of several of the points stated cannot be denied, these
speculations are offered as an attempt to focus attention upon the
popular strong emphasis on aspects of education other than the
academic.

Discipline

The subject of pupil discipline is mentioned in forty-one of
the seventy policy books upon which this study is based. Eighteen
of these are from the group of school districts with enrollments
of 2900 or more pupils, nineteen of the books are from the school districts with pupil enrollments of 1000-2899, and there are two books from each of the two other classifications of the smaller districts. In general, the references to pupil discipline are very similar. The typical statement of policy on this subject is:

A pupil may be suspended temporarily from the schools by the principal or by the superintendent of schools for gross disobedience or persistent misconduct. However, in no case shall he be expelled under this rule except by order of the Board of Education.

In one of the policy books, representing a high school district in the group of the largest districts, the matter of pupil discipline is stated differently:

It is recognized that self-discipline as contrasted to imposed discipline is a desirable goal.

As a guide for implementation, this policy is much too general, yet it is a reflection of a positive approach to the matter of pupil discipline. The accent is on desirable conduct because the pupils are expected to be good citizens of the society in which they live. Certainly, the point of view is clear: the pupils will act properly if they can develop an attitude of worthiness and dignity which will help them to be self-disciplined. It is significant to note that the one book containing this policy contains an objective as part of its policy on the philosophy of education which stresses the acquisition by the pupils of a sense of self-direction and social responsibility in a democracy. This internal
consistency gives strength to the policy book.

In addition to this one exception to the typical statement of policy on pupil discipline, there are several specific references which merit comment. In eight of the books, examples of grounds for suspension and expulsion are listed. The usual breaches of good conduct include these: profanity, truancy, smoking, drinking liquor, drawing obscene pictures, insubordination, and defacing school property. One of the policy books adds chewing paper as an action which might bring suspension. Another book warns the pupils against sitting "IN THE WINDOWS." Three of the books state that the student must be cheerful if he is to avoid the wrath of the powers that be. In none of these books is the degree of cheerfulness delimited nor is the concept defined. One book lists filthiness of person as grounds for expulsion, and it also states that "Any pupil carrying firearms or other deadly weapons shall be suspended." Two of the policy books warn the pupils to refrain from reading comic books on the school premises. These two policy books contain similar statements in this regard:

Objects brought to school which create hazards to students or cause general interference with school aims will be confiscated immediately by the teachers. Such articles include: guns, bean shooters, knives, hard balls, and comic books.

Although the implication may be unintentional, it would seem that the list of undesirable items equates comic books with guns and knives. Granted that the reading of comic books during school
hours should be discouraged and perhaps punishment should be meted out to the offenders, it seems that it is stretching a point too far to group this offense with those of a more serious nature. Perhaps some of the comic book readers are incapable of reading the textbooks and their activities, then, are the result of scholastic deficiency rather than disciplinary non-conformity. Or perhaps some of the comic book readers are bored gifted children who, according to Terman's studies, read more comics than their non-gifted classmates.¹⁹ In spite of these tongue in cheek speculations, this problem of reading comic books in school merits serious thought and policy level statements relating to comic books should not be arbitrary in their origin.

The topic of corporal punishment is covered by policy in only thirteen of the seventy policy books. These thirteen represent books of school districts of all four pupil enrollment categories. Policies in four of the books prohibit corporal punishment. A typical policy is: "Corporal punishment shall not be administered by any school personnel for any reason." One of the policy books has a very ambiguous reference to corporal punishment:

Corporal punishment is not the official policy of the school district. However, profanity, abuse, or the case of one child physically assaulting another is not to be tolerated in our schools, and the teachers and the principal are expected to maintain order.

One can see very readily that this ambiguity may lead to so many difficulties that it is as indefinite as no policy at all.

Policies in eight of the books allow corporal punishment to be employed as a last resort or as a means of self defense. The policies of this type are similar to the following:

Corporal punishment is permitted only after other means are exhausted and under the following conditions: sufficient reflection by the teacher, adult witness present, the pupil shall not be struck in the region of the head or of the vital organs, the principal shall be notified of the punishment within one hour.

It is obvious that the majority of the policy books in this study, 80.1 per cent of the total sample, do not refer to corporal punishment as a matter of policy, and it is equally obvious that there is a disparity of thought among the thirteen books which include policies on this topic. Except for the one ambiguous policy quoted above, however, the policies stated are very explicit. This is a strong point.

The preceding analyses and comments are related to areas of policy which are concerned with pupils and their educational experiences. The following analyses and comments are related to areas of policy which are concerned with the operation of the school board and with the professional staff.

Standing Committees

The organization of the school board into standing committees with specific, detailed functions is advocated in twenty-four of
the seventy policy books studied. Twenty-nine of the books state unequivocally that there will be no standing committees of the board, and sixteen books contain no reference to standing committees. One of the policy books states that the utilization of standing committees is optional, but in no case may the duties of such a committee be legislative or administrative. The following table shows these results according to the size of the school districts:

**TABLE IV**

POLICIES PERTAINING TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOUND IN POLICY BOOKS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF VARIOUS ENROLLMENT CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Enrollment</th>
<th>2900+</th>
<th>1000-2899</th>
<th>700-999</th>
<th>Less than 700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent from the table that there is no pattern in relation to the size of the school district and its policy on standing committees. The difference in the total number of school districts which prohibit standing committees is slightly more than
the number which favors them, twenty-nine to twenty-four, respectively.

All of the twenty-four policy books which advocate standing committees have at least these two:

1. Building and Grounds (one district calls this committee Real Estate)
2. Finance

Other types of standing committees listed and the number of districts which specify these are as follows:

1. Education...........................................7
2. Teacher.............................................3
3. Transportation....................................3
4. Public Relations.................................2
5. Janitor and Supplies............................2
6. Planning...........................................1
7. Administration and Policy.....................1

The usual duties of standing committees are to investigate needs and problems of the school and community, to report the findings to the Board of Education, and to recommend procedures and policies to be followed relative to the area of investigation.

This emphasis on standing committees by 34.3 per cent of the school districts represented in the study is very clear. These results are surprising, however, in view of the fact that there are so many references in the professional literature which state explicitly that standing committees of the school board tend to be a divisive influence in school board operation. The one policy book which makes optional the establishment of standing committees em-
phrases that these committees may not have legislative or administrative duties. This awareness of the dangers of standing committees is the most important reason that so many authors advise school boards to avoid the establishment of these committees. The American Association of School Administrators view standing committees unfavorably as is shown in this quotation:

> There is evidence that dividing a school board into standing committees on buildings, faculty, budget, and the like is . . . inefficient. In one city in the Southwest the board was organized for years with permanent "special committees." The board, when sitting as a body, would act blindly on the committee recommendations. Gradually the committees develop into "little boards." The chairman became such "authorities" in their respective fields that the superintendent of schools and his professional staff were usually bypassed. One committee recommended teachers for appointment, one operated buildings and grounds, one purchased supplies, and one determined salaries. The president of the board was the "boss" of the whole system. Discord and confusion prevailed.

> An awakened citizenry eventually changed the membership of the board. The new board organized to work as a committee of the whole and empowered the superintendent and his staff to operate the schools under its general direction. The school system soon changed from a state of confusion to an efficient orderly organization. . . .

> Some boards with standing committees do operate satisfactory school systems, at the cost of much unnecessary effort by the board and duplication of work for the superintendent.20

Reader's comments on this topic are very similar to the preceding quotation:

---

20American Association of School Administrators, School Board-Superintendent Relationships, pp. 43-44.
By a standing committee is meant a permanent committee. The members of standing committees, if any, should be appointed for a one-year term, but should be eligible for reappointment. Students of school administration are agreed, however, that a school board should not have any standing committees but should do its work with the whole board or a quorum of the board present at all deliberations. They are opposed to standing committees because the members of such bodies are often tempted to usurp the power of the whole board, to regard themselves as experts in school administration, and, therefore, to undertake to perform technical duties which should be delegated to the board's employees. They believe that committee work, moreover, requires too much time of board members. The work which standing committees are appointed to do can be done more efficiently by the superintendent of schools and his professional co-workers who will report and recommend to the whole board, leaving to the board, of course, the making of decisions on the report and the recommendation of the committee. 21

In spite of authoritative opinion to the contrary, it bears repeating that twenty-four of the policy books, representing all four categories of school districts included in this study, favor the establishment and utilization of standing committees of the school board. Why this expert opinion is not accepted is a question for further investigation. The fact is that the advice is not acceptable to twenty-four of the school boards as indicated. Whether or not the sixteen districts which contain no policies on standing committees agree or disagree with the opinion of experts is another question for speculation and investigation.

It was stated that all of the school boards in this study which do have policies favoring standing committees specify a com-

21 Reeder, School Boards and Superintendents, p. 29.
mittee on finance in their organizational plan. Whether or not a school board has a standing committee on finance, a temporary committee on finance, or a committee of the whole board on finance, this area is one of the most important practical considerations of a school board. Since salaries for the personnel of the school district are a major concern of committees on finance and of the whole school board, the policies on salary schedules are analyzed next.

**Salary Schedules**

Reference to the existence of a district-wide salary schedule for the professional staff is made in forty-eight of the seventy policy books. In the group of twenty-nine school districts with pupil enrollments of 2900 or more pupils, twenty books (sixty-nine per cent) contain policies pertaining to a salary schedule; in the group of thirty-one school districts with 1000-2899 pupils, twenty-four books (77.4 per cent) contain such policies; and in each of the two groups of smaller school districts two books include policies on salaries. Ten of the forty-eight books cover the non-professional staff with a policy on salary schedules. Eight of these ten are from school districts in the group of the largest districts and two are from the next largest group. The major emphasis in this analysis of the topic, however, will be on salary schedules for teachers.
In ten of the books, there is nothing more than a general statement relating to salary schedules. An example of this type of policy is: "A regular teacher shall be paid according to an annual salary schedule adopted by the Board of Education."

In twenty-one of the books, a copy of the current salary schedule and statements explaining it are included in addition to a policy similar to the above quotation. Eighteen of these books are from school districts in the group of the largest districts. The usual salary schedule includes the beginning, or the minimum, salary; the maximum salary; the number of annual increments, or steps (usually 14 steps); the amount of annual increments (the average is $145); the bases upon which salary increments will be granted; and the differentials for various factors such as dependency allowances, degrees, extra duties, and experience. Merit is mentioned as one of these factors in one schedule.

The National Education Association lists eight guides for effective salary schedules:

1. Minimum salaries should be high enough to attract well-educated, promising young people into teaching.
2. Maximum salaries should be high enough to retain highly competent teachers.
3. Equity of treatment of classroom teachers of like qualifications and experience is essential.
4. Annual increments should provide an orderly progress to a maximum salary.
5. The salary schedule should offer professional stimulation through incentives in recognition of professional qualifications.
6. Salary schedules should be adjusted periodically with due consideration for trends and earnings in other professions and for changes in the cost of living.

7. Salaries of professional school personnel other than classroom teachers should be scheduled in accordance with principles that apply to classroom teachers with suitable recognition of responsibilities and preparation for professional leadership.

8. There should be professional participation of classroom teachers in the development and administration of salary policies.²²

In general, there is agreement between these desirable practices and what has been found in the salary schedules in the policy books in this study.

The fact that almost one-third of the school districts included in this study do not have a policy on salary schedules leads to a further consideration of this situation. One can only guess why 31.4 per cent of the seventy school board policy books ignore a reference to a salary schedule. It is possible, of course, that some of the twenty-two school districts which have no expressed salary schedule policy do have a salary schedule. Only the expressed policies contained in the policy books, however, may be considered for analysis and evaluation.

There is no dearth of references in the professional literature which emphasize the use of a salary schedule. The eight principles of the National Education Association, cited on the preced-

ing page, are but one example of authoritative opinion which advocates this administrative device. Assuming that a salary schedule is important, it is significant that so many districts do not state policies on this topic. Certainly, the determination of the specifics of the salary schedule in any given school district is an individual problem, but experts insist upon the necessity of a policy on salary schedules for several reasons.

It is no secret that schools do not operate on an unlimited budget. Hence, it is true economy to seek the greatest value for every dollar spent. Without sufficient intelligent planning this goal can never be achieved. Because teachers' salaries constitute a major expenditure, much planning should go into the development of a salary schedule which is itself a "plan designed to prescribe the exact limits within which the administration must manage the salaries of its teachers." The final acceptance of any salary schedule should be the function of the board of education, but the planning of the schedule should be a cooperative endeavor of representatives of all groups whom the schedule will affect. Much research and investigation will be necessary and the moot question of dependency allowances, merit raises, and other salary differentials will have to be settled in the determination of the salary

23 Illinois Association of School Boards, Salary Schedules for Teachers, Pamphlet No. 4 of School Board Reference Library (Springfield, 1946), p. 4.

policies to be included in the final draft of the schedule. The type of educational program desired by the community is of paramount importance because it is the local community which pays the greatest share of the cost of the educational program in Illinois and in many other states. Thus, the elected community representatives, the board of education, must determine the amount of financial encumbrance which it is willing to assume at the time of the adoption of the salary schedule and when there may be many teachers at the maximum level. The type of program which the community desires must be evaluated by the tax-payers, especially by the board of education, from a monetary point of view; and this view, tempered by intelligent reflection, should be a determining factor in the final acceptance of any policy concerning the salary schedule.

Once the board accepts a schedule which is as attractive as financial practicability will allow, the administration of the schedule should be easy. When a teacher can determine for himself just what his position on the schedule is and what it will be, the very undesirable feature of haggling and dickering over salary at contract time will be avoided. Existing evidence of the value of a salary schedule and logical thinking make it clear that the dickering system is not an example of true economy. Certainly, an expert bargainer on the board of education will be able to whittle down a teacher's salary request, but this is a short term finan-
cial gain, and true economy in a school district is based upon the long term point of view. The few hundred dollars which a board can save by besting several teachers in a salary dickering contest may result in an actual cost in terms of teacher turnover in the district. Unless there are unusual advantages to teaching in a given district, a teacher who has to haggle over salary terms probably will not remain in that district for many years. When a competent teacher leaves his position, the efficiency of the school is impaired and the cost of operation automatically increases as a result. The following quotation makes this evident:

In industry much attention has been given to labor turnover; it is recognized that a high rate of turnover is expensive; and scientific employment has been found to be economy. In education a high rate of teacher turnover is expensive to the school because of the excessive time and expense which must be devoted to the selection of teachers and because of the additional supervision made necessary by the lack of knowledge concerning local standards, conditions, and so forth on the part of the new teachers. The more serious cost of turnover, however, is borne by the pupils, and therefore by society, because of the lower efficiency of teachers who are strange and unaccustomed to their pupils, equipment, and community. There is, moreover, a heavy burden of expense to society at large in the training of many teachers who serve in the profession only a short time and then leave it. While the expense of either of these types of turnover cannot be measured in dollars and cents as in industry, it is nevertheless present.25

The above quotation, emphasizing the expense of teacher turnover, is not in itself an endorsement of the establishment of a

25Leonard V. Koos et al., Administering the Secondary School (Chicago, 1940), p. 344.
salary schedule. However, although an attractive salary schedule will not eliminate teacher turnover, it may be a potent factor in the reduction of this problem.

Since the board of education has the responsibility of administering the budget of the school district, it must utilize true economy in personnel management if it is to avoid monetary waste. At best, there will be some errors in financial administration and the aim of the board should be to minimize the amount of careless, erroneous, or unintelligent spending. Wise planning of the budget is necessary, but the administration of the budget is no less important. With a workable and attractive salary schedule the basis for sound economy in the management of personnel is established because the determination of salaries to be paid becomes an objective matter. The following quotation is significant:

Of the funds allocated for personal services the salaries of teachers usually constitute more than 90 per cent of the total. Because so large a part of the total school budget is required for teachers' salaries, it is essential that this money be expended according to sound budgetary practices which are designed to bring the largest educational returns to the children and the community. This purpose gives direction and control to the board's chief executive officer by providing an established plan for the disbursement of funds allocated for teachers' salaries in a manner designed to guarantee consistency of action and sound financial management. 26

In the booklet which contains the above quotation the point is made that salary schedules provide the community with a method of

accounting for public funds. This is a very important feature of a salary schedule but it is seldom mentioned as an argument favoring the establishment of a schedule as a matter of school board policy.

The realization of this purpose (use of the schedule as a method of accounting for public funds) necessitates the construction of a salary schedule which gives proper recognition to the interests of the general public as well as of the teaching profession. . . . the salary schedule should be so constructed that it commands the respect of the citizenry and permits the members of the teaching profession to maintain living standards commensurate with their positions in the community.27

In the two preceding quotations the word choice deems it imperative that a salary schedule be established if sound financial management policies are to be followed. Such words as essential, sound, and consistency were used to describe the need for and the value of a salary schedule. In view of this and other evidence, a school district which is concerned with true economy and intelligent methods of financial administration cannot ignore the recommendations relative to the establishment of a salary schedule as a matter of school board policy. If this conclusion is acceptable, it is significant that almost one-third of the school board policy books included in this study do not have a policy on salary schedules.

27Ibid.
Public Relations

Policies on public relations are expressed in twenty-two of the seventy policy books analyzed. This represents 31.4 per cent of the total sample. As was stated in the discussion of the standing committees of school boards, there are two districts which establish standing committees for the purpose of public relations functions. These two districts are among the twenty-nine of the largest districts included in this study. In the same vein, of the twenty-two books which include policies on public relations twelve are from the group with 2900 or more pupils, eight are from the next largest group, and the remaining two books are from the districts with 700 or less pupils. Based on this representation, it is apparent that the larger districts are more concerned with policies on public relations than is the case with the smaller school districts. Of course, this generalization is applicable only to the sample upon which the study was based. To extend the generalization beyond the scope of the seventy books studied is to tread on thin ice, although the extent to which this generalization may apply is a consideration worthy of further study.

The policies pertaining to public relations generally state that a program of publicity is necessary in order to improve understanding and morale within the schools and to keep the public informed as to the activities, needs, and achievements of the schools.
The responsibility for this program, as stated in the policy books, is generally that of the superintendent, although there are variations. It is important to note that the two-way aspect of school-community relations is ignored in the typical policy as paraphrased above. The concept of public relations appears to be a one-way street whereby the school attempts to notify the community of its activities, needs, and achievements. This is significant if one can accept the following quotation which stresses a two-way communication system:

Social Interpretation is that activity whereby the institution is made aware of the community conditions and needs, and the factual information service whereby the people are kept continuously informed of the purposes, values, conditions, and needs of the educational program. 28

In four of the policy books, two each from the largest categories of school districts according to size of enrollment, there are policies concerning advisory committees of the citizens of the community. These policies encourage the participation of lay groups to assist the board of education in determining policies, appraisal of the educational program, and, in one instance, planning new construction. In only one of the four policy references to these lay groups is there a definite statement that the board need not accept the advice or the recommendations of these groups or committees. The important feature of these policies by these

28Moehlman, Social Interpretation, p. 104.
four school districts is that in each case the board recognizes the necessity of a two-way program of school-community relations, a recognition which is in harmony with the quotation of Moehlman.

In three of the books, not included in the four just mentioned and all of which are from the group of the largest school districts, there is a policy which spells out the procedure to be followed by parents or patrons who have a grievance. If the grievance cannot be handled satisfactorily by the teacher nor the principal nor the superintendent, in that order, then the complaining party may present the case to the school board. In one of the books the policy states that the president of the board will allow no more than five minutes for a discussion of the complaint. Only if a majority of the board votes for a time extension will more time be allowed.

The line and staff organization is evident in these instances, a hierarchical chain of command system which is corroborated by the organizational charts and/or definitions of duties of personnel which are found in almost all of the seventy policy books. Not only is this procedure of working through channels a major consideration for those who agree with the comment of Burton and Brueckner: "Certain leaders are expressing the belief that it may be actually impossible to organize a good school system under traditional line-and-staff;"29 it is also a major consideration for those who are

interested in the public relations aspect of such policies. It is apparent from the analysis of the seventy policy books that despite some references to democratic procedures, these procedures are intended to be carried out in a structured, authoritarian, line and staff frame of reference. This situation need not elicit derogatory comments from the community residents of a school district unless there are severe abuses in the functioning of this chain of command. The school board which delegates its authority in a most democratic fashion may be courting disaster in those districts where the community is not ready for the democratic approach. An analysis of the merits of the democratic versus the authoritarian approach to educational administration is beyond the scope of this study. It is important to note, however, that the apparent emphasis in the seventy policy books is on the latter approach when decisions of a serious nature are to be made. The resulting effect upon school-community relations is impossible to evaluate in this study, but it is an area for further study.

As a final comment on the topic public relations, the fact that only twenty-two of the policy books analyzed contain references to this area should not be interpreted as a lack of interest in school-community relations on the part of the school boards. In the analysis of the physical characteristics of the policy books in Chapter III of this study, many weaknesses in the appearance were noted. Despite these, however, and despite the absence
of policies on public relations in more than two-thirds of the seventy policy books, the very fact that these books have been compiled for public perusal is at least an implicit acknowledgement of the public relations value of printed policies. This point has been stated in Chapter III, but it bears repeating. Any interested school board can improve the physical appearance of its policy book, and many school boards can strengthen the internal elements of these books. Once this is recognized and accepted, it is logical to assume that the public relations aspect of these books will be improved greatly.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The foregoing analyses of the physical characteristics and the internal aspects of the policy books collected for this study are valuable as a frame of reference within which the following hypotheses, previously stated in Chapter I, may be accepted or rejected.

HYPOTHESIS 1: There is general agreement concerning the important areas of school policy.

The results of the analysis of this phase of the contents of the seventy policy books support this hypothesis. The seven most frequently mentioned areas of school policy were found to be in accord with the findings of Smith's study of school board policy books, as stated in Chapter IV. These seven areas which reflect considerable agreement concerning their importance are policies pertaining to:

1. General Organization
2. The Board of Education
3. School Administration
4. Teachers
5. Pupils
6. School Buildings
7. Non-Teaching Employees
As was pointed out in the discussion of these headings, however, it is important to note that in spite of the general agreement concerning the most important areas of school board policy, many of the policies relating to these areas are very different when they are compared on a district to district basis. Moreover, it should be repeated that many of the statements included in the policy books are rules and regulations, not policies.

**HYPOTHESIS 2: The policies include statements of a school philosophy and objectives.**

In twenty-five of the policy books there are policies relating to what is called the philosophy of education of the school district and in fifteen of these books there are lists of objectives of education. Three additional books include a heading labeled Philosophy of Education but either a blank space or a "not completed" followed. Twenty-three of the twenty-five policy books with policies relating to a philosophy of education are found in the books representing the larger school districts. It has been pointed out that there is a great weakness concerning policies in this area because, in general, the nature of the educand is ignored and the policies which are expressed are vague, inarticulate, and, in some cases, there is confusion between objectives and expressions of philosophy. When to these internal weaknesses of policies relative to philosophy we add the fact that sixty per cent of the seventy policy books do not contain any ref-
erence to policies on philosophy of education, the conclusion is evident that there is a conspicuous need for clearly stated, meaningful policies on the philosophy of education of the school district. Therefore, although there is some evidence which supports the hypothesis, the preponderance of the evidence based upon the seventy policy books analyzed in this study would force one to reject the hypothesis.

HYPOTHESIS 3: The policies of a school district are consistent with each other and with the philosophy of education of the school district.

The analysis of the seventy policy books reveals some contradictory evidence concerning the acceptance or rejection of this hypothesis. In specific instances which were cited in the analysis of policies on curriculum and pupil promotion, for example, there are indications that there is a degree of inconsistency among the policies of a given school district. In certain other instances which were cited in relation to policies on pupil promotion and pupil discipline, there are indications of consistency. Since the policies on the philosophy of education are so inadequate, it is not surprising to find this apparent contradiction. In fact, it is surprising to find that there is any consistency when there is no clearly expressed philosophy of education. From another point of view, if one insists that every policy is an indication of or an implementation of the philosophy of education
of the districts, then it is surprising that an articulate phi-
losophy cannot be formulated inductively in those districts where
there is consistency in the policies.

It has been emphasized that many of the policies are so vague
that interpretation is difficult. As a conclusion, however, the
evidence seems to support the hypothesis insofar as there are more
apparent consistencies than inconsistencies in the policies in a
school district as represented in the sample. The emphasis in
most of these districts seems to be on the social and citizenship
aspects of the educational program, and the majority of the seventy
school districts include policies which reflect this emphasis.
The support of this hypothesis, however, is based upon consistency
of vagueness and this is not the most solid of bases upon which to
build and structure.

HYPOTHESIS 4: The policies are stated as general principles
which give sufficient direction to enable the formulation of con-
sistent specific rules and regulations.

As was stated in reference to Hypothesis 3, many of the pol-
icies are vague and therefore difficult to interpret. In Chapter
IV it was stated that there are many specific statements included
in the policy books which are too detailed to be considered as
policies and which probably belong in a handbook of rules for
teachers or in special bulletins. The policies relating to the
teachers, the non-teaching personnel, and to the use of the build-
ing are, in general, the policies which lose their identity and become mere rules and regulations. In many instances too many specific details are listed and these should not be considered as policies. However, in spite of the excessive details in some instances, these specifics do serve as implementations of either an expressed or an implied policy. To this extent, then, the hypothesis is acceptable, but this is stretching a point. In many instances the hypothesis must be rejected, especially in the areas of policy mentioned above.

The policies pertaining to the areas of school organization, school board, and school administration, however, are more in accord with Hypothesis 4. There are exceptions, to be sure, where detailed statements reign supreme, but, in general, the policies in these areas are very similar to each other and they are stated as general principles from which consistent specific rules and regulations may be formulated.

In the area of policies pertaining to the pupils there are many differences. In some of the books there are a few general policies, in some of the books there are detailed rules which are called policies, and in some books there are no policies pertaining to pupils. Hence, the results are not indicative enough to draw a conclusion in relation to the hypothesis under consideration.

Generally, therefore, it is possible to accept this hypoth-
esis, although there is considerable evidence to reject it. The results of the analysis indicate that the acceptance is safe, but the margin of difference is not great.

**HYPOTHESIS 5:** The policies include provisions for long range planning.

This hypothesis is related to the preceding one and the conclusion in this case is similar. In general, the results of the study support this hypothesis, especially the results based upon an analysis of the policy areas of the school organization, the school board, and the school administration. These policies, in most cases, are stated so that their application is not limited to a given school year. Even in the other general areas of policy, there are many statements which indicate long range planning. For instance, the policy that the board will use a salary schedule is an indication of provisions for long range planning but the inclusion of a salary schedule in the policy book with detailed explanation of the schedule does not indicate long range planning. There are too many specific details which probably require yearly revision in these other general areas, as has been discussed, but although these weaken the hypothetical statement above, they do not cause one to reject the hypothesis.

In spite of the acceptance of this hypothesis in terms of the results of the analysis, it should be pointed out that there is much room for great improvement in this regard.
HYPOTHESIS 6: The policies are reviewed and revised periodically.

There is very little evidence in this study in relation to this hypothesis. In Chapter III it was stated that only ten of the policy books included a date of adoption and a date of revision, and among these ten books the range for revision is from one year to sixteen years. Whether these revisions are done according to a schedule is mere speculation. Four of the books do not list any date and the date listed for each of the other fifty-six may not be a revision date. Therefore, since the evidence is meager and inconclusive no valid acceptance or rejection of Hypothesis 6 is possible without further study.

HYPOTHESIS 7: The policies are not significantly different in terms of geographic and district enrollment differences.

The analysis of the seventy policy books reveals that this hypothesis must be accepted without fear of contradiction. Various differences in physical characteristics of the books were noted in Chapter III of this study and one of these referred to the number of pages in the policy books. In general the larger districts have the greater number of policies, but the areas of policy are not significantly different insofar as the total sample is concerned. This is borne out by Table III in Chapter IV. Moreover, in several of the books certain policies were identical and there was no relationship between the policies and the size or the loca-
tion of the districts involved. Examples of similarities of policy were cited in Chapter IV.

This general agreement of policy areas and, in some cases, policy specifics, should not be surprising. The principles of school board operation and efficient school administration must be applicable to most school districts if they are principles. Certainly, with local influences on the schools differences in policies are inevitable, but there should be agreement in the major areas of school board policy. The findings of this study corroborate this contention.

**Implications For Further Study**

In addition to these major considerations as indicated by the seven hypotheses, there are many more specific conclusions reached in this study. These are indicated as they pertain to the analytic treatment in Chapter III and IV. As a by-product of some of these conclusions, the following questions are listed as phases of this study which merit further investigation:

1. How can the schools improve the program of school-community relations?
2. What effect has an emphasis on the line and staff organization of a school district upon a program of school-community relations?
3. Do school boards actively seek the establishment and utilization of lay advisory groups?
4. Why do so many school districts ignore the recommendations of experts that salary schedules for certificated personnel are desirable?
5. Why do so many school boards utilize standing committees in the face of expert opinion to the contrary?
6. Why do so few school boards concern themselves with an articulate expression of the philosophy of education of the school district?

7. What is the primary purpose of education?

**Recommendations**

Although there are significant strengths in the policy books, it is evident from the results of this investigation that there are many weaknesses in school board policies as represented by the seventy policy books analyzed in this study. These weaknesses relate to the physical characteristics of the books as well as to the contents of the books. Even if there were few weaknesses, there would be room for improvement since perfection is never attained by mortals. Therefore, without elaborating further on the negative aspects of the books, a general recommendation is offered, a recommendation which is aimed towards the improvement of the policies as well as the books in which they are contained. This general recommendation, or suggestion, may be stated simply: Intelligent planning is necessary for policy formulation. The makers of policy, the school board, must first define the purpose of the enterprise, then they may proceed to formulate those policies, implemented by consistent specific rules and regulations, which will give intelligent structure and direction aimed towards the realization of the purpose as defined. Throughout, articulation is essential. With intelligent planning, articulation will result. With intelligent planning, the policies will have long range purpose and will avoid excessive rigidity and detail. With intelli-
gent planning, there will be provisions for periodic review and evaluation of the policies and changes will be made when appropriate. With intelligent planning, the physical characteristics of the policy books will improve readily. Intelligent planning is time consuming but the rewards are great.

In summary, the following quotation is pertinent:

It is difficult to work in such an area as that of the development of board policies without falling victim to some of the shortcomings here discussed. However, if we keep in mind that policy development is a continuous and cooperative process, if we patiently adopt some of our policies on an experimental basis, if we make use of available resources in the way of personnel and materials, and if we review and revise periodically, we shall eventually arrive at effective statements of educational policy which "provide for continuity and stability, yet project beyond the growing edge of the educational program into the future."¹

¹Nebraska Department of Public Instruction, School Board Policies, p. 26.
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APPENDIX I

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO SUPERINTENDENTS
OF CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS
IN ILLINOIS

May 16, 1958

Dear Superintendent:

All of us realize that the educational enterprise which we are guiding is a complex operation. Several recent studies have pointed out the need for written school board policies as an aid to efficient school administration.

I intend to collect and to analyze the policy books of school districts in Illinois as a doctoral dissertation. Without the co-operation of the school districts, however, this study cannot materialize. Therefore, if your school system does have a school board policy book, please send me a copy of it. There will be no identifying data in the study because many districts prefer anonymity.

I hope that you will be able to provide me with the requested material.

Sincerely,

Melvin P. Heller
Superintendent
APPENDIX II

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS
OF THE WHEATON BLOCK

April 18, 1958

Mr. Lillias K. Walker
Grundy County Superintendent of Schools
Morris, Illinois

Dear Mr. Walker:

At the meeting of the assistant county superintendents of schools on April 15, 1958, Mr. Merrill Gates of DuPage County asked the group to provide me with a list of the districts in each county represented for which there is a written policy book. The group approved this request.

I intend to analyze the policy books as a doctoral dissertation topic. There will be no identifying data in the study because many districts prefer anonymity.

As soon as possible, please send me the list of school districts in your county which have written policies.

Yours truly,

M. P. Heller
Superintendent
APPENDIX III

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO CERTAIN SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
AS A RESULT OF DATA RECEIVED FROM
COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS

May 5, 1958

Mr. Fred H. Gunderson, Superintendent
Richmond Consolidated Grade School
Richmond, Illinois

Dear Mr. Gunderson:

Mr. R. L. Tazewell, Superintendent of Schools, McHenry County, has informed me that he believes that your school district has a school board policy book.

I intend to collect and to analyze the policy books of school districts in Illinois as a doctoral dissertation. Without the co-operation of the school districts, however, this study cannot materialize. Therefore, if your school system does have a school board policy book, please send me a copy of it. There will be no identifying data in the study because many districts prefer anonymity.

I hope that you will be able to provide me with the requested material.

Sincerely,

M. P. Heller
Superintendent
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