



1979

## An Analysis of the Managerial Functions of the Elementary School Principal as Reflected in the Professional Literature and as Stated in the Professional Negotiations Agreements of Selected Districts

Therese Nijole Daugirdas  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Daugirdas, Therese Nijole, "An Analysis of the Managerial Functions of the Elementary School Principal as Reflected in the Professional Literature and as Stated in the Professional Negotiations Agreements of Selected Districts" (1979). *Dissertations*. 1796.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/1796](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1796)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1979 Therese Nijole Daugirdas

201

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AS REFLECTED IN  
THE PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE AND AS STATED IN THE  
PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS AGREEMENTS  
OF SELECTED DISTRICTS

by

Therese Nijole Daugirdas

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate  
School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree  
of Doctor of Education

January

1979

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Philip Carlin and Dr. Jasper Valenti for their comments, criticisms, and suggestions. A special thanks is due to Dr. Melvin Heller, the Chairman of her dissertation committee, not only for his invaluable assistance throughout the course of this study, but also for his timely prods and support.

In addition, the author is especially grateful to her husband, Tomas, for his patience, understanding, and moral support.

## VITA

The author, Therese Nijole Daugirdas, is the daughter of Janina and Napoleonas Binderis. She was born in Wurzburg, Germany on September 27, 1946.

She received her elementary education at St. Theodore's School in Chicago, and her secondary education at Maria High School in Chicago, Illinois, where she graduated in 1964.

In January of 1968 the author graduated from DePaul University receiving a Bachelor of Science degree in elementary education. Two years later, in January 1970, she obtained a Master's degree in elementary education. In January, 1978, she was awarded the degree of Doctor of Education from Loyola University of Chicago.

The author is a member of the Loyola Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
VITA . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Role of the Principal . . . . .	5
Critical Task Areas and Associated Functions . . . . .	7
Images of the Principalship . . . . .	16
Administrative Process of the Prin- cipalship . . . . .	17
Legal Description of the Principal- ship . . . . .	19
Importance of Professional Negotiations Agreements . . . . .	20
Alleged Limitations of Principals' Authority by Professional Negotiations Agreements . . . . .	21
Procedure . . . . .	28
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	34
The Status of Negotiations in the State of Illinois . . . . .	35
The Growth of Professional Negotiations . . . . .	41
The Implications of Professional Negotia- tions for Principals Managerial Roles . . . . .	43
Studies on the Effects of Professional Negotiations . . . . .	47
III. PRESENTATION OF DATA . . . . .	57
Collection of Data . . . . .	57
Identification of Statements . . . . .	60
Interviewing Process . . . . .	65

Presentation of Data for Each Critical Task Area: Contract Findings, Inter- view Findings and Analysis . . . . .	67
Instruction and Curriculum . . . . .	67
Pupil Personnel . . . . .	85
Staff Personnel . . . . .	97
Community School Leadership . . . . .	117
School Plant and Transportation . . . . .	122
Organization and Structure . . . . .	128
School Finance and Business Manage- ment . . . . .	138
IV. SUMMARY . . . . .	147
Conclusions . . . . .	150
Implications/Recommendations . . . . .	155
Recommendations for Further Study . . . . .	159
REFERENCES . . . . .	162

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The School Code of Illinois states that the principal shall assume administrative responsibility and instructional leadership for the planning, operation and evaluation of the educational program of the attendance center to which the principal is assigned.<sup>1</sup> This legal description is compatible and basic to the diversity of descriptions of the principal's role found in professional literature. Theorists and practitioners seem to agree that the principal's raison d'etre rests on the responsibility of administering the instructional program and supervising, or improving, instruction in the school. As the building administrator, the principal is charged with the managerial duties of planning, implementing, maintaining, and evaluating resources to achieve the goals of the school district. The principal's role is significant, especially if Hitt's statement is considered: management is the vital organ of an institution, and schools just like all enterprises need

---

<sup>1</sup>State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education, The School Code of Illinois, 10-21.4a, "Principal-Duties," (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1977) p. 81.

effective management.<sup>2</sup>

The principal's position as the building manager has been a topic of concern during recent years. Recent professional literature suggests that the managerial functions and discretionary powers of the elementary school principals are changing and, perhaps, diminishing as a result of professional negotiations agreements. Epstein states that principals' functions, activities, responsibility, and authority are being defined and limited by the decisions which emerge from negotiations.<sup>3</sup> The increased scope of professional negotiations agreements has been cited by Epstein as the major cause of the principal's managerial role changing and thus becoming more and more limited. Booth and Carlson claim that this loss of control is apparent in districts which require approval of the teacher organization or union before a decision or action can be initiated by the principal.<sup>4</sup> Braun claims the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) is rapidly moving toward its goal; the AFT is deter-

---

<sup>2</sup>William D. Hitt, Educational Management (Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Laboratories, 1977) p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Benjamin Epstein, "What is Negotiable?" in Professional Negotiations Pamphlet Number One (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969) pp. 1-6.

<sup>4</sup>Ronald R. Booth and Milton Carlson, How Collective Bargaining Affects Decision Making in Illinois Schools, 1974-75 (Springfield, Il.: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1975) p. 7.



mined to eventually control the public schools of the United States.<sup>5</sup> Lipham and Hoeh attribute the changing role of the principalship to factors such as the increased popularity of shared decision-making, the improved professionalism of teachers, the broadened scope of professional negotiations agreements, and the emergence of larger districts.<sup>6</sup>

The purpose of this study is to determine what writers identify as the principal's managerial areas of responsibility and the corresponding functions, and to determine if professional negotiations agreements define or limit the principal's performance in these functions. Specifically, is there anything stated in professional negotiations agreements which defines or limits the "traditional" managerial role of the principal as it is cited in the professional literature? The principal's managerial role has been isolated for this study because this dimension of the principalship is the most identifiable aspect of the role. This study will provide an in-depth analysis of the principal's managerial role based on an examination of professional literature and a comparison of how such functions are reflected in a sample of professional negotiations agreements.

---

<sup>5</sup>Robert J. Braun, Teachers and Power (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1972) p. 10.

<sup>6</sup>James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions (New York: Harper & Row, 1974) p. 232.

Focus on the managerial aspects of the principal's role was determined because of the ease of identification of areas of managerial responsibility in literature as well as the professional negotiations agreements. The general aspects of administrative leadership can be too vague and too encompassing to identify with sufficient specificity for analysis.

This study will address the following questions:

- 1) What do current writers identify as the major managerial areas of responsibility of the principal?
- 2) What are the managerial functions common to most principalships within the identified areas of responsibility?
- 3) What areas of responsibility of the principalship are included in the professional negotiations agreements?
- 4) Similarly, which specific managerial functions within the identified areas of responsibility are included in the professional negotiations agreements?
- 5) How are the principal's managerial functions being defined or restricted in the collected sample of professional negotiations agreements?
- 6) Are professional negotiations agreements defining

- or restricting the principal's managerial role only in certain areas or certain functions?
- 7) How do the agreements define or restrict the decision-making component of the managerial functions?
  - 8) Have professional negotiations agreements dictated that certain managerial functions be moved up or down the hierarchial decision-making ladder?
  - 9) Based on interviews, what options are available to principals in exercising discretion in their managerial roles despite definitive or restrictive professional negotiations agreements?

### Role of the Principal

A large number of studies on the principalship attempt to answer the question: "What is, or what should be the role of the principal?" This question has been asked since the inception of the principalship in the 1800's (at which time the principal was simply the head or principal teacher of a particular school), and it continues to be addressed as the principal's role has changed and evolved, especially during the last twenty years. One author feebly claims that an exact role definition of the principalship is unavailable because of the nature of the role, i.e., that the principalship is such a vital and evolving institution

that it never stands still long enough for an exact definition of its role to be developed.<sup>7</sup>

Differing role definitions of the principalship can at least partly be attributed to the differences found among various school districts. For example, the principal of an elementary school obviously faces different problems than one who supervises secondary education. The principal's role will also depend upon the location, size and budget of the school district involved. The financial level of the community served and the community's overall philosophy towards education will also affect a given principal's function in that community.

Despite the variation of the principal's role, current professional literature has attempted to provide us with four basic descriptions of the principalship. Some authors have tried to identify the areas of responsibility and the corresponding functions in each area, and thereby to characterize the role in a behavioral sense. This description is the most comprehensive and will serve as the foundation for identifying the principal's managerial areas of responsibility and functions. Others have examined the images a principal may portray in the minds of the commu-

---

<sup>7</sup>Richard W. Saxe, Perspectives on the Changing Role Of the Principal (Springfield, Illinois. Charles C. Thomas, 1973) pp. 13-14.

nity. Thirdly, others have looked at the principal's functions in terms of the administrative process. Lastly, a legal description of the principal's responsibilities is presented by The School Code of Illinois. All of these descriptions are important in order to realize the scope of the principal's managerial role.

### Critical Task Areas and Associated Functions

The principals' major areas of managerial responsibility are presented as Critical Task Areas by the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (SSCPEA).<sup>8</sup> Although this study was completed in 1955, it is still being identified as applicable to today's principalships as evidenced in current books by Lipham and Hoeh (1974) and Faber and Shearron (1970).

According to the SSCPEA, the identified Critical Task Areas account for not only a majority of the time on the job spent by principals, but also could be identified in the majority of specialized coursework developed in the field of educational administration used in preparation for the principalship. The seven Critical Task Areas are:

- 1) Instruction and Curriculum

---

<sup>8</sup>Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration, (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1955), pp. 125-177.

- 2) Pupil Personnel
- 3) Staff Personnel
- 4) Community School Leadership
- 5) School Plant and Transportation
- 6) Organization and Structure
- 7) School Finance and Business Management

Within each Critical Task Area, the authors of the SSCPEA further identified specific tasks of educational administration, methods of task performance (an operational expression of theory), and know-how (knowledge and skills needed to perform a specific task). Although the SSCPEA considered the tasks of school administrators in general, their classification is appropriate for the principalship as well, and has, in fact, been applied for this purpose in the analyses of Lipham and Hoeh<sup>9</sup>, Faber and Shearron<sup>10</sup>, and Grieder, Pierce and Rosenstengel<sup>11</sup>. These authors looked at the specific functions of a principal within each Critical Task Area. Combining the results of the work of all

---

<sup>9</sup>James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions (New York: Harper & Row, 1974) pp. 119-121.

<sup>10</sup>Charles F. Faber and Gilbert F. Shearron, Elementary School Administration Theory and Practice (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970) pp. 212-214.

<sup>11</sup>Calvin Grieder, Truman M. Pierce and William E. Rosenstengel, Public School Administration (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1961) pp. 149-151.

these authors, the managerial responsibilities of principals are presented:

First Critical Task Area: INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

- Functions:
- 1) Providing for the formulation of curriculum objectives.
  - 2) Providing for the determination of curriculum content and organization.
  - 3) Relating the desired curriculum to available time, physical facilities and personnel.
  - 4) Providing materials, resources and equipment for the instructional program.
  - 5) Providing for the supervision of instruction.
  - 6) Providing for in-service education of instructional personnel.

Second Critical Task Area: PUPIL PERSONNEL

- Functions:
- 1) Maintaining procedures for collecting essential data on student attendance and interpreting and recording such data.
  - 2) Locating and contacting parents of pre-school children and instituting measures for the orientation of new pupils.

- 3) Providing counseling services and assessing the effectiveness of these services.
- 4) Providing health services.
- 5) Arranging systematic procedures for the continual assessment and interpretation of pupil growth.
- 6) Establishing means of dealing with pupil irregularities.

Third Critical Task Area: STAFF PERSONNEL

- Functions:
- 1) Providing for the recruitment of staff personnel.
  - 2) Selecting and assigning staff personnel.
  - 3) Explaining personnel assignments and functions.
  - 4) Evaluating professional competence and attitudes.
  - 5) Developing a system of staff personnel records.
  - 6) Stimulating and providing opportunities for professional growth of staff and personnel.

Fourth Critical Task Area: COMMUNITY SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

- Functions: 1) Determining the educational services



the school renders and how such services are conditioned by community forces.

- 2) Helping to develop and implement plans for a positive school to home communication program.

**Fifth Critical Task Area: SCHOOL PLANT AND TRANSPORTATION**

Functions: 1) Developing an efficient program of operation and maintenance of the physical plant.

- 2) Translating a statement of an educational program into a plan of plant facilities that would adequately house such a program.

- 3) Providing for the safety of pupils, personnel and equipment.

**Sixth Critical Task Area: ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE**

Functions: 1) Interpreting educational needs in terms of services available.

- 2) Preparing and presenting reports to the central office.

- 3) Developing staff organization as a means of implementing the educational objectives of the school program.

- 4) Estimating the effectiveness of a par-

ticular organizational pattern in terms of educational purposes.

- 5) Delegating authority and responsibility.
- 6) Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities.

Seventh Critical Task Area: SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

- Functions:
- 1) Coordinating the designated school expenditures to the school program needs.
  - 2) Completing processes necessary for the computation of budget requests to the central office.
  - 3) Accounting for school monies and school properties.

Naturally, the functions cited under each Critical Task Area do not cover all of the possible functions a principal may be required to perform. Because of this vagariousness, it is essential to consider a general description of each Critical Task Area with the understanding of the variety of functions which may be implied in each area.

The functions of the principal related to the first Critical Task Area, Instruction and Curriculum, include assessing the community context for education, determining

the educational needs, stating educational objectives, planning and implementing instructional change, and evaluating program outcomes.

Pupil Personnel, the second Critical Task Area, includes disciplining, gathering and maintaining information on students, and counseling students, parents and teachers. As a leader, the principal must initiate the appropriate building structure within which the contributions of teachers, guidance counselors, and other student personnel specialists can best be made. In addition, this task area requires that the principal remain abreast of legal rulings concerning students since the latter obviously have implications for school policies and procedures.

The third Critical Task Area, Staff Personnel, includes expressing and elaborating upon staff needs, and judging the value of various types of personnel information. The functions in Staff Personnel include the recruitment, selection, orientation and supervision of the non-professional staff. In addition, many districts expect the principal to contribute meaningfully to certain district-wide staff personnel functions which typically include developing or updating personnel policies, identifying long-range staffing needs, and in some school systems, serving as a member of the school board's negotiating team.

The fourth Critical Task Area, Community School

Leadership, suggests the principal's thorough understanding of the perceived educational needs and expectations of the various groups within the community. Effective Community School Leadership requires the principal to communicate and interact effectively with diverse subpopulations. Perhaps because of the variance of districts' philosophies and needs throughout the country and even within individual states, the SSCPEA does not define the functions in this area as clearly as in the first three Critical Task Areas. Success in this area requires a great deal of discretion and sensitivity, especially if the increased cost of financing schools, the reignited concern over "back to basics," citizen involvement in decision-making, desegregation, and the accountability movement are considered. The functions in this Critical Task Area encompass all the components necessary for establishing and/or maintaining positive public relations.

School Plant and Transportation, the fifth Critical Task Area, includes the principal's responsibility to perform all the necessary functions which would assure maintaining a physical environment which promotes the teaching-learning processes. Often these responsibilities and functions are shared by support personnel in a central office.

The sixth Critical Task Area, Organization and Structure, requires principals to formulate and implement organi-

zational plans which will facilitate the educational program. Functioning in this area inevitably includes foreseeing both productive and descriptive developments, and acting to keep the organization of the school functioning. This area also includes performing organizational building tasks required by the district and county, state and federal agencies. To perform effectively in this area, a principal must have skill in directing the participation of lay and professional groups in educational planning and skill in rendering professional advice to lay and professional groups.

The last Critical Task Area, School Finance and Business Management, includes the principal functioning in the areas of planning, programming, budgeting, purchasing, and evaluating services and supplies. The range of the principal's involvement in this area also varies from a position of managing a restricted amount of resources to one of providing leadership in a Program Planning Budgeting System (PPBS) format in some districts.

The preceding descriptions of the Critical Task Areas present a supplementary view of the scope of functions associated with each Critical Task Area. Inevitably, an overlap of functions is present among the Critical Task Areas. It is significant that different forces affect the importance of one Critical Task Area over another at dif-

ferent times. For example, the principals' traditional modus operandi in performing supervisory functions in the area of Staff Personnel have changed with the advent of professional negotiations. Some have viewed the resulting trends toward democratic supervision and shared decision-making as a threat to the traditional authority of the principal, while others have viewed these trends as an opportunity for providing staff leadership. The effect of professional negotiations on the principals performance in this area will be presented in the findings of this study.

### Images of the Principalship

In an effort to assist superintendents in their search for a principal which would meet the need of a particular school, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) approaches describing the principalship through the portrayal of five images.<sup>12</sup> In a 1967 publication which is still applicable today, AASA claims that principals often portray the following images: "Mr. Chips," the headmaster, the administrative mechanic, the change agent, and the leader. The publication characterizes the role of each of these images.

---

<sup>12</sup>American Association of School Administrators, The Right Principal for the Right School (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1967) pp. 14-15.

"Mr. Chips" is presented as the understanding and sympathetic principal who knows and takes a personal interest in each pupil. Obviously this type of principal is more the exception than the rule in these days of large districts. The headmaster is presented as the scholar who is a master of subject matter and a master teacher. The principal as a headmaster is an outdated image if one considers the knowledge explosion of the Twentieth Century and the increased presence of instructional specialists. The administrative mechanic is considered to be a principal who is perpetually immersed in the administrative trivia of paperwork and is rarely working meaningfully with students or teachers. The principal as a change agent has been an important concept since the emphasis on innovations began in the sixties. The image of the change agent implies the need for principals to direct educational improvements as well as trying to implement them. This image has increased in prominence with the appearance of larger school districts which inevitably have required schools to become more autonomous. The principal as a leader is an image that is very value-laden. Depending on the situation, this image may imply the principal to be a defender of the status quo as well as a change agent.

#### Administrative Process

A more concise description of the principalship is

presented if the administrative process, Gulick's POSDCORB, is considered. Educators have repeatedly referred to this mnemonic device when describing the administrative activities of the principal:

- 1) **PLANNING:** working out in broad outline the things that must be done and the methods to be used to accomplish the purpose set for the enterprise.
- 2) **ORGANIZING:** establishing the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined and coordinated for the defined objective.
- 3) **STAFFING:** the whole personnel function of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work.
- 4) **DIRECTING:** the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as the leader of the enterprise.
- 5) **COORDINATING:** the all-important duty of interrelating the various aspects of the work.
- 6) **REPORTING:** keeping those persons to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on. This requires of the administrator that he keep himself and his subordinates informed through records, research and inspection.



- 7) BUDGETING: fiscal planning, accounting and control.<sup>13</sup>

Gulick's POSDCORB combined with the SSCPEA Critical Task Areas and AASA's images of the principal provide a comprehensive description of the role of the principal.

#### Legal Description of the Principalship

At this time it is important to consider one other source of opinion about the principalship: The School Code of Illinois, which provides a legal framework for this role. The School Code states that the principal has administrative responsibility for the educational program of the school, and also must assume the instructional leadership necessary to plan, operate and evaluate that program.<sup>14</sup> The School Code clearly states that principals have responsibilities in the areas of curriculum and instruction, and implies their charge of student and staff personnel, public relations, and overall school organization. Thus, this broad legal definition is in accord with the diversity of descriptions of the principal's role found in the profes-

---

<sup>13</sup>Luther Gulick, "Notes on the Theory of Organization", in L. Gulick and L. Urwick (eds.), Papers on the Science of Administration (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937) pp. 14-15.

<sup>14</sup>State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education, The School Code of Illinois, 10-21.4a, "Principals-Duties," (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1977) p. 81.

sional literature, and if a principal today, in a pessimistic moment, perceives his or her role to be merely that of "keeper of the keys," "bell-ringer," or "head-counter" for a school district, that principal is atavistically evoking the primal origins of the principalship, and not perceiving the role in its richness and complexity.<sup>15</sup>

### Importance of Professional Negotiations Agreements

In further considering the principalship, it is important to recognize the forces and events which have contributed to the evolution of the role to its current status and which have, in fact, shaped the American educational system as well. Some of the events which have had the greatest impact on the principalship include the beginning of free public education, the growth of the population of the United States, the development of the graded school, industrialization, compulsory education laws, the formation of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association, administrative certification demands, the growth of the Progressive Movement, the Scientific Movement, the Accountability Movement, and others. While the impact of these forces on the principal-

---

<sup>15</sup> Paul Revere Pierce, The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship (Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago, 1935) pp. 37-41.

ship has varied, current professional literature demonstrates that one of the single most important trends to affect the educational system in recent years has been the growth of professional negotiations.

Alleged Limitations of Principals' Authority by Professional Negotiations Agreements

The use of professional negotiations by public school employees has been increasing. While current writers may not be in agreement on the exact causes for the growth of negotiations, they all seem to agree that they are here to stay. This permanence is evident by the large number of districts operating under such agreements and by legislation permitting or mandating negotiations between boards and their teacher organizations. The thrust of this activity, according to Watson, seems to be an attempt by teachers' organizations to achieve shared control over policy formulation and administrative decision-making.<sup>16</sup>

Teachers' desire for a voice in educational decision-making is not a new phenomenon. Moskowitz's 1950 study of New York City teachers clearly demonstrates that teachers

---

<sup>16</sup> Bernard C. Watson, "Teacher Militancy and Collective Negotiations," in Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, ed. by Richard W. Saxe (Springfield, Il.: Charles C. Thomas, 1973) p. 265.

wanted to participate in educational decisions.<sup>17</sup> A study done by Chase in 1951 also supports this notion.<sup>18</sup> He identified five factors conducive to teacher satisfaction; the majority of these were related to the teachers' autonomy in their work.

Teachers have long expressed a keen interest to participate in educational decision-making and have found professional negotiations to be a preferred route to this goal. Since the sixties, an increasing number of teacher organizations have managed to persuade, convince or force school boards to negotiate with them. Some of the early contracts were, with the exception of those negotiated in large cities like New York, very simple documents. They focused primarily on items directly related to the financial compensation of teachers, and included salaries, raises, insurance, rates for summer work, and similar benefits. A few professional negotiations agreements included formal grievance procedures. Some agreements provided for tools for dealing with impasse situations. Recently, however, professional negotiations agreements have evolved into long and elaborate agreements covering a wide range

---

<sup>17</sup>S.D. Moskowitz, "The Teachers' Council and Democratic Administration," The NASSP Bulletin, XXXIV (1950) p. 136.

<sup>18</sup>Francis S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappa XXXIII (1950) p. 127.

of items. Many agreements now include statements regarding staff selection and supervision, student discipline, purchasing of supplies, curriculum, and even such intangibles as academic freedom.

Epstein (1969) among other authors suggests the managerial functions and discretionary powers of the elementary school principal are changing, and perhaps diminishing as a result of professional negotiations agreements.<sup>19</sup> He notes that the contents of such agreements between local school districts and teacher organizations have dramatically increased in importance to school administrators.

In addition to including statements regarding the negotiations process per se, such contracts may include statements regarding the rights of the organization which has been recognized as the negotiating unit, the personal rights of teachers, the welfare benefits for teachers, and grievance machinery. Epstein identifies twenty-seven items directly related to educational practice and policy that are now appearing in many professional negotiations agreements. Epstein's list includes:

- 1) Representation on curriculum construction or review councils.

---

<sup>19</sup> Benjamin Epstein, "What is Negotiable?" in Professional Negotiations Pamphlet Number One (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969) pp. 11-22.

- 2) Determination of uses of state and federal grants.
- 3) Promotion of special educational programs (such as "More Effective Schools," a design being promoted by many AFT locals).
- 4) Teacher recruitment, selection, appointment, and assignment.
- 5) Selection and distribution of textbooks and other educational materials.
- 6) Determination of pupil-teacher ratio.
- 7) Determination of functions of teacher aides and school aides.
- 8) Establishment of class-size maximum.
- 9) Approval of school calendar, length of school year, and schedule of holidays.
- 10) Pupil promotional policies.
- 11) Setting up procedures for evaluation of teacher performance.
- 12) Participation in supervision of performance of fellow teachers.
- 13) Policies regarding supervision of after-school extracurricular activities, both athletic and non-athletic.
- 14) Establishment of practices regarding racial integration of pupils and staff.
- 15) Setting up approaches for dealing with racial and cultural factors in learning materials.
- 16) Limitations on faculty and departmental meetings (numbers and length).
- 17) Provisions for excusing pupils from school to provide teacher conference time.
- 18) Participation by teachers in the selection of administrative and supervisory staff.
- 19) Teacher transfers, both voluntary and involuntary

(usually based on giving preferential treatment to teachers with greatest seniority).

- 20) "Rotation" or "equitable distribution" of grouped classes to provide equal assignments of so-called "difficult" classes.
- 21) Protection for teachers who are assaulted by pupils or others while engaged in their work.
- 22) Problems involved in the dismissal of teachers.
- 23) Pupil discipline and disruptiveness (with teachers having the right to decide which pupils they may refuse to have in their classes).
- 24) School faculty committees to review school policies with the principal prior to putting those policies into practice.
- 25) System-wide educational policy councils, with guarantees that at least half of the membership will be selected by the negotiating organization (such councils must be consulted by the superintendent prior to the initiation of any curricular or teaching innovations or modifications).
- 26) Academic freedom. (This is presented above as a personal right of a teacher. Here it involves the development of definitions of academic freedom in a particular school system.)
- 27) The school building program (site selection, school size, architectural design).

Much of the controversy over professional negotiations agreements inevitably relates, directly or indirectly, to the inclusion of educational policies and practices in such agreements, as cited by Epstein. The increased scope of such agreements threatens to transfer the role of decision-maker to the teacher organization, and has direct implications for the principal regarding policy-making procedures and implementation. Principals direct the operation

of the schools and must comply with the terms and conditions of the negotiated contracts. Furthermore, it is a firmly held belief that if a principal is to be an effective leader, involvement in the formulation of a contract which the principal will have to implement is mandatory. Yet some agreements recently negotiated are bypassing the principal completely, spelling out a direct teacher organization to superintendent relationship on committees determining curriculum, personnel, in-service needs, and other areas usually attributed to the principal's role. Watson, in discussing the scope of such agreements, notes that the principal is losing power by being identified as the first step in a grievance procedure.<sup>20</sup> There is a strong movement by some teacher organizations, according to Watson, to view this step as insignificant, or perhaps to bypass it altogether and to proceed to a central hearing without ever having involved the principal. Principals are obviously concerned about the scope of such agreements. They must live with them, and have no authority to change or modify them.

School Boards are similarly concerned over the content of professional negotiations agreements. This concern

---

<sup>20</sup>Bernard C. Watson, "Teacher Militancy and Collective Negotiations," in Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, ed. by Richard W. Saxe (Springfield, IL.: Charles C. Thomas, 1973) pp. 271-272.



is evident in the State of Illinois. During the past few years, the Illinois Association of School Boards has conducted a series of elaborate studies focusing on the effect such negotiations are having on the school system in the state. Clusters of school districts surrounding Chicago have participated in private studies to determine whether or not these contracts infringe upon the rights of school boards. One recent study analyzed a cluster of contracts including approximately twenty-five school districts. Over 900 pages of analysis of the contracts themselves and of their implications to the boards of education resulted.

In analyzing the impact of recently negotiated professional agreements upon the principalship, Watson further writes:

... Once begun, the passing of authority and control from other sources within the school to teachers may be expected to continue until a major realignment has occurred in the decision centers of the organization. The basic issue behind the principal's place in collective negotiations is how much final authority is to be granted to teachers when important education decisions are to be made. In the past, the participation of teachers has usually been limited to either the interpretation of established policy or to the execution of policy.<sup>21</sup>

One of the consequences of this realignment of power in favor of teachers has been the loss of power by the school principal. When teachers negotiate on issues such as class

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 274.

size, promotions, assignments, transfers, length of the school day, and similar important decisions, the discretion of the principal is obviously curbed. The bargaining relationship between the teacher organization and superintendent and/or school board then substitutes centralized decision-making for the decentralized, local decision-making performed to a great extent by the school principal. To make matters worse, principals are generally excluded from the negotiation process in the formulation of such agreements. It is not surprising, then, that principals are becoming increasingly concerned over the scope of such agreements that threaten to encroach upon their authority and decision-making power without decreasing their responsibility nor accountability.

This study examined the impact of professional negotiations agreements on the managerial role of the elementary school principalship. Specifically, which of the Critical Task Areas and the correlated managerial functions are present in a sample of 1976-1977 agreements, and how do these functions restrict the role of the principal?

#### Procedure

An analysis was made of what current writers identified as the managerial functions of the principal. This analysis led to development of the Critical Task Areas and

the functions corresponding to each area: these tasks are described in detail on pages 9-12 in Chapter One.

The prototype of Critical Task Areas and associated functions were then used as the basis for analyzing a selected sample of professional negotiations agreements. The prototype list of managerial areas of responsibility and the managerial functions was used as the model for identifying and evaluating the extent that a sample of professional negotiations agreements define or limit the principal's managerial functions. Based upon the prototype list, professional negotiations agreements were examined for statements which related directly to this model.

Originally, it was proposed that the prototype list be incorporated into an instrument which would record numerically if an agreement requires the involvement or approval of teachers in a particular function; if there is not reference to this function in the agreement; or if a particular function requires a varying degree of teacher input. This proposed numerical scale was found to be inadequate for this study because of the importance of recording specific statements relating to each of the managerial areas of responsibility. Rather, statements were recorded citing the exact wording of the allegedly restrictive statements. Actual recording of restrictive statements was also important to the follow-up interviews. Principals were

asked to react to the actual statements which were identified as restrictive in the agreement.

Next, the literature pertaining to the effects of professional negotiations agreements on the principalship was reviewed in an attempt to determine whether or not recent studies indicate that such agreements do limit the principal's "traditional role."

A sample of 1976-1977 professional negotiations agreements was collected. The sample was limited to elementary districts in Cook County, Illinois, because of the greater similarity among elementary school districts versus high school districts in the complexity and variety of managerial functions of the principal. Also, the Chicago School Districts were not included because of their uniqueness in size as compared to the suburban districts.

Using the prototype list of areas of responsibility and functions, all collected agreements were analyzed to determine if they contain any statements which define and/or restrict any of the "traditional" managerial functions of the principal within the various areas of managerial responsibility. The role of the principal as defined by such professional negotiations agreements was compared and contrasted to the principals "traditional" functions identified in the prototype list. This list was based on the Critical Task Areas and functions originally identified by

the SSCPEA. An in-depth descriptive analysis was then done which focused on the major implications, restrictions and/or options found to be stated in the agreements. In those districts where professional negotiations agreements were found to conflict with or restrict this role, selected follow-up interviews with the principals involved were obtained in an attempt to disclose:

- 1) The options available to principals in exercising their managerial roles despite the nature of these agreements.
- 2) The planning and strategies employed by the principals in implementing the agreements between the teacher organization and the board.
- 3) What kind of tactics, if any, are being used to avoid certain restrictions present in these agreements?

A series of twenty-five follow-up interviews were held with a sample of principals currently employed in the districts whose agreements were identified to contain statements considered to be definitive or restrictive in terms of the principal's managerial role. The interviews were structured to probe the options available to principals in exercising discretion in their managerial roles despite the nature of such agreements. The standard questions used in the interview focused on the planning and strategies em-

ployed by principals in implementing the agreements between the teacher organization and the board. Specifically, the questions dealt with what kind of tactics are used by the principal to exercise options to avoid the restrictions of the agreements. The interview included questions such as:

- 1) You appear to have restrictions specified in the agreement. How do you work around these restrictions?
- 2) What specific tactics do you use?
- 3) The agreement states that topics for in-service must be limited to the recommendations of the teacher organization. How do you promote topics for in-service which in your opinion would be most appropriate for the staff?
- 4) How much influence do you have in determining the length, type, and depth of the in-service program?
- 5) In what phase of planning teacher in-service do you seek the input of the teacher organization?
- 6) The agreement requires that the teacher organization approve all curricular innovations prior to their implementation. How do you promote gaining support for a curricular change?
- 7) What strategies do you use to assure the teacher organization's approval of a curricular change?

Responses to the interview questions were analyzed

in terms of similarities, differences, and uniqueness in approaches used by principals in exercising options to avoid any restrictions which may be found in the agreements.

This study is an attempt to determine whether principals can exercise discretion in the use of alternatives if and when restrictions are present in a professional negotiations agreement. The findings can be very useful to administrators who work in districts having such agreements.

Chapter One provides a foundation for the study by identifying the elementary school principal's managerial role in terms of critical tasks and associated functions, images the principal may portray, the administrative processes, and a legal description of the principalship. This was followed by a description of the alleged limitations of principals' authority by professional negotiations agreements. Lastly, the procedure was presented in Chapter One.

Chapter Two reviews the status of negotiations in the State of Illinois, the growth of professional negotiations agreements, and studies citing the effects of such agreements on the principalship.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Professional negotiations, or collective bargaining, is a process whereby a group of teachers in an organization exercises concerted action so as to improve their economic circumstances, and/or conditions of employment.<sup>1</sup> Since the sixties, professional negotiations have continued to increase in momentum throughout the country. Prior to 1962, no government employee had the legal right to engage in collective negotiations. Since that time, the courts have consistently held that it is not illegal for teachers to organize for the purpose of engaging in collective bargaining even in the absence of legislation, as in Illinois. The right to join together to bargain, according to the courts, is guaranteed by the United States Constitution under the First Amendment which guarantees people the right to assemble.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Clarence Hughes, Some Basics for Boards of Education, Annawan Community Unit School District No. 226, Annawan, Illinois, 1975.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 58.



The Status of Negotiations in the State of Illinois

The State of Illinois has not been an exception to the national trend of negotiations between teacher organizations and the local school district. This trend is especially apparent in the greater Chicago area (Cook, Lake, and DuPage counties) where approximately 76 per cent of the elementary districts had a signed professional negotiations agreement with the local teachers associations in 1976-1977.<sup>3</sup> The national and local trend has been of interest to teachers, administrators, and boards of education. The interest in this trend is documented both locally and nationally by a proliferation of articles and research of its causes, status, and effects.

A comprehensive study called Collective Bargaining in Illinois Schools was performed by Booth and Carlson for the Illinois Association of School Boards.<sup>4</sup> The 1976-1977 three-part report presents in survey form by Illinois regions data regarding the status of collective bargaining in a particular area, and attempts to analyze the effect collective bargaining has on decision-making in that area. It is important to consider Booth and Carlson's research

---

<sup>3</sup> Ronald A. Booth and Milton Carlson, Collective Bargaining in Illinois Schools, 1976-1977 (Springfield, Il.: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1977), p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

since the decision areas they cite may include many of the "traditional" managerial functions of the principal cited in Chapter One.<sup>5</sup>

In their report, Booth and Carlson note that both bargaining and non-bargaining districts have tended to increase the scope of items discussed with teachers, moving from salary and economic items to other working conditions.<sup>6</sup> In the greater Chicago area, teacher affiliation with the Illinois Education Association (IEA) has increased by 2 per cent to 66 per cent from 1975-1976 to 1976-1977 while affiliation with the union has remained steadily at 18 per cent; affiliation with neither organization has slightly decreased to 16 per cent.<sup>7</sup> The next finding is not totally in accord with Hughes definition of bargaining which was cited earlier. The Booth and Carlson results indicate that there is virtually no significant difference in salary and benefits granted to teachers between bargaining and non-bargaining districts in the greater Chicago area. It should be noted that non-bargaining districts outside the metropolitan areas provided significant-

---

<sup>5</sup>See Critical Task Areas, Chapter One, pg. 9.

<sup>6</sup>Ronald A. Booth and Milton Carlson, Collective Bargaining in Illinois Schools, 1976-1977 (Springfield, Il.: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1977), p. 12.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

ly fewer fringe benefits than bargaining districts. There was no significant difference in salaries in bargaining and non-bargaining districts outside the greater Chicago area.

In their report on the effects of collective bargaining on decision-making, Booth and Carlson categorize statements in the professional negotiations contracts as relating to miscellaneous decisions, direct teacher benefits, implied teacher benefits, and decisions related to teacher security.

In the first area, a survey of teacher involvement in miscellaneous decisions (establishing a citizens' advisory committee, replacing the head coach, adding a learning disabilities teacher, adopting a student dress code, approving specifications for a building, holding a tax rate referendum, permitting the association to make P.A. announcements, and considering requests to attend union conventions) is presented. A majority of districts in the Chicago area do not involve teachers in establishing a citizens' advisory committee (65 per cent), replacing the head coach (76 per cent), adding a learning disabilities teacher (73 per cent), holding a tax rate referendum (56 per cent), and granting association requests to make P.A. announcements (53 per cent).<sup>8</sup> The presence of an agree-

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 50-53.

ment seemed to increase teacher involvement in the remainder of the state.

Decisions included in the direct benefit category include those which affect salaries. Districts in the Chicago area with and without written agreements include teachers in the approval of these decisions in all categories (class size, and days off from unused snow days). Districts with agreements involved teachers in decisions regarding increasing class size (74 per cent). Interestingly enough, 49 per cent of the districts without contracts involve teachers in decisions regarding days off from unused snow days and only 39 per cent of the districts with contracts involve teachers in this decision.<sup>9</sup>

Decisions related directly to teacher security include those that affect the continuing employment of teachers. A majority of the Chicago area districts with professional negotiations agreements involve teachers either by policy or contract in revising teacher evaluation (88 per cent), reassigning teachers (66 per cent), payment of extra duties (65 per cent), developing pupil discipline procedures (84 per cent), limiting irrelevant classroom discussions (64 per cent), and revising grievance procedures (94 per cent).<sup>10</sup> The presence of a professional

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 54-57.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., pp. 64-67.

negotiations agreement requires involvement of teachers to a lesser degree than policy according to the study.

While Booth and Carlson claim that implied teacher benefits only indirectly or insignificantly affect income or work load, and are not generally considered critical bargaining issues, it is most appropriate that such benefits be carefully considered in this study. Implied teacher benefit decisions include decisions closely related to the principal's functions cited in Chapter One as the Critical Task Area of Instruction and Curriculum. Regardless of the presence of an agreement and the location in the state, districts involve teachers in the following decisions: establishment of curriculum (90 per cent), assignment of teachers to committees (88 per cent), assignment of summer school positions (55 per cent), adoption of new texts (97 per cent), agreement to use student teachers (73 per cent), and arrangement of in-service programs (93 per cent).<sup>11</sup>

The overall results of the Booth and Carlson study indicate that the policy or practice of involving teachers is more significant in giving teachers a voice in educational decisions than the presence of a professional negotiations agreement. Thus, the involvement of teachers by

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., pp. 59-62.

policy or practice in the absence of a professional negotiations agreement nullifies the contention popularly made by union leaders that only by contract are teachers given a voice in decision-making. The data indicate that involvement in decision-making seems to be increased by the presence of an agreement only in the direct teacher benefits area.

The loss of decision-making control by boards of education is of concern to advocates of public control of education, who fear that unions will eventually be controlling schools.<sup>12</sup> Many boards of education are not at all convinced, and continue to insist, that making educational policies is a function of school boards and their superintendents. This is a function which boards do not wish to share with teachers other than on a consultative or advisory basis. For example, some school boards, dissatisfied with the curriculum in their schools, may wish to bring in consultants from universities or other agencies. They do not wish to be limited or prevented by a professional negotiations agreement in making such a decision. Neither do boards feel that they must ask permission of their teacher organization to undertake such studies.

---

<sup>12</sup> Ronald A. Booth and Milton Carlson, How Collective Bargaining Affects Decision Making in Illinois Schools, 1974-1975 (Springfield, Il.: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1975), pp. 7-9.

There are certain decisions that legitimately should provide for teacher input since they are, or should be, of great importance to teachers as part of their professional lives. Curriculum, textbook selection, extra-curricular activities, in-service training and discipline are but a partial listing of a considerable number of such items that might be enumerated. It is the type or process of involvement that is the issue for boards of education. Teachers should be involved in decisions dealing with matters related to their professionalism. Yet, it must be emphasized that decisions and discussions of a purely professional nature cannot be considered in an atmosphere characteristic of the bargaining table. The failure of some boards and administrators to involve teachers in decisions related to professional matters has been cited as a factor contributing to the growth of professional negotiations.

#### The Growth of Professional Negotiations

During the 1960's, the growth of professional negotiations was attributed to factors such as the increase of male teachers, better educated teachers, and the desire for job security at a time when declining enrollment and financial bleakness in school districts is mounting.<sup>13</sup> All of

---

<sup>13</sup>James D. Koerner, Who Controls American Education? (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), pp. 27-43.

these factors are still affecting school districts throughout the country. In addition, teachers have been encouraged to be more involved in decision-making as the result of new structural arrangements such as team leaders, department chairpersons, advisory committees, etc. All in all, it seems that teachers have heard the message of broadening staff participation in decision-making and have become more knowledgeable about how to exert their collective power.

While current writers identify various reasons for the growth of professional negotiations, they all seem to agree that professional negotiations are here to stay. The continuing growth of professional negotiations is evident by the annual increase in the number of districts operating under such agreements and by the growing number of states having legislation which permits and/or mandating negotiations.

Since the sixties, professional negotiations agreements have evolved from very simple documents concerned with the negotiations process and teacher welfare benefits to more elaborate documents which may include any and all items that affect teachers' roles in the classroom. Epstein notes that teacher organizations are striving for agreements which give teachers a key role in setting up procedures for educational innovations, scheduling teacher assignments, determining curriculum, limiting class size, and a host of



other matters involving educational practice and policy.<sup>14</sup>

Reacting to the increased scope of professional negotiations agreements, many administrators, especially principals, have become concerned about the effect this increased scope will have on the administrator's role. Epstein states further that many of the recent agreements have had the effect of diminishing principals' prerogatives and decision-making powers in certain areas while they have not decreased their responsibility and accountability.<sup>15</sup> Rather, implementing elaborate agreements has imposed additional responsibilities on principals.

### The Implications of Professional Negotiations for Principals Managerial Roles

Given the historically close relationship between teachers and principals, as well as the administrative duties traditionally associated with the principalship, how do principals define their role in districts operating according to the rules of a professional negotiations agreement? In some important respects, the role of the principal has been altered with the advent of professional nego-

---

<sup>14</sup> Benjamin Epstein, "What is Negotiable?" in Professional Negotiations Pamphlet Number One (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969), p. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., pp. 4-6.

tiations. Numerous authors have focused on the principal being the "person in the middle." This phenomenon has been applied most often to the principal's role in the negotiations process. Recently, Randles has examined this phenomenon in terms of the principal's administrative organization or management.<sup>16</sup>

The "top-down" hierarchical organization that characterized school administration for so long has been replaced by "bilateral" administration according to Randles. He notes that negotiated contracts are bilateral agreements; they necessitate a sort of balance of power between parties, which means that responsibility and communication are two-way. "Administrative organization has been redefined placing the principal in the middle between two equal forces. The principal has become necessary to two parties, management and employees, in administering the contract," as Randles observes.<sup>17</sup>

Exactly how principals should balance their obligation to two parties is not too clearly stated in the literature. Neither is there total agreement on whether or not principals' positions have been strengthened or weaken-

---

<sup>16</sup>Harry E. Randles, "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts, "The National Elementary Principal" 55.2 (November/December 1975), pp. 57-61.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 60.

ed by professional negotiations, though authors agree that it has been partially redefined. But the literature does indicate quite strongly that the doomsday predictions of the early sixties, foretelling the destruction of the principalship as a result of negotiations, have not come to pass.

One reason why the literature is so inconclusive in certain areas is that conditions vary so much from district to district and from state to state. Griffin points out,

...that some states (such as Michigan) rather rigidly define the principal's role in collective negotiations. In some states principals are excluded by law from operating in conjunction with teacher organizations. In other states the law allows more leeway in defining the principal's position. In New York, for example, the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) rules in separate cases as to whether principals are to be considered management or employees. And in yet other states, such as Utah, principals are not allowed to participate in any district collective negotiations.<sup>18</sup>

Such variation in the laws governing the principal's position in both the negotiations process and in contract administration means that "a variety of roles for the principal in collective negotiations and in their managerial responsibilities will be the norm, rather than the exception," as Griffin states. He views this variety as "a natural, healthy, political result of a decentralized

---

<sup>18</sup>Michael F. Griffin, "The Role of the Principal in Collective Negotiations." APSS Know How, XXV, 5 (January 1975), pp. 1-2.

educational process."<sup>19</sup> While it may or may not be healthy, this variety certainly makes it difficult to study the principal's managerial role and to come up with consistent findings.

Because of the influence of professional negotiations agreements on the managerial role of the principal, arguments have been made for including the principal on one side or the other of the negotiations' fence.

Those favoring his alliance with teachers point to the traditionally close professional relationships between principals and teachers. They also argue that at the building level administrative concerns cannot rationally be separated from faculty concerns. The effectiveness as well as the efficiency of the educational process at this level are contingent on close cooperation and shared goals between teachers and principals.

Have collective negotiations and the resulting closer affiliation with management meant that principals have lost power? A conclusive answer is not to be found, but some writers believe that principals' decision-making powers have expanded in the managerial areas of school community relations, personnel, and instructional leadership. The following review will present an overview of the results

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

found in recent studies.

Studies on the Effects of Professional Negotiations

Numerous studies have investigated the effects of professional negotiations agreements on various aspects of the principal's role. There is considerable disagreement in the literature regarding the effects of professional negotiations agreements on the principal's role.

Some studies suggest that professional negotiations agreements have little or no effect on the principal's role. McCumsey in his study of 150 principals and 400 teachers, found no conclusive evidence that professional negotiations had any significant effect on the decision-making functions of the principal in the internal management of the school.<sup>20</sup> He concluded that as more districts became involved in professional negotiations agreements, staff involvement in the decision-making function may increase. Conversely, according to McCumsey, staff involvement in the decision-making function may decrease. It is interesting to note that McCumsey's study shows that principals perceive themselves as more involved in decision-

---

<sup>20</sup>N. L. McCumsey, "The Effects of Professional Negotiations on Secondary School Principals' Decision Making Functions," (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1967) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, XXVIII, p. 2951-A.

making than do their teachers. This was found to be true whether or not the district was involved in professional negotiations. While the presented study does not replicate McCumsey's study, it will be significant to note if the presented study, completed ten years later, is in agreement with McCumsey's findings.

Guilii's results are similar to McCumsey's.<sup>21</sup> The purpose of his study was to determine some of the ways the decision-making process of the elementary principal is affected by the existence of a professional negotiations agreement. Guilii identified no real difference among perceptions of principals and teachers in districts with and without professional negotiations agreements in the degree, method or expectations of teacher involvement in decision-making.

Pott's study reports that professional negotiations agreements have had virtually no impact on the supervisory role of principals.<sup>22</sup> He studies the administrative duties

---

<sup>21</sup>O. J. Guilii, "A Study of Selected Effects of Collective Negotiations with Teacher Organizations on the Decision Making Role of the Elementary Principal," (Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University, 1972) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, XXXIII, p. 1357-A.

<sup>22</sup>V. R. Potts, "A Study of the Relationship of Professional Negotiations to the Administrative Tasks Performed by High School Principals in Michigan," (Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, XXXI, p. 2075-A.

of principals in districts in Indiana and Michigan and found that the existence of compulsory negotiations, as in Michigan, had no relationship to the principals' performance of administrative tasks.

Hooks based his study on the contention that the principalship, once characterized by stability of authority and purpose, has come under considerable pressures because of the introduction of negotiations.<sup>23</sup> His study compared the amount of time principals without professional negotiations spent on tasks constituting the major functions of the principalship to the amount of time spent on such tasks by principals in districts without agreements. He found more areas of similarity than difference in the way the two groups spend their time. While negotiations activities accounted for most of the differences between the two groups of principals, there was little evidence that negotiations made more than a minor alteration in the time allotted to the school related activities of the principal. This study does stress that an increasing amount of time is devoted to negotiations activities and that a greater amount of time should be spent planning in this area with central

---

<sup>23</sup>A. R. Hooks, "A Study of the Relationship between Collective Negotiations and the Activities of the Secondary School Principal," (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, XXX, p. 1776-A.

office personnel, particularly with the superintendent.

Other studies suggest that professional negotiations agreements affect only selected components of the principal's role. Renaud's research focused on determining if there were any changes as a result of negotiations upon the leadership role responsibility of the elementary school principal in the areas of educational program, personnel administration, management, and community relations.<sup>24</sup> His findings indicate that the leadership role of principals remained the same in the areas of educational program, personnel administration, and management. Principals did indicate a definite increase in the leadership role responsibilities in the area of community relations since the adoption of the professional negotiations agreements.

T. M. Love examined teacher participation in decision-making in school systems which engage in collective negotiations as contrasted with teacher participation in school systems which do not negotiate with teachers.<sup>25</sup> His major findings indicate that collective negotiation enlarges

---

<sup>24</sup>A. J. Renaud, "The Effects of Professional Negotiations upon the Leadership Role of the Elementary School Principal" (Doctoral Dissertation, United States International University, 1973) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, XXXIV, p. 1552-A.

<sup>25</sup>T. M. Love, "The Impact of Teacher Negotiations on School System Decision Making" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1968) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, XXXIV, pp. 2194-2195.



teacher participation in decision-making by reducing the extent of unilateral decision-making by enhancing the power of teacher organizations. He claims that teachers who engage in bargaining are more active in seeking changes in personnel policy, more vigorous in initiating educational policy discussions, and more free to question administrative judgements. Teacher involvement tends to be greatest, according to Love, in large school systems where a union holds exclusive representation rights and where state law encourages the widespread development of collective negotiations. The conclusions of the study cite that although administrative and school board discretion is narrowed under collective negotiations, administrators quickly learn to use the negotiation process to preserve areas of discretion and school boards retain their right to represent the public interest and to make all final decisions. Lastly, he emphasizes that decisions involving the content, materials, or techniques of education are almost never negotiated, but non-negotiation decision processes are being created to give teachers a greater voice in such decisions.

A few studies suggest that certain aspects of the principal's role have been substantially compromised as a result of professional negotiations agreements. The Butkiewicz study of secondary school principals concluded that professional negotiations between teachers and boards of

education have forced principals to adopt a shared decision-making manner of administering the schools in personnel management and instructional leadership.<sup>26</sup> In a self-report principals perceived the least change in their functions associated with pupil services and plant management. The greatest role change was perceived in the personnel management and instructional leadership functions. The latter area was actually strengthened. In line with views stated in the professional literature on the autocratic-democratic continuum of leadership behavior, the study found that professional negotiations agreements have resulted in a definite trend toward democratic leadership on the part of principals. They have, according to Butkiewicz, been required to consult more frequently with the superintendent and other central office staff since the advent of negotiations. Decisions which previously were made at the school level have moved up the hierarchial decision-making ladder. Lastly, this study notes that the chief source of the principal's input into the negotiations process was through the teachers' organization.

Lutz found severe limitations on the authority of

---

<sup>26</sup>C. A. Butkiewicz, "A Study of the Effects of Professional Negotiations on the Role of Selected Secondary School Principals in Maryland," (Doctoral Dissertation, George Washington University, 1973) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, XXXIV, pp. 2194-2195.

the principal under professional negotiations.<sup>27</sup> He noted that "traditional supervision" and "democratic supervision" are dead concepts in education. He stated that principals continue to be administrators, providing the educational climate for learning, but were no longer leaders. However, he did suggest that principals exercised a pattern of behavior combining the encouragement of joint participation in rule-making with teachers and the ignoring and modification of certain contractual rules. A study conducted by Morton indicated changes in decision-making after schools had experience in professional negotiations.<sup>28</sup> His study suggested a trend toward more central office and teacher cooperation in decision-making and more principal and teacher cooperation on the decision-making process.

The variety of results found in the literature strongly suggests that one must use care in discussing the effects of professional negotiations agreements on the role of the principal. The studies indicating little or no impact of professional negotiations on the role of the prin-

---

<sup>27</sup>Frank W. Lutz, "The Principal as a Personnel Manager," ISR Journal, II (Winter, 1973), pp. 4-13.

<sup>28</sup>R. J. Morton, "Decision Making Responsibilities of the Elementary Principal Before and After Professional Negotiations," (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1972) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, XXXIII, pp. 6025-6026.

principal may be explained by the fact that most of the data are based on principals' perceptions. Principals may have been reluctant to admit that a change in power status was occurring.

Studies on the impact of professional negotiations agreements on the principal were reviewed by Nicholson and Nasstrom.<sup>29</sup> They state that principals most likely will find their decision-making role affected in the future by professional negotiations. They claim that the role of the principal is not destroyed but will require that principals understand how to share decision-making power while exercising it. Similarly, they note that supervisory and leadership functions of principals have been altered by agreement requirements; nevertheless, principals will still be able to exercise authority over their schools if they understand that some new techniques may have to be used. In reviewing the effects of the agreements on the work load of principals, they infer that principals may expect to see the development of a more impersonal relationship with their teachers. This type of relationship in the future is by no means a certainty, particularly after professional negotiations agreements are no longer considered a new pro-

---

<sup>29</sup> Everett W. Nicholson and Roy R. Nasstrom, "The Impact of Collective Negotiations on Principals", NASSP Bulletin, LVIII (October, 1973), pp. 100-107.

cess.

Nicholson and Nasstrom conclude that principals will continue to play an indispensable role in the administration of the school. Further, they claim that even if professional negotiations agreements lead to minor changes in some functions of the principal's role, such agreements will not lessen and weaken either the importance or potential for leadership of the principal's role.

The preceding review focused on the status of negotiations in the State of Illinois, and on presenting an overview of the implications and effects of professional negotiations on principals throughout the country. While recent studies have examined the effect of negotiations on various aspects of the decision-making role of the principal, no previous studies could be found which specifically examine the effect of professional negotiations on the principal's managerial role. It is interesting that this issue has not been scrutinized in the light of the constant allegations that the principals' managerial role is at least being redefined, if not diminishing altogether.

The purpose of this review of the literature has been to present a broader understanding of professional negotiations as it relates to the principal. The effects of professional negotiations on the managerial role of the principal certainly extends beyond implementing an agree-

ment. This fact is evident if the variety of current topics related to professional negotiations and the principal are considered. Principals' roles have been examined from perspectives ranging from their involvement in the negotiations process, principals' considerations to organize or unionize as a reaction to the negotiations trend, and principals' new relationship with the staff, administration, board and community as a result of professional negotiations.

Prior to examining how professional negotiations agreements in suburban Cook County have defined or restricted principals' roles, it has been important to understand some of the factors motivating the growth of professional negotiations and the implications of negotiations on the principal's role from a broader perspective. Chapter Three will present the procedure used in analyzing the agreements in order to determine if in fact they define or restrict the principal's managerial role.

## CHAPTER III

### PRESENTATION OF DATA

Using the procedure stated in Chapter One, data were collected for purposes of analysis. The data presented in Chapter Three are presented in tabular as well as narrative form.

The presentation of data for each Critical Task Area includes a description of the restrictive, limiting or definitive statements found in the sample of professional negotiations agreements. Next, a report of the interview findings is presented for each Critical Task Area. Lastly, an analysis focusing on the actual restrictiveness of the professional negotiations agreements on the principal's role in each Critical Task Area is provided.

#### Collection of Data

One administrator in each of the 115 elementary districts in suburban Cook County were contacted by telephone. Following a brief explanation of the purpose and procedure of this study, the administrators were asked to provide basic data about the district and were asked to send a copy

of the district's 1976-1977 professional negotiations agreement between the board of education and the district's teaching staff. The following information reflects the returns:

Number of districts contacted: 115

Number of districts having a  
1976-1977 professional nego-  
tiations agreement: 94

Number of professional nego-  
tiations agreements received: 51

In eight of the districts having professional negotiations agreements the superintendents stated that they would not be able to send a copy of their professional negotiations agreement. A letter was sent to the seven superintendents who requested that the university advisor verify the study. The remaining twenty did not send copies of their professional negotiations agreement.

The 51 agreements which were recieved were analyzed to determine if they contained any statements which define and/or restrict any of the managerial functions within the following seven Critical Task Areas (CTA):

1. Instruction and Curriculum
2. Pupil Personnel
3. Staff Personnel
4. Community School Leadership
5. School Plant and Transportation
6. Organization and Structure



## 7. School Finance and Business Management

A statement was considered restrictive if it contained reference to specific limits such as time, space, or procedure. A statement was considered to be definitive of the principal's role if it directly referred to the principal, or the superintendent's designee. Statements were also identified as implicative if they suggested a function which was identified as one of the principal's managerial functions.

It is appropriate to distinguish these three categories by citing the definitions of restrict, define, and imply:

- restrict - "...to set bounds or limits; to hold within bounds; as: to check for activity, motion, progress or departure of;...to check, bound, or decrease the range, scope of incidence of...<sup>1</sup>"
- define - "...to explain the nature of essential qualities of; describe; to define judicial function to make clear the outline or form of...<sup>2</sup>"
- imply - "...to involve as a necessary circumstance; to signify or mean; to indicate or suggest as something naturally to be inferred, without express statement...<sup>3</sup>"

---

<sup>1</sup>Philip Babcock Gove and The Merriam-Webster Editorial Staff, Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, G. & C. Merriam Co., (Springfield, Mass.), p. 1937.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 592.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 1135.

### Identification of Statements

The procedure used to identify statements in the professional negotiations agreements as definitive, restrictive or implicative for the principal's managerial role involved examining each professional negotiations agreement and recording the actual definitive, restrictive or implicative statement under the appropriate Critical Task Area. For example:

Critical Task Area: Instruction and Curriculum

- a. Teacher representatives on curriculum committees shall be elected by the faculty of each buliding (function 2).
- b. In-service programs shall be based on the expressed needs of teachers (function 6).

Statements such as the above were recorded from each professional negotiations agreement in the sample. The preceding statements, a and b, refer to managerial functions number 2 and 6 respectively in the Critical Task Area of Instruction and Curriculum of the prototype list. This procedure was followed for all fifty-one professional negotiations agreements in the sample.

Once statements were recorded under the appropriate Critical Task Area, each statement was then categorized according to the specific managerial function to which it related. Table 1, on pages 61 and 62, presents an overview

Table 1

Agreements by District Containing Restrictions in the  
Seven Critical Task Areas

Critical Task Areas:

Code Number For District:	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1	X	X	X				
2	X		X		X	X	
3							
4							
5							
6							
7	X		X		X	X	
8							
9	X		X				
10		X	X				
11	X		X				
12			X				
13			X				
14		X	X				
15							
16	X	X	X			X	
17	X	X	X		X		X
18	X	X	X		X		
19			X				
20			X				
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							

Table 1 (Continued)  
 Agreements by District Containing Restrictions in the  
 Seven Critical Task Areas

Code Number For District:	Critical Task Areas:						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
27		X	X	X			X
28	X		X				
29	X	X	X		X		
30	X	X	X		X	X	
31			X			X	X
32			X				
33	X	X	X				X
34	X	X	X				X
35	X	X	X		X		X
36			X		X	X	
37			X			X	
38	X	X	X		X	X	X
39	X	X	X		X		
40	X					X	
41							
42	X	X	X			X	
43	X		X				
44						X	
45	X	X	X		X	X	
46	X		X		X	X	
47	X		X		X	X	X
48	X		X		X	X	
49			X		X	X	
50	X	X	X		X	X	X
51			X				

of the presence of restrictive statements in the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements which were analyzed. In Table 1, the left column containing numbers 1 through 51 represents the fifty-one agreements examined in this study; I through VII across the top of the table represent each of the Critical Task Areas; the Xs represent the presence of a statement(s) in the agreement which defines, implies or restricts the principal's managerial role in a particular Critical Task Area.

In examining Table 1, it is evident that twelve of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements did not contain any statements which referred to any of the managerial functions cited under the seven Critical Task Areas. These twelve agreements focused exclusively on direct teacher benefits (salary, sick leave, personal leave, insurance retirement, professional membership, and recognition of the negotiations procedure). It should be noted that in all the agreements with restrictions in at least four Critical Task Areas, restrictions were identified in the third Critical Task Area, Staff Personnel. Also, only two agreements out of all the agreements which contained statements identified as restrictive did not contain such statements in the area of Staff Personnel. The presence of restrictive statements in the agreements indicates an obvious concern of teacher organization input into this Critical Task Area.

Table 2, on this page, identifies the actual number of agreements which contained restrictive statements in each of the Critical Task Areas. The greatest number of restrictions appears in the third Critical Task Area, Staff Personnel followed by the first Critical Task Area, Instruction and Curriculum.

Table 2  
Number of Professional Negotiations Agreements  
Containing Restrictions in the Seven  
Critical Task Areas

	Critical Task Areas						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Number of Agreements with Restrictive Statements:	25	18	37	1	18	19	9

These findings citing the greatest number of restrictions in the areas of Staff Personnel and Instruction and Curriculum correspond to the reported allegations often made regarding teachers' concern for a voice in items relating to their professional autonomy. The Critical Task Areas with the greatest number of restrictions along with Student Personnel, have been repeatedly cited and are recognized as integral to the principal's role. The functions related to these Critical Task Areas are identifiable if the legal description, the major areas of responsibility

and corresponding functions cited by the SSCPEA, and the image of the principalship described by the AASA is considered. The specificity of the restrictions in each area will be discussed in the presentation of data. Nonetheless, it is significant to note that the greatest amount of restriction is evident in those areas which comprise the essence of the principal as an educational leader, the influence the principal has over personnel and program. The focus of the study, however, is on the managerial aspects of the principalship.

#### Interviewing Process

Following the analysis of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements for statements which define, limit, restrict, or have implications for the "traditional" managerial functions of the principal within the seven Critical Task Areas, a series of follow-up interviews was held. The purpose of interviews was to probe the options available to the principals implementing the most restrictive professional negotiations agreements.

The most restrictive professional negotiations agreements were identified as those agreements having statements which define, limit or restrict the principal's managerial functions in at least four of the seven Critical Task Areas. Eighteen districts had professional negotiations agreements

with such statements in at least four of the seven Critical Task Areas. The eighteen districts with such agreements were being implemented by a total of 162 principals.

The procedure used to select the principals for the interviewing process involved assigning numbers from 1 to 162 to the principals implementing the agreements. Following this assignment, a table of random numbers from 1 to 200 was used to assure the selection of a random sample of twenty-five principals for the interviews.

The interviews were structured to probe the options available to principals in exercising discretion in their managerial role despite the restrictive agreements. The interviewing procedure involved approaching each restrictive statement individually. First, the restrictive statement was read to the principal. Secondly, a series of structured questions was presented which focused on the planning and strategies employed by the principal in implementing the agreement between the teacher organization and the board. Specifically, the questions dealt with what kind of tactics are used by the principal to exercise options to avoid the restrictions of the agreements. The questions posed to the principals are cited in the procedure.



Presentation of Data for Each Critical Task Area:  
Contract Findings, Interview Findings and Analysis

Instruction and Curriculum, Contract Findings

As noted, the prototype for the first Critical Task Area, Instruction and Curriculum, includes performing the following tasks inherent to the principalship:

1. Providing for the formulation of curricular objectives.
2. Providing for the determination of curricular content and organization.
3. Relating the desired curriculum to available time, physical facilities and personnel.
4. Providing materials, resources and equipment for the instructional program.
5. Providing for the supervision of instruction.
6. Providing for the in-service education of instructional personnel.

Twenty-five of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements contained statements which defined, limited or implied restrictions for the principal in this Critical Task Area. The number of agreements containing statements referring to the specific functions in this Critical Task Area is presented in Table 3, on page 68. Eight of the professional negotiations agreements stated that academic

Table 3

Number of Statements which Restricted, Defined, or Limited  
the Principals' Managerial Functions in the  
Critical Task Area of INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM  
(Number of agreements containing statements: 25)

Functions:	Number of agreements with restrictions refer- ring to the specific function:
1. Providing for the formula- tion of curriculum objec- tives	8
2. Providing for the determina- tion of curriculum content and organization	5
3. Relating the desired curri- culum to available time, physical facilities and per- sonnel	10
4. Providing materials, re- sources and equipment for the instructional program	2
5. Providing for the super- vision of instruction	Cited in Critical Task Area, Staff Personnel
6. Providing for in-service education of instruction- al personnel	16

freedom is guaranteed: teachers are assured that they are free to use and discuss materials and methods relevant to the objectives of the educational program. Three contracts stated that they assured academic freedom to the teaching staff within the guidelines set by the board and administration. One contract presented carte blanche discretion

for the teacher; it stated that teachers shall have the right to use instructional materials according to their best judgment. The variance in the contracts also included statements to the effect that teachers will notify the administration when they plan to "inject a controversial issue in their curriculum." A blanket statement assuring academic freedom to a teaching staff can be controversial, especially if one considers the incorporation of more conservative or liberal views which may not be acceptable to particular members in a community. Recent court decisions substantiate the need for careful consideration. Apparently community reaction to certain curricula components is anticipated in the agreements of two districts assuring academic freedom. They cite specific procedures which shall be followed in the event there is a complaint or criticism made by a parent regarding a teacher's use of academic freedom. The contracts state that such a situation should be resolved at the building level. If the situation is not resolved, a procedure is identified for a union/administration fact finding committee.

A principal operating in a district which assures academic freedom to its staff must at all times be aware of the content and implications of the curriculum presented by each staff member. A curricular program may be monitored either through the original planning, supervision, or evalua-

tion of a program. The point is the principal must stay abreast of program content in order to implement the professional negotiations agreement in the event there is a complaint and for the principal's accountability.

The second function in the Critical Task Area of Instruction and Curriculum states that the principal must provide for the determination of curriculum content and organization. In light of the fact that academic freedom is guaranteed to teachers in eight of the contracts, this function may be restrictive. Five contracts contained statements which assign the responsibility of curricular change to a district-wide committee whose composition is identified in the agreements. In most cases membership is composed of staff members elected by the building staff, representative administrators, and at times, a board member. One contract states that items such as curriculum, morale, and working conditions will be discussed at regular intervals at meetings attended by the principal, a union representative, and building staff. The actual power of district-wide committees may be questionable since in all five contracts they are identified as "advisory committees." Nothing appears in the agreements which requires adhering to the advice of the committee. Time restrictions for the principal are specified in one agreement which states that the principal, the union representative, and representative

teachers shall meet during a specific month to discuss current programs, staff working conditions and needs.

In the event a principal desires to introduce a change in the instructional program, the principals in five districts are directed by contract to work through the "advisory committees." While the actual procedure a principal must follow in introducing the curricular change is not specified in the agreement, the composition of the advisory is described in the agreement. According to the agreements, the individual building representatives are to be elected by the faculty in the particular school. Two contracts specify the membership on such committees to a greater degree. The agreements state that a specific minimum number of the committee members must belong to the teachers' organization. Defining the composition of an advisory committee does imply a restriction for principals who would ordinarily have the option to appoint a teacher to represent the building faculty. Considering that the composition of such committees is defined, and that teachers, not principals, are responsible for selecting the representative, one may question how principals have prerogatives in the formulation of such committees. Principals' involvement would inevitably have to be indirect, that is either through a teacher or administrator on the committee. One agreement which specifies the role of a curriculum committee and its

composition totally by-passes the principal. The agreement states that the recommendations of the committee are to be submitted to the superintendent who then submits the recommendation to the board. There is no mention made of the involvement of the principal in this process.

The principal's function of "relating the desired curriculum to available time, physical facilities and personnel" is included in ten of the professional negotiations agreements. The following functions were definitive and/or restrictive for the principal by actual statement, and in some cases by implication: the agendas of faculty meetings, time schedule for meetings as well as frequency, activities for the first day of school, function of para-professionals, committees that will be maintained, and areas requiring staff input, evaluation or approval.

One agreement requires the principal to discuss with teacher representatives the agenda for faculty meetings. According to the contract, discussion of the agenda is to be done a reasonable time prior to the meeting. The time restraints of discussing the agenda will obviously vary from building to building depending upon the teacher representative and the principal. The scheduling of meetings is cited in two of the contracts. One requires that they would not be scheduled to conflict with the union meetings and the other states that they would not be held past a

certain hour unless there is an emergency. The principal certainly can exercise discretion here in determining what is an emergency. Principals are also given some discretion in an agreement which states that an unassigned period can be other than preparation when deemed necessary by the principal.

Based on the contents of three agreements, teacher organizations are obviously concerned about the maintenance of specific programs. Three of the fifty-one contracts state that the district will continue to be committed to a program for the gifted. While this is a commitment required of the board in the contract it has implications for the principal as the building manager who must recognize this program as well as supervise it regardless of the principal's, teachers' or board's commitment to the program.

One contract in the sample requires the principal to consult with the teachers in the building to determine the function of teacher aides. Interpreted literally the statement requires seeking advice on the planning phase of paraprofessional staff assignment. While the ultimate decision is the principal's, the principal is still required to adhere to the procedure of seeking staff input.

Nine contracts identify specific areas for staff input. These include teachers or representative committees "recommending, participating, and planning" with the build-

ing principal in the areas of text and material selection, determination of maximum class size, formulation of report cards, and evaluation of staff. Two agreements clarify the power of staff input by stating that the recommendations shall be subject to the policies and procedures specified by the district. While the adoption of policies is a function of the board, one of the functions of the principal is to contribute, to varying degrees depending on the district, to the formulation of rules and procedures. The contracts which define the specific areas for staff participation are facilitating implementing shared decision-making within the framework of district procedures and policies. One contract identifies that the principal shall determine class composition. Such a statement defines a function of the principal. Determination of class composition is a function that principals consider significant, especially in situations when teachers submit a recommended class list for an upcoming year, and the principal determines that changes must be made to appease a demanding parent.

The fourth function in this Critical Task Area, providing resources, materials and equipment for the instructional program is noted in two professional negotiations agreements. One agreement specifies that staff members must submit supply requests in writing to the appropriate administrator, presumably the principal, who notifies the



teacher if the request is granted. If denied, the teacher can request the reason for denial in writing. This requirement can be time consuming and is a change from the time when a negative response did not have to be justified. The other agreement specifies that a new program cannot be introduced unless all supplies and equipment are available prior to the beginning of the school year. This agreement further notes that if adequate materials are not available, a curriculum committee shall agree to a time schedule for phasing in the program. This contract implies the need for the principal's effective planning and organization in order to assure the successful implementation of programs. While this statement may be considered to define the principal's role it may simultaneously be considered a positive requirement of the principal.

The fifth and sixth functions in the Critical Task Area of Instruction and Curriculum encompass the supervision of instruction and the in-service education of instructional personnel. These two functions complement each other and overlap. Thus they are considered jointly.

Twelve contracts state that the teaching staff shall be involved in the planning of in-service programs. Teacher involvement in this phase of in-service includes teacher input via an advisory committee. Three agreements require that the union be informed of the goals and objectives of

of the program. One contract states that participation in in-service training programs, held after school hours, is voluntary.

The evaluation of individual programs is cited in one contract which requires the principal to meet with a union appointed committee of teachers for the purpose of improving the educational environment of the school.

The supervision of staff and evaluation is covered in the Critical Task Area of Staff Personnel.

Two contracts have implications for the principal requiring lesson plans. One agreement states that teachers shall submit lesson plans only when requested by the principal. This agreement still gives principals the option to determine when to request lesson plans. The other agreement requires teachers to prepare lesson plans, but states further that no teacher shall be required to submit the plans for approval to the principal. Such a statement need not be a restriction for the principal who can request lesson plans under the pretense of wanting to be informed of the program in a particular classroom.

One agreement requires that all grade changes on report cards be initialed by the person, presumably the principal, making the change. This statement requires the principal to be accountable for change, it does not restrict the principal from making the change.

Instruction and Curriculum, Interview Findings

As noted, twelve of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements contained statements assuring academic freedom to the teaching staff. As may be expected, this clause was included in the contracts as a result of the teacher organizations' efforts and concerns over such controversial topics as current politics and sex education which are included in the curricular program. Upon questioning principals working with such agreements about the implications of this item to their role, all principals indicated that this item has been of no major consequence. The eight principals noted that the inclusion of this item into the contract causes them to stay abreast of the curricular content and maintain a positive relationship with their teaching staff which would foster constant communication about program content. Principals felt that there should be constant interaction going on between the principal and the teaching staff making the presence of this item in the contract not an issue. It would be interesting to determine the extent of control principals exert over academic freedom in districts without such a statement in the contract. It is possible that this item would not be of consequence if principals would merely attempt to identify the topics that would be so terribly controversial. Another important consideration regarding academic freedom is the

principal's role in screening teachers prior to their selection or recommendation for employment. Certainly teachers can be screened at least minimally regarding their views on curricular topics which may be considered controversial. The selection of new staff members can be limited to those with more conservative attitudes.

When principals were posed with identifying how they have input into "providing for the determination of curricular content and organization" when district wide committees are used which are often composed of teacher representatives elected by the building staff, principals' reactions varied. In cases where a district wide committee functions, principals' tactics for input most popularly included talking to the building representative and informally guiding the representative to a decision. In some cases, principals are able to exert influence over which teacher will be the elected representative by discussing who a good candidate would be with a few key teachers in the building.

In one district, principals noted that despite an elected committee which operates to make curricular decisions on a district wide level, the actual decisions relevant to curriculum and in-service begin and end with the district's Administrative Council whose membership is composed largely of the districts' principals. Principals in another district having a contract clause identifying a

teacher advisory committee as the vehicle to determine curriculum were very candid in their response; principals noted that the power for curricular decisions does not rest with the teachers' committee despite the contract, nor does it rest with principals despite that determining curriculum has been identified as being traditionally part of their role. The principals claimed that the power rests with the Central Office staff who manage to steer both principals and teachers toward the curricular programs they select. In the same district one principal stated that it was the principals' job to supervise the implementation of a curricular program, not to administer the program. The same principal noted further that supervising the curricular programs was enough to keep every principal very busy.

In several cases principals noted that the building representative whom the teacher organization would independently select for a district committee would in most cases be the same person the principal would nominate. These principals all noted that teachers have been quite accurate in identifying the staff member who would be the best candidate for the committee.

In one district principals stated that if they have a particular interest in a committee, the option for their membership is present. In this situation or any where principals are represented on a committee, principals do have

the opportunity to exert influence over the committee's decisions. Simply by their presence on a committee principals exert more influence than a teacher on a committee; people still follow the leader.

Control of a curriculum committee's decisions can be, and is, in one district at least, determined prior to the involvement of teachers. The process involves a series of meetings of principals to discuss the "direction and planned outcome" of a committee. Two principals have reported that this strategy has worked. Interestingly enough, the principals did not feel they controlled the curricular decisions. Just as they determined the desired outcome of the teachers' committee, the principals felt that the Central Office Administration decided on the direction of the principals' decision. This strategy may be one of carefully defining a committee's purpose and very delicately presenting the options available to the committee.

A statement in a contract, while in every legal sense is binding, can in some cases be meaningless. Such statements are found in two districts which have in their contracts a clause that a specific district committee is existing for the purpose of determining curricular issues. The fact is that both sides, the teachers' organization as well as the district administration choose to ignore the contract requirement to have the committee meet. Apparently, in one

district, this committee failed to function, or even meet, for four years and both sides recently agreed to remove this item from the professional negotiations agreement.

In no case did principals feel that the contract requirement of securing faculty input for in-service topics was restrictive. All principals stated that they would definitely seek faculty input for in-service topics regardless of the agreement. Several principals noted that both teachers and principals generally are in agreement as to what the in-service topic should be.

The restrictions placed on principals by professional negotiations agreements defining frequency, timing and agenda input or notice of faculty meetings were acknowledged as a restriction. The limited time allowed by contract for faculty meetings requires principals to resort to either very brief faculty meetings; very specialized meetings working with a specific grade level during planning periods; an increase in the use of written communication to cover information that would usually be presented at meetings; or meetings very limited in frequency, length and scope. In eight out of ten cases principals stated that this type of clause caused them to become more organized. They could no longer, in most cases, use faculty meetings for items which could be easily conveyed in a written memo. Once again, in one district the faculty and principal chose to ignore this

item; they have frequent, lengthy and helpful meetings in spite of the agreement. The principal claims that while teachers are not required by contract to attend, there is very high attendance at such meetings because of staff pressure and enthusiasm for such meetings. At the same time, another principal from this district who obviously does not enjoy the positive rapport or support of the staff has resorted to relying on written memos to supplant faculty meetings.

#### Instruction and Curriculum, Analysis

Of all the Critical Task Areas which were examined in the sample of professional negotiations agreements, this area had the second greatest number of statements which were restrictive and definitive of the principals' role. The degree of restrictiveness of the statements in the agreements according to the principals was such that principals were able to maintain their roles as building managers. While the autonomy of the building administrator was affected by the statements in the agreements, the effect was minimal and only defined or limited certain tasks.

In analyzing the effect of the statements it is appropriate to consider at this point a description of management functions. Hitt presented a description of management functions within a framework of a humanistic philo-



sophy which is applicable to the management of a school. He identifies management for principals as "planning, organizing, facilitating, evaluating, and developing staff."<sup>4</sup>

The statements in the agreements provided a framework which principals had to recognize. Statements which assured academic freedom to the faculty require the principal to continually be aware of the injection of controversial issues into the school program. Yet, it is significant that the restriction of teaching students about the particular issues would not be a typical occurrence because of the limited number of topics that would be considered controversial. Thus, the assurance of academic freedom can only restrict the principal in unique cases. The principal's involvement in planning, organizing, facilitating, evaluating and developing the curriculum is rarely affected by the assurance of academic freedom. Thus, academic freedom is a minimal restriction on the principals' managerial role.

The contract statements requiring procedures for staff input into curricular decisions were more definitive. The agreements typically focused on specifying the composition of curricular committees. Regardless of the presence of such statements in agreements, principals still manage to have input into curricular programs in spite of a commit-

---

<sup>4</sup>William D. Hitt, Educational Management, (Columbus, Ohio: Batelle Laboratories, 1977), p. 7.

tee approach. Perhaps the days of principals autocratically determining the program to be implemented in a school are slowly diminishing. The reason for more staff input into programs may be the result of more democratic leadership and/or the increased scope of professional negotiations agreements. In cases where specific committee selection procedures were identified for the principals, the principals still managed through strategies involving rapport, power or planning to have input into program selection.

Similarly, the contract requirement for staff participation in determining in-service topics is an area which would often be based on staff input. This requirement, while somewhat restrictive to the principal who claims to have the "super-vision" to be able to identify staff needs, is equally minor in its limitations. Teachers may have more input into in-service topics, yet their input may reflect needs which principals have managed to convey whether directly through evaluations or faculty meetings or indirectly through informal chats with teachers.

The last aspect of this area, agreements which defined the frequency and timing of meetings, and presentation of agendas, is recognized as a definitive restriction for principals. Some principals obviously managed to circumvent the limitations on staff meetings. They have resorted to written memos and may have lost the important component

of direct contact and interaction with the staff as a group.

To summarize, the main restriction placed on principals in the area of Instruction and Curriculum is in the principals' role of meeting with staff to plan, organize, inform, and evaluate various aspects of the school program. It seems that the teacher organizations want the faculty to have input, but it also seems that the input is desired through the committees established by the district and the association versus staff input and exchange directly with the building administrator. Based on the restrictions found in this area, one can conclude that the principals' managerial role is being somewhat restricted in the area of curriculum and instruction. The restrictions are most evident by the formal exclusion and lack of involvement of the principal in district advisory committees. Attempting to restrict principals in their direct contact with the faculty as a group and limiting the length and frequency of faculty meetings has also been restrictive for some principals. Despite these restrictions, however, the principals have been able to exercise their influence through a variety of strategies as borne out in the interview findings.

#### Pupil Personnel, Contract Findings

The prototype of the principal's managerial responsibilities in the second Critical Task Area, Pupil Person-

nel, includes the activities related to the following functions:

1. Maintaining procedures for collecting essential data on student attendance and interpreting and recording such data.
2. Locating and contacting parents of pre-school children and instituting measures for the orientation of new pupils.
3. Providing counseling services and assessing the effectiveness of these services.
4. Providing health services.
5. Arranging systematic procedures for the continual assessment and interpretation of pupil growth.
6. Establishing means of dealing with pupil irregularities.

As is evident in Table 1, a total of eighteen professional negotiations agreements of the fifty-one which were collected had statements referring to principals' managerial responsibilities in this Critical Task Area. As noted in Table 4, on page 87, the eighteen agreements which contained statements which defined, limited or restricted the principals' managerial role in this area directly referred to functions 3, 5 and 6. There was no reference in the eighteen agreements to the principals' role in functions 1, 2 and 4. The greatest emphasis in the Critical Task Area of

Table 4

Number of Statements which Restricted, Defined, or Limited  
the Principals' Managerial Functions in the  
Critical Task Area of PUPIL PERSONNEL

(Number of agreements containing statements: 18)

Functions:	Number of agreements with statements re- ferring to this func- tion:
1. Maintaining procedures for collecting essential data on student attendance and interpreting and recording such data	0
2. Locating and contacting parents of pre-school children and instituting measures for the orientation of new pupils	0
3. Providing counseling services and assessing the effectiveness of these services	3
4. Providing health services	0
5. Arranging systematic procedures for the continual assessment and interpretation of pupil growth	2
6. Establishing means of dealing with pupil irregularities	17

Pupil Personnel focused on function 6: establishing means of dealing with pupil irregularities. Seventeen of the eighteen professional negotiations agreements referred to the principals' role in establishing and maintaining disci-

pline. In these seventeen agreements, "establishing means of dealing with pupil irregularities" was the only function in this area which was mentioned in the agreements.

The professional negotiations agreements addressed the principals' responsibilities of managing discipline to varying degrees. Eight agreements contained statements identifying that the principal shall, must, or will determine or establish guidelines for student behavior. These statements do not restrict the principal's role as much as they define the role. It is obvious by the statements that teachers are looking at the building administrator for leadership in this area. Thus, in spite of an implied restriction on what the principals must determine, the specifics concerning the essence of the determination remain the prerogative of the principal. In four of the contracts the principal is required to share the responsibility for maintaining discipline with the teachers. Teachers do not want to be solely responsible for student behavior in at least six districts which have agreements which specify that the responsibility of maintaining student behavior rests with teachers, parents, the administration, and other certified personnel. Again, the apparent restrictions focus on personnel to be involved rather than on the principals' opportunity to be a decision maker. Restrictions on this latter role were not specified in any of the contracts.

While the professional negotiations agreements did not define what is and is not appropriate behavior for students, seven contracts elaborately described the procedure a principal must follow prior to returning a student who was excluded from class by the teacher for inappropriate behavior. Principals are required by these agreements to notify the teachers, often in writing, of the action they have taken prior to having a student re-admitted. Perhaps having this procedure in the contract is a tactic devised to make principals give more serious thought to their remedies for inappropriate behavior. It is interesting to note that one contract was very liberal in condoning the exclusion of students from class. It stated that "a student may be excluded when the student's presence makes the classroom intolerable." A statement such as this one may force a principal to constantly deal with discipline problems if a particular teacher has a low tolerance level. The principal may be forced to deal with such behavior depending upon the judgment of the teacher but the method of dealing with the student is the principal's option.

The importance of maintaining appropriate behavior in the classroom has repeatedly been the concern of teachers, parents and administrators. Parents have continually identified the need for meaningful disciplining in annual surveys of parent opinion on American schools. The fact

that there is no concrete restrictions cited in any of the contracts which may prevent the principal from exercising discretion in this all important area reaffirms that the principal can maintain his managerial role in this function of student behavior.

Teacher organizations are aware of parent concern for student behavior. Three professional negotiations agreements identify procedures for managing parent complaints. In all three cases a formal procedure is identified which requires that principals first request parents to meet with the classroom teacher to resolve a problem. Additional steps are identified whereby a parent complaint proceeds from the parent and teacher conferencing. If the issue is unresolved, a conference is held with the parent, teacher and principal present. A final step to this procedure is a conference with the parent, teacher, and superintendent. The principal is excluded at the meeting with the superintendent, parent and teacher. This exclusion does raise questions regarding the principal's effectiveness in dealing with the issue. Why is the principal's input formally severed at the meeting with the superintendent? One can speculate that the principal plays a mediator's role, and if the principal does not succeed, a new mediator, the superintendent is involved. However, the actual exclusion of the principal at the specified meeting does not prevent



formal and informal meetings with the superintendent for purposes of information and influence.

In line with concern over the importance of discipline, one contract states that students with behavior problems will not be assigned to teachers who have not had previous teaching experience. It is significant to note that this statement appears in an agreement which does not specify a procedure for excluding a student from the classroom. The fact that a principal may not assign students with individual behavior problems to an inexperienced teacher may be a restriction of administrative prerogatives; at the same time, it may be merely a reference to sound administrative practice in the first place.

Three professional negotiations agreements recognize the importance of adequate pupil personnel services for students. One agreement simply states a commitment to providing the professional talent and district funds to help students with psychological and personal problems. The vagarity of this statement in the agreement does not limit the principal nor provide specifics in reference to pupil personnel services which are needed.

Two contracts require that principals and teachers follow the procedures established by the pupil personnel department. Interestingly enough the interviews revealed that the central office administration introduced the in-

clusion of these clauses in both districts simply to assure that principals and teachers follow the established procedure.

Lastly, two professional negotiations agreements relate to the principal's managerial function of arranging systematic procedures for the continued assessment and interpretation of pupil growth. They both state that it is the placement of students that is the principal's responsibility but that teacher's suggestions will be considered. One contract states that the teacher's recommendation will be given prime consideration in the promotion and retention of students. Principals are restricted in making changes in student assignment after the first month of school in one district. They are allowed to make changes only after consulting with staff. Consulting literally is not very binding; it is a process in a procedure which must take place but it does not require one to comply with one's consultants.

#### Pupil Personnel, Interview Findings

As noted, eighteen of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements contained statements which potentially define, restrict or limit the principals managerial functions in "providing counseling services and assessing the effectiveness of these services" (function 3), "arranging

systematic procedures for the continual assessment and interpretation of pupil growth (function 5) and establishing means of dealing with pupil irregularities (function 6).

In questioning principals about the strategies they employ to overcome the definite procedure which "principals and teachers must follow" in securing the services of the pupil personnel department, no principals felt that any type of strategy was necessary. The principals unanimously agreed that the presence of a definite procedure to be followed simply presented reasonable guidelines. Thus, this procedure was not in any respect restrictive.

Principals' responses to the fifth function in the Critical Task Area of Pupil Personnel were similar. The contract statement requiring principals to give prime consideration to teacher recommendations regarding the promotion or retention of students is, according to the interviewed principals not only non-restrictive, but educationally sound. Principals noted that the presence of such a statement in the professional negotiations agreement merely recognizes the professionalism of the district faculty. All interviewed principals indicated that consulting with teachers regarding the evaluation and ultimate promotion or retention of a student has never been an issue which has arisen thus far. This finding does not eliminate the possibility of student retention becoming an issue, especially

if there is a variance in the philosophy regarding student retention. Certainly the topic can potentially become a power play between the teachers and the administration. Unfortunately, the decision does not necessarily have to reflect the best interest of the student in such a situation. The judgment of the principal is the key.

As may be expected, statements referring to the role of the principal in student discipline yielded more varying responses from the interviewed principals. When asked how principals circumvent the restrictions of having to respond in writing citing the disciplinary action taken against a student, principals responses ranged from being unaware of the presence of such a statement, to strict adherence, to a compromise made with the faculty. Principals found it time consuming to have to report in writing of the action they have taken. Most felt they had no alternative but to follow the contract in this case since management of student behavior is too vital an issue. Thus, they indicated teachers would not be too receptive to compromising this procedure. As can be expected, a limited number of principals stated that time constraints prevented them from being able to always follow this procedure. The principals avoided the written reports entirely by verbally stating to teachers the action taken. In each case where principals employed such action, the principals indicated

that they had a good rapport with their staff which overrode the professional negotiations agreement. Thus, the human touch overcame the alleged restriction in the contract. Principals noted that it was teachers who requested that principals be required to report in writing of the action taken by the building administrator. One contract reversed the above situation. This contract requires teachers to submit in writing to the building principal the reason for sending a student to the office. Needless to say, this item was included in the professional negotiations agreement as the result to principals' insistence in an effort to avoid an abused practice of sending students to the principal for very minor offenses.

#### Pupil Personnel, Analysis

The nature of statements cited as restrictive in this area are vague. This vagarity is evident in terms of scope and definition of the restrictions. For example, the statement noting that the principal must establish guidelines for student behavior does not specify the actual planning that must be done by the principal to accomplish this task. Nor does this type of statement direct principals' decisions in any way. They are still free to decide according to their own best judgment.

A formal structure of authority is defined in the

agreements: principals are required to keep their subordinates, the faculty, informed of the action taken to correct inappropriate behavior.

The agreements which require the principal to follow a specific procedure which involves notifying teachers and involving them in parent complaints is restrictive in some sense. It inhibits the spontaneous decisions or actions that principals would normally be able to apply to a complaint a parent may have. The principal is bound by contract to involve a staff member. This formal structure is for purposes of communication and perhaps legality, but the principals decide upon the action itself.

The vagarity of the statements defining the principal's role is especially evident in the statements requiring the principal as well as teachers to follow procedures established by the pupil personnel department. None of the elements of management such as timing, staffing, funding, or program is specified. Thus, the statement is a procedure versus a restriction. In fact, compliance with such procedures is common in school districts whether or not there is a contract reference to this point.

In summary, the only functions of the principal which are restrictive in nature are the statements defining the specific steps a principal must follow in the event a student is excluded from class and the procedure requiring

teacher involvement in handling parent complaints.

### Staff Personnel, Contract Findings

The Critical Task Area with the greatest number of statements which potentially limit, restrict or define the principals' managerial role were found in the Critical Task Area of Staff Personnel. Thirty-seven of the fifty-one collected professional negotiations agreements contained statements directly related to the following staff personnel functions:

1. Providing for the recruitment of staff personnel.
2. Selecting and assigning staff personnel.
3. Explaining personnel assignments and functions.
4. Evaluating professional competence and attitudes.
5. Maintaining a system of staff personnel records.
6. Stimulating and providing opportunities for the professional growth of staff and personnel.

The greatest number of restrictions in this area related directly to the principal's responsibilities in the fourth function: evaluating professional competence and attitudes. All thirty-seven contracts with restrictions in this Critical Task Area contained at least one statement defining, restricting or limiting the principal's role in evaluating the staff. As noted in Table 5, on page 98, restrictions and limitations appeared to a lesser degree in

Table 5

Number of Statements which Restricted, Defined, or Limited  
the Principals' Managerial Functions in the  
Critical Task Area of STAFF PERSONNEL

(Number of agreements containing statements: 37)

Functions:	Number of agreements with statements re- ferring to this func- tion:
1. Providing for the recruit- ment of staff personnel	11
2. Selecting and assigning staff personnel	17
3. Explaining personnel assignments and functions	12
4. Evaluating professional competence and attitudes	37
5. Developing a system of staff personnel records	2
6. Stimulating and providing opportunities for profes- sional growth of staff and personnel	6

the other managerial functions. Eleven contracts out of the fifty-one contained restrictions or limitations for the first function; seventeen contained restrictions or limitations for the second function; twelve contained restrictions for the third function; two contracts contained restrictions for the fifth function; six agreements contained restrictions for the sixth function.

The extent to which principals' roles were defined



regarding the first function, providing for the recruitment of staff personnel, was that eleven contracts stated that principals' shall notify the staff of vacancies in the district. In most cases principals were required to post the vacancies in the teachers' lounge. While a procedure is defined for the principals in this instance, the procedure certainly does not limit them to recruiting strictly from the building staff.

The second managerial function, selecting and assigning staff personnel, was somewhat more restrictive in seventeen of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements in the sample. Of these seventeen agreements, only four agreements contained statements that the principal shall or will follow certain guidelines in the selection of staff. Statements typically found included that principals shall give priority to tenure teachers or to length of a teacher's service in the district in the selection of summer school staff. While the principal must give consideration to the tenure of veteran teachers for summer school assignments, the principal certainly can consider but do nothing beyond considering. The principal certainly can "counsel" teachers into a summer school position. Similarly, the principal can use strategies to counsel staff members out of a possible summer school appointment. Perhaps considering a teacher with more experience for such an opening, while a defined

procedure, may be considered sound administrative practice if one is of the belief that more extensive experience in the classroom is often an ingredient for superior teaching.

One contract partially took away the responsibility of selecting a "head teacher" from the principal. The head teacher is defined in the contract as the staff member who is responsible for the building and staff in the absence of the principal. The agreement stated that two head teachers shall be selected: one by the principal, and one by the teaching staff. These two staff members who are reimbursed for this added responsibility alternate covering the principal's role in the event of his/her absence from the building. While the staff has been given the power to choose one head teacher, certainly it does not mean that a poor candidate will be chosen. Teachers realize they want a professionally strong person in that position in the event an emergency does occur. A principal can in a casual manner assure the selection of a competent staff member by suggesting such a person to several key personnel in the building. A somewhat unrealistic, but nonetheless a possible strategy a principal may employ to avoid giving the head teacher any power, is to diligently avoid being absent from the building.

Principals were faced with time restrictions in fifteen of the fifty-one contracts in the assignment of staff

personnel. In most cases, dates were cited in the professional negotiations agreements as deadlines for notifying staff members of new assignments. Ten agreements were non-restrictive whatsoever; they merely stated that principals shall notify staff members of any new assignments as soon as possible. Certainly principals are being given a great deal of discretion in determining what is as soon as possible.

Principals' roles were defined in four agreements in the assignment of staff to "non-teaching duties." Two contracts stated that such assignments had to be made on a rotating basis. One agreement required that teacher preparation periods and schedules shall be determined by a committee composed of the principal, teachers and a union representative. This type of committee, as any committee, will be planned and organized differently by different principals. Some principals will have the schedules formulated prior to the commencement of the committee; others will work with the committee in establishing schedules. Still other principals will allow the committee to determine the schedule.

Once contract was very creative in defining the procedure principals must follow in assigning recess duty. This agreement gave principals the function of developing a recess schedule on a rotating basis. If this schedule

was not found to be adequate by the staff, they were to develop a schedule. If satisfaction was still not reached by the principal and staff, the agreement states that recess duty assignments shall be made by drawing lots. This process, while taking a managerial responsibility away from the principal, does not re-assign the responsibility. Hopefully, this technique will continue to be limited to assigning recess duty.

Twelve agreements contained statements referring to the third managerial function in this area, explaining personnel assignments and functions. Five agreements state that student teachers will be assigned only after the approval of the classroom teacher. One agreement states that teachers shall evaluate student teachers, teaching interns and substitutes and that it shall be the responsibility of the principal to investigate negative evaluations. Principals are required by contract to provide special assistance to new teachers according to four agreements. The scope of this special assistance for their new assignment is not identified. While not a restriction, principals are directed by contract to consider teachers requests to leave the building during planning periods in four contracts. The agreements generally state that principals may permit teachers to leave the building. This is a practice which may exist regardless of the presence of an agreement.

The fourth managerial function of the principalship, evaluating professional competence and attitudes, was the most frequently cited task in the entire sample of fifty-one professional negotiations agreements. Thirty-seven agreements contained statements which defined, restricted and limited the principals' role in the evaluation of the teaching staff. Direct reference was made with varying frequency to the following aspects of evaluation: purpose, orientation of the staff for the procedure used, time schedules for orientations, notice of observation, frequency and length of observation, evaluation tool to be used, time and format of the post-observation conference, and the use of mechanical devices to observe staff. In addition, fourteen agreements contained various statements which potentially restrict the principals' role in the process of evaluating the teaching staff.

In spite of the fact that thirty-seven teacher associations and boards of education perceive teacher evaluation as a topic significant enough and appropriate for inclusion in an agreement, only two agreements contained statements regarding the purpose of evaluation: the improvement of instruction. Sixteen agreements stated that the principal shall orientate or acquaint teachers with the evaluation tool or procedure prior to implementing the procedure. Twelve of the fifteen agreements cited a time re-

straint on the orientation, noting that orientation must take place within a certain number of days after the beginning of the school year. In two agreements, orientating staff was the extent of the restriction. While only eleven agreements stated that a uniform instrument must be used for all staff members, it may be presumed that if the principal must acquaint the staff with the procedure used, the principal will hardly have the time in the beginning of the school year to individualize the evaluation procedure for the staff. Using different evaluation procedures and tools is especially important if a variance exists in the ability and styles of teachers. Different teachers respond differently, and often need various approaches to improving their instruction. It is significant to note that educators have advocated individualizing for so many years, yet contracts do not allow an individualized approach to the supervision of instruction.

Twenty-one agreements specified the frequency of observation required of the principal prior to the actual written evaluation. Sixteen agreements required principals to notify their staff in advance of an upcoming observation and ten agreements specified a minimum amount of time for each observation. All three of these aspects of observation which are noted in agreements seemed to be based on the presumption that principals must commit a specified amount of

time to formal observation prior to being able to evaluate the performance of a teacher. Not only is this a definite restriction on principals' time, but most principals inevitably are "observing" constantly. Opinions are inevitably formed from casual as well as, if not more frequently, from formal observation. Thus the time restrictions based upon informal observation may affect the principal in his managerial role, but he can use the data gained from informal sources as an aspect of his discretionary authority.

The actual time schedule for the evaluation process becomes even more restrictive as principals must arrange conferences within a certain amount of time following the observations in ten districts. If a principal is responsible for a staff of twenty or more, the time restraints can become a burden.

Granted, time restrictions and specifications for observation can be restrictive for the principal in evaluating the performance of staff. As long as principals are not restricted by the agreement to use a specific evaluation instrument, they have the option to determine which instrument would best meet the needs of their staff. Seven professional negotiations agreements do not give principals this option. The agreement identifies the instrument to be used and in four cases the instruments were included in the appendices of the agreements. One contract states that

principals must use the evaluation tool described in the district's policy book. The origin of the instrument for teacher evaluation is evident in three agreements. One contract states that the instrument shall be developed jointly by the superintendent and principals in the district. While the principal has the opportunity for input in such an instrument, it still restricts the principal to adhere to one tool. Two contracts state that the evaluation instrument will be developed cooperatively by the building administration. Input from staff on the evaluation instrument can be restrictive if a principal has a predetermined preference for a particular evaluation tool. If a principal combines careful planning, sensitivity to the staff's needs, and good rapport in the efforts to adopt an evaluation instrument, in most cases the principal will succeed in the approval of his/her preferred instrument. Another agreement states that the administration shall determine the evaluation technique after receiving suggestions from teachers. Once again the requirement to receive suggestions does not demand that suggestions be incorporated into the final product. At the same time, if the administration repeatedly ignored the suggestions presented, this posture could provide the setting for a possible grievance. This situation requires the administration to use some discretion. Certainly, some of the suggestions made by the staff members



would be of some value, but the final decision is not theirs.

One district's agreement states that a district committee shall be formed composed of teachers and administrators to evaluate the evaluation instrument. The agreement does not specify what action will be taken following the evaluation. Obviously the results of the evaluation may vary from minor changes to total revisions. In the event that the latter occurs, the revised evaluation may prove restrictive to the principal.

Principals are required by four agreements to incorporate certain procedures in their evaluation process. One contract states that principals must provide a positive effort to improve the negatively evaluated teacher's instruction. As a description, positive effort is very nebulous. It does not directly refer to either frequency, procedure, degree or the nature of providing remediation. As an extreme interpretation, positive effort may mean that a principal smile while assisting the teacher. In another contract, the importance of following the evaluation procedure in the contract is emphasized by stating that a teacher will not acquire tenure if the procedure cited in the agreement is not followed. This statement may facilitate teachers monitoring principals to assure the process is followed exactly. Simultaneously, if a principal wants to assure that a particular teacher will be granted tenure, the prin-

principal will be very sensitive to following the specifications in the contract. Again, this choice is a matter of some discretion.

Principals are restricted to not evaluating teachers in the area of individualizing instruction in one district. The contract states that evaluation in this area may not take place until a district-wide committee develops a statement on this matter. While the principals cannot focus on this aspect of instruction, individualization, certainly there are various other components of teaching that the principal can evaluate. Often teachers if rated as excellent, are excellent in individualizing instruction. Further the principal has the option of evaluating this area but doing it indirectly on the actual evaluation.

Lastly, one contract, requires principals to provide teachers with written recommendations to eliminate deficiencies. This requirement defines one aspect of the principals' role; yet it is a function that is performed regardless of its presence in a professional negotiations agreement.

#### Staff Personnel, Interview Findings

As noted, thirty-seven of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements in the sample contained statements which potentially define, limit, and/or restrict the prin-

principal's managerial role in the Critical Task Area of Staff Personnel. The greatest number of restrictions were present regarding the principals' role in the fourth function, evaluating professional competence and attitudes.

As a result of interviewing principals working with these professional negotiations, overwhelmingly they indicated that they were restricted literally in performing their managerial functions in this area. Yet specific strategies were mentioned to overcome these restrictions.

The requirement to post district vacancies was of very minor importance to all the principals who were interviewed. In performing the first function in this Critical Task Area, principals viewed the contract statement simply as a procedure to be followed. This directive, according to the principals, could have been a directive from the central office as well as a directive stated in the contract. In several instances principals noted that candidates are often initially screened by the central office personnel prior to the principals' review of credentials. Principals also stated that vacancies should be public information. To summarize, principals did not find the requirement to post vacancies restrictive, and thus did not find a need to develop strategies to avoid the restriction.

Statements in the sample of agreements which were relevant to the second managerial function, selecting and

assigning staff personnel were, according to the interviews with principals, somewhat more restrictive than the requirements in the agreements regarding the first function.

The requirement of seventeen agreements for principals to give consideration to tenured staff for summer school positions only occasionally proved to be restrictive. This restriction would occur if a newly hired teacher who had been an outstanding teacher during a limited time in the district was not, according to contract, to be considered for an appointment for summer school. On rare occasions when this situation would occur, principals stated that there really was not anything that could be done to hire this person. One principal stated, in a tone of consolation, that he was satisfied with having the teacher for the regular school year.

The agreement which required the selection of one head teacher by the principal and one by the staff was identified as a restriction that principals, with time, have overcome. The strategies employed by the principals in this district include identifying the qualities necessary for an effective head teacher to the staff, and by discussing potential candidates for the head teacher position with key staff members. Principals stated that the staff in their buildings were aware that the most popular person in the building does not necessarily make the most competent head

teacher. As with other restrictions, principals noted the importance of having positive rapport with staff as instrumental in securing the principals' choice in the selection of staff, program or procedure.

The time requirement for notifying staff members of their assignments was noted by interviewed principals as merely a schedule. Principals stated that notifying staff of assignments by a particular date or as soon as possible was a procedure that existed regardless of the presence of an agreement in a district. Principals seemed to be of the opinion that re-assignment announcements are made when, and only when, the administration is prepared to do so, regardless of an agreement. Not notifying staff members sooner can be justified according to principals by stating that "a decision has not been made."

Agreements which require principals to assign non-teaching duties on a rotating basis was identified as a reasonable and non-restrictive practice by principals.

The most frequently cited task, found in thirty-seven of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements related to the evaluation of the teaching staff. A statement made by one principal, "You don't fool with the evaluation tool" was typical of the response of most principals. The components within the function of evaluating staff include orientation, observation, the actual procedure or

instrument, the follow-up conference and the written evaluation. Sixteen districts have agreements which specified that the principal must provide an orientation acquainting staff with the evaluation procedure. While most principals indicated they most likely would not orientate their staff to the evaluation tool or procedure in the absence of the agreement, they did indicate that orientation is certainly a helpful practice for teachers. When questioned about specifications in the agreements regarding the notification and frequency of observation, dissatisfaction was expressed by the principals. Most principals indicated that even though the contract requires the principal to notify teachers of when they are going to be observed for evaluation, principals indicated that observation is a continual process. Having to abide to using only the "formal" observation times restricts principals from incorporating specific trends or behaviors typical of a teacher. Teachers tend to do their best when they are being "formally" observed. A specified number and length of observations put incredible time pressures on principals which some principals have not been able to manage. Principals felt restricted because of the requirements in the contract regarding observation yet they did not foresee any options open to them. Observing becomes a number one priority at a specific time of the year. Principals said they merely ended up putting other

functions aside. Observing according to the agreement seemed to be more cumbersome than restrictive.

Principals indicated they definitely were restricted when having to use a specified instrument as the evaluation tool. In several cases, principals managed to work with a restrictive check-off evaluation list by adding a narrative portion to the evaluation which focused on those items principals considered significant which were not included on the instrument. Another group indicated that the district's evaluation tool was loose enough in format to allow principals to individualize the instrument. In this situation the instrument merely identified areas which had to be addressed by the evaluator. In one district, principals are required to use an instrument that focuses very heavily on individualization in the classroom. At the same time, the principals are not able to individualize their approach to evaluating staff. One principal managed to supplement the imposed instrument by maintaining written and oral communication with staff regarding instructional practices. This principal stated that he does feel very restricted by having to use the instrument, but he felt he can still improve instruction on a personal basis regardless of the instrument. One principal has developed a self-evaluation instrument that the teaching staff completes prior to the implementation of the instrument required by contract. While tech-

nically the principal cannot use this instrument as part of the formal evaluation, the data cannot be ignored. Principals indicated that the inclusion of the evaluation instrument in the agreement has also been restricting in that it has prevented principals from feeling comfortable about evaluating teachers with accuracy. Principals are hesitant to make negative formal evaluations because of the possible reactions by teachers. Principals did note that teachers in general are very unfamiliar with current agreements, yet if teachers feel there was an inequity in any area, they certainly will refer back to the agreement to identify their rights by contract.

The importance of following the contract is apparent to principals. Whether principals add a narrative, go off on tangents, or supervise instruction around the instrument, principals do adhere to the requirements of the contract. In this area principals still rely on positive interaction with their staff to accomplish the improvement of instruction. In general, principals feel they must adhere to the requirements of following evaluation procedures to the letter, but they can exercise judgment nonetheless. Even though principals may not be able to modify the requirements of the agreement, they always have the option to supplement the evaluation procedure. This approach can place even greater time pressures on principals, but it is an option



to be used for a variety of purposes.

A small minority of principals indicated that the specific procedure and instrument for evaluation was not only non-restrictive but helpful. They stated that it provided structure and uniformity for the evaluation procedure. One principal noted that he knows of only one way to evaluate since the procedure has been in effect since he started his career as a principal.

#### Staff Personnel, Analysis

The analysis of the professional negotiations agreements and the subsequent interviews indicate that principals are restricted in performing specific managerial functions in this Critical Task Area. This restrictiveness is especially evident in the principal's functions related to the fourth function, which focuses on the evaluation of the staff. By citing the specific procedures for staff evaluation, the agreements literally define how the principal must plan, organize, direct, coordinate, and report on the evaluation process. The only administrative process which is not noted in the agreements describing the evaluation process is budgeting, an activity which is not directly necessary for the evaluation of staff.

The restrictiveness of the planning component of teacher evaluation is evident in the agreements which out-

line the activities which must be done and the methods which must be used to accomplish the evaluation process. The organization of this process is defined as well; the agreements establish the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged and defined for the objectives of evaluation. The task of making decisions, directing, is also seriously limited. Because of the elaborate and time consuming processes principals must follow in the evaluation of staff, principals are very hesitant to evaluate staff in any way but a positive way. Coordinating the various aspects of evaluation, and keeping the staff informed is rigidly defined.

Principals were all in agreement that they are restricted in their evaluation of staff. Granted a few indicated strategies to circumvent some of the required procedures such as supplementing the evaluation areas covered in the instrument. Nevertheless, in spite of possible strategies, principals indicated they are being restricted in one of the most important components of their role: the evaluation and supervision of staff. If principals are losing their autonomy in this area, which is so integral to their role, loss of discretion in controlling the processes or outcomes of the other Critical Task Areas is almost secondary. Does it really matter if the principal still maintains power in school-community relations or school budget-

ing and finance, if the principal has no authority to determine the evaluation processes and techniques to be employed in the school?

The fact that very few of the principals mentioned specific strategies to overcome the literal restrictions is revealing. No matter how formal an instrument or how restrictive a procedure, the matter of judgement cannot be legislated by an agreement. In an area as vital as staff evaluation, the principal who cannot find ways to exert his influence, discretion, and authority is allowing managerial problems to overshadow his professional leadership role. An intelligent, strategic use of the latter can obviate many managerial restrictions such as those described.

#### Community School Leadership, Contract Findings

The principals' managerial responsibilities in the fourth Critical Task Area, Community School Leadership includes the activities related to performing the following functions:

1. Determining the educational services the school renders and how such services are conditioned by community forces.
2. Helping to develop and implement a program for positive school to home communication.

As noted in Table One and Table Six, pages 61 and 62,

and page 119 respectively, only one professional negotiations agreement contained a statement which referred to the principals' role in this area. The statement in the agreement referred to function two. The agreement did not refer directly to the principal in the following statement: teachers shall not be required to attend more than three evening meetings during the school year. Nevertheless, this statement potentially can limit the principal who may coordinate the year's program to include more than three evening meetings.

This statement was cited as a restriction under Community School Leadership since the purpose of evening meetings is traditionally to accommodate the parents. Considering the variety of evening activities such as open house, conferences, parent teacher organization meetings and student performances which are held in many schools, this statement does put a restriction on the number of school related activities which may be held at night. The other consideration is that perhaps certain meetings, or performances may be held in the evening but the principal cannot depend on staff support for such events.

#### Community School Leadership, Interview Findings

Two principals were interviewed who were operating under an agreement which limited the number of evening

Table 6

Number of Statements which Restricted, Defined, or Limited the Principals' Managerial Functions in the Critical Task Area of COMMUNITY SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

(Number of agreements containing statements: 1)

Functions:	Number of agreements with statements referring to this function:
1. Determining the educational services the school renders and how such services are conditioned by community forces	0
2. Helping to develop and implement plans for a positive school to home communication program	1

meetings that teachers would have to attend.

Both principals stated that there were more than three evening meetings, the number allowed by the professional negotiations agreement, which the principals wanted their staff to attend. In both cases principals were successful in assuring high teacher attendance at approximately seven evening meetings per school year.

The basic strategies employed by both principals included first identifying to the staff the three top priority evening meetings with parents for the school year. In this district these included: the first parent teacher organization meeting, the annual open house, and evening conferences with parents. Once the priority meetings were announced,

principals would meet with key staff members several weeks before the event which was not included as a top priority. Principals would establish the need for staff personally and would request that they attend. According to the principals, staff members recognize the importance of their attendance at various community-school functions held in the evenings, and attendance, while not perfect, is high.

#### Community School Leadership, Analysis

As noted, there was only one statement in the sample of fifty-one professional negotiations agreements which referred to the principal's role in this Critical Task Area. The one statement which was present was not explicit in restricting the principals' role; it merely limited by contract the number of evening meetings that teachers may be required to attend. The agreement did not, in fact, prevent the principals from successfully recruiting faculty members to attend evening community-school functions.

While the presence of the restriction was an attempt to assure that teachers would not be required by their principal to attend more than three evening meetings per school year, teachers seemed very receptive to attending several additional meetings. Their attendance may have been the result of their awareness of the importance of maintaining positive school-community relations. Perhaps this area

was minimally restrictive since teachers have traditionally played more of a supportive role rather than a leadership role in this area.

Examined in a broader scope, perhaps there are functions beyond those identified which inevitably may have an effect on school-community relations. The community ultimately does react to every area of responsibility of the principalship: curriculum, staff and student personnel, building and perhaps even budgeting practices and policies. The current study was too general in scope to determine the overall effect of professional negotiations agreements on the principals' role in maintaining positive school-community relations.

Once again, based on the contents of the agreements, the managerial role of the principal was not restricted. First of all, only one agreement contained any reference to this aspect of the principals' role. Secondly, the one reference made in the agreements did not infringe upon the principals' role in managing, planning, organizing, staffing, directing and budgeting for school-community relations. The simple strategy of persuasion seems to be successful in circumventing any possible restriction relative to the number of evening meetings requiring teacher attendance. Presuming agreements do not broaden their scope, principals may continue to maintain a significant role in this area.

School Plant and Transportation, Contract Findings

As noted, the prototype for the fifth Critical Task Area, School Plant and Transportation, includes performing the following tasks inherent to the principalship:

1. Developing an efficient program of operation and maintenance of the physical plant.
2. Translating a statement of an educational program into a plan of plant facilities that would adequately house such a program.
3. Providing for the safety of pupils, personnel and equipment.

Sixteen of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements contained statements which limited, defined, or implied restrictions for the principal in this Critical Task Area.

Seven of these sixteen agreements, as noted in Table Seven, on page 123, contained statements relating to the first managerial function. In these seven agreements there is a specific requirement that each attendance center have a teachers' lounge and/or workroom which is attractive and clean. While a principal cannot be held accountable for the presence of a lounge, the principal can be held responsible for the maintenance of such an area. Granted, the presence of such a statement directly refers to the principal's responsibility of assuring that the physical plant be



Table 7

Number of Statements which Restricted, Defined, or Limited  
the Principals' Managerial Functions in the  
Critical Task Area of SCHOOL PLANT AND TRANSPORTATION

(Number of agreements containing statements: 18)

Functions:	Number of agreements with statements re- ferring to this func- tion:
1. Developing an efficient program of operation and maintenance of the physical plant	8
2. Translating a statement of an educational program into a plan of plant facilities that would adequately house such a program	4
3. Providing for the safety of pupils, personnel and equipment	4

maintained. Assuming that the principal has authority over the custodial staff, the maintenance of a lounge would not restrict the principal. Such statements in an agreement require that the principal merely assure that the lounge is maintained in an attractive and clean manner -- clearly an example of exercising judgement. Moreover, the principal does have the option of delegating this responsibility to the custodial staff or to the teachers on a rotating basis. This principal does not have to personally assume this task. The maintenance of such an area for the faculty was the ex-

tent of defining the principal's responsibility. One agreement requires principals to respond in writing to a teacher who complains about the condition of a classroom. While a written response is required, the agreement does not specify when the principal must respond, nor does it specify how the principal must respond. The response by the principal could be limited to merely recognizing the complaint.

Several statements were identified in the sample of agreements which related to the second managerial function in this area. These statements focused on principals assuring that certain items be provided in a classroom. Two agreements stated that the administration of each building shall assure that each teacher will have a desk, file cabinet, and appropriate furniture for students in each classroom. While the principal is responsible for assigning such items, their presence or absence would ultimately revert to the responsibility of the district maintaining an adequate inventory. Thus, assuring the presence of these items is a minimal restriction insofar as the statement reiterates the responsibility of the principal to work with central office staff to guarantee that basic items are present. The actual presence of this statement in the agreement would most likely facilitate the principal securing these items from the district office.

One contract requires principals to notify teachers

before removing any items from the classroom. While such a statement defines a procedure for principals to follow, it does not restrict principals from removing such items. Another contract requires principals to schedule rooms for parent-teacher conferences in the event the classroom is not available for such purposes. The agreement states further that this shall be done with consideration for the facilities that are available. Once again, the principal has the option of determining the most appropriate location for a conference. If the facilities are truly limited, the principal has the option of recommending any area, including the hall.

The last function in this Critical Task Area, providing for the safety of pupils, personnel, and equipment, focuses on responsibilities principals cannot assign to the faculty. Two contracts state that teachers will not be "utilized to search for suspected bombs" and that "teachers may be required only to scan their classroom in the event of a bomb threat."

The principals' role is defined in the statements found in two contracts. The first requires the principal to be in the building in the event a conference is scheduled after 6:30 p.m.; the second assigns the task of arranging transportation of athletic teams to the principal. The latter is a responsibility the principal can easily delegate,

at least in part to the secretarial staff or volunteer parents. The time restriction can be avoided by scheduling meetings prior to 6:30 p.m. Vagaries abound.

#### School Plant and Transportation, Interview Findings

The principals who were interviewed about the statements contained in the agreements all indicated that they simply provide directives for procedures which must be followed.

The presence of "maintaining a clean and attractive teachers lounge" in the agreement simply requires the principal to supervise the custodial staff, a task which would be done regardless of the contract.

Notifying teachers before removing any items from the classroom, not utilizing teachers to search for suspected bombs, and responding in writing to teachers who complain about the condition of a room are all tasks which principals considered standard to the position. Principals did not avoid these tasks, nor did they find cause to employ strategies in avoiding the tasks.

#### School Plant and Transportation, Analysis

An analysis of the professional negotiations agreements containing statements relevant to this Critical Task Area indicates that the principals' managerial roles, al-

though defined to a degree, are not restricted.

The tasks which are defined in the agreements generally are tasks which the principal would perform regardless of the presence of an agreement. These tasks include supervising the custodial staff to assure for the provision of furniture and the maintenance of areas such as a teachers' lounge. A few agreements had isolated statements requiring procedures such as responding in writing to teacher complaints about the condition of rooms and being present in the building for conferences scheduled after a specific hours. Such directives could be imposed on the principal by the central administration as readily as by an agreement. In addition, the requirement to respond in writing to a complaint can be interpreted literally to involve merely an acknowledgement. Specifics relating to the scope, nature, depth, and length of the response are missing in the agreement.

The agreement stipulations removing the responsibility from teachers of searching for suspected bombs is similarly a responsibility more suitable for the building administrator than a faculty member. The principal's discretion is not altered in such a stipulation. For the contract does not specify that if there was a genuine concern about a possible bomb, that the principal is responsible for locating the explosive. Certainly the principal would be in con-

tact with appropriate authorities in such cases.

To summarize, the principal is not restricted by the presence of an agreement in this area. The attempt to make the principal accountable to the contract stipulations are too vague and too easily managed to be of serious concern.

### Organization and Structure, Contract Findings

The principal's managerial responsibility in the sixth Critical Task Area, Organization and Structure include the activities related to performing the following functions:

1. Interpreting educational needs in terms of services available.
2. Preparing and presenting reports to the central office.
3. Developing staff organization as a means of implementing the educational objectives of the school program.
4. Estimating the effectiveness of a particular organizational pattern in terms of educational purposes.
5. Delegating authority and responsibility.
6. Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in education planning and other educational activities.

As noted in Table One, pages 61 and 62, nineteen of

the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements in the sample contained statements which potentially define, restrict, or limit the principal's managerial role in this area. Table Eight, on page 130, indicates that the greatest number of restrictions in this area related directly to the principals' responsibilities in the third function. There were no restrictions in the sample of agreements which related directly to the second function, preparing and presenting reports to the central office, or to the fifth function, delegating authority and responsibility.

The first managerial function in this area is an encompassing statement. "Interpreting the educational needs in terms of services available" is a responsibility which can be applied to any one of the Critical Task Areas of the principalship. In identifying the statements relevant to this area, an effort was made to focus the planning, organization, directing, and coordination of the educational needs to the services. There were no statements in this area which repeatedly appeared in the agreements. Similarly, the statements in this area were more of a directive versus a restrictive nature.

Statements within the first function included that the principal shall assign new students in a manner which attempts to maintain an equal distribution of students and

Table 8

Number of Statements which Restricted, Defined, or Limited  
the Principals' Managerial Functions in the  
Critical Task Area of ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE

(Number of agreements containing statements: 19)

Functions:	Number of agreements with statements re- ferring to this func- tion:
1. Interpreting educational needs in terms of services available	4
2. Preparing and presenting reports to the central office	0
3. Developing staff organization as a means of implementing the educational objectives of the school program	8
4. Estimating the effectiveness of a particular organizational pattern in terms of educational purposes	3
5. Delegating authority and responsibility	0
6. Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in education planning and other educational activities	1

that the principal shall attempt to equalize the teaching load of the faculty. In both statements the principal is required to make an effort to adhere to balanced teaching loads and student distribution. The first statement can



be restrictive but the principal can exercise his judgement in determining whether a particular teacher can, or cannot, manage the addition of a new student with a particular learning problem. Similarly the principal can exercise some discretion regarding the second statement in terms of his assignment of special subject area teachers for specific time periods. One agreement states that teachers shall participate in planning of special subject classes; it states further that the final decision rests with the principal. One agreement sanctions the decision-making of the principal. It states that the length of the homeroom period shall be at the discretion of the principal.

The third managerial function, developing staff organization as a means of implementing the educational objectives of the school program is reflected in a series of statements concerning procedures. Two agreements state that teachers may leave the attendance center during planning periods if the principal determines that they have satisfactorily completed their duties. While this statement defines that the principal may allow teachers to leave, he has the discretion to determine if the duties of the teacher are satisfactorily completed. The principals' use of the public address (P.A.)/intercom has entered the contents of agreements from a practical side in addition to the restricted use of the P.A. for evaluation which was

noted in the findings on Staff Personnel. Five agreements restrict the use of the P.A. system except at regularly scheduled times. While the contracts do not state that the principal is the person limited to using this system, it is usually the principal who determines the frequency of its use. Thus there is an apparent restriction present. One agreement states that the teacher association may make announcements over the P.A.

While not necessarily a specific function of the principal, though principals often serve in an advisory capacity in this area, six agreements state that the teacher organization shall have input to the superintendent regarding the school calendar. The strength of such a statement is questionable since calendars are affected by state requirements as well as attempts to be in concert with the high school district.

The fourth function, estimating the effectiveness of a particular organizational pattern in terms of educational purposes, is included indirectly. In three agreements the principal is required to meet at specific intervals with teacher organization representatives to discuss school operations. One contract, which was quite comprehensive in scope, required the principals to meet regularly with the union president to discuss the implementation of the district's agreement. The definition of "regularly" was not clear,

and the mandate to discuss did not specify the nature or types of consequences of the discussion.

The last function, organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities, is referred to indirectly and in only one agreement. The statement noting the participation of staff members at parent organization meetings is the only reference to this point.

#### Organization and Structure, Interview Findings

As noted, restrictive statements in this Critical Task Area were limited to statements referring to functions one, three, four and five.

When questioned if the contract requirement of maintaining a balance of student distribution in classes at a grade level posed a restriction, principals unanimously responded that this situation has never been restrictive. They noted that regardless of the presence of the agreement, pressures from the community, faculty, and administration, would inevitably cause them to try to maintain a balance in the number of students assigned to a teacher at a particular grade level. Avoiding a balance, in addition to being poor administrative procedure would, according to one principal be a great injustice to the children at that grade level. Generally, the same rationale was applied in response to how

principals viewed the contract requirement to equalize the teaching load of the faculty.

The agreement which required principals to have teachers participate in the planning of special classes was viewed by the principals in the district not as a restriction but actually as an asset. Principals, who according to the agreement control the final decision in this area, claimed that teacher input facilitated positive teacher attitudes about the schedules. Simultaneously, the principals indicated that often valuable suggestions were made by the faculty which contributed to a schedule that accommodated an increased number of staff members. One principal stated that prior to the inclusion of this item in the contract, teachers were given the opportunity to switch time slots among themselves.

The statements in the agreements which sanction teachers leaving the building during the noon hour or during planning periods also appeared not to cause principals concern. In several cases principals indicated that, given an appropriate reason, teachers can leave. In certain cases principals would assume responsibility for a class if the teacher had to leave. Principals noted that this practice had not been abused, thus the practice did not have to be rigidly controlled. One principal noted that allowing a staff member to leave, could if necessary, be used as a "trade-

off" in a future situation.

The restricted use of the public address system appeared in five contracts. It is interesting that this restriction was probably the most direct and obvious limitation identifiable in a contract. When asked if principals found this a restriction there were a variety of responses. A few principals stated that the school secretary is the person responsible for screening messages made on the all call. This procedure has been successful; thus the principals have not had reason to become involved. Principals were unaware of the presence of the restriction regarding the use of the public address, yet it seems it is a clause that has been avoided with success. Principals noted that if a staff member would complain, there would be closer compliance to the agreement. It is interesting to note that not only is the system used as needed, with discretion, but it is also used to relay personal messages to the faculty. Primarily because of this fact, none of the principals interviewed reported any comments or complaints on this matter.

The statements in three agreements requiring regular meetings between the principal and representatives from the teacher organization have elicited responses ranging from compliance to avoidance by both parties. In the situations where there was compliance to this requirement, principals viewed the matter as an opportunity to work with the repre-

sentatives to bridge the "we-they" status. One principal noted that while a sincere effort was initially made by the union representative to meet and discuss school needs, their meetings were discontinued because of a lack of agenda items and a resultant lack of need. One principal noted that even though these meetings are required to be scheduled by contract, it was a mutual decision of the teacher organization representative and the principal that there was no need for them.

To summarize, the interviews establish that despite the presence of a limited number of statements which potentially could be restrictive to a principal, the interviewed principals viewed them simply as minor procedures and thus found no need to use strategies to avoid the agreement requirements.

#### Organization and Structure, Analysis

There were statements in nineteen of the professional negotiations agreements which defined and restricted the principal in this Critical Task Area. The restrictions were not as explicit or as easily identifiable in this area as in other Critical Task Areas. This vagueness may be attributed to the comprehensiveness of the functions in this area.

The restrictions in the agreements focused on defining educational practices for the principal. Specifications in-

cluded maintaining a student and a teacher schedule balance, allowing teachers to leave the building during planning periods, limiting the use of the public address system, and meeting with union representatives to discuss school operations.

While principals are required to maintain a balance in assigning students and schedules, the agreements do not specify how principals must proceed to establish this balance. Principals still have the option to assign specific students to specific teachers and to schedule a particular special subject at the principal's discretion. Final decisions resulting from the principal's planning, organizing, and staffing are not affected.

The use of the public address system while a specific restriction in the agreement, in practice rarely was adhered to in the individual buildings primarily because of factors of mutual convenience of the principals and their staffs.

The requirement to meet with union representatives is also one which has not been implemented with consistency.

Perhaps because of positive rapport between the administration and the faculty, or effective management, or a positive staff, the restrictions stated in the agreement are not currently curtailing or molding the principal's role. This current status does not of course, exempt the principals from the possibility of facing these restrictions

in the future. But these restrictions seem to be so minor as well as so dependent upon the judgement of the principal, their existence in a contract cannot be regarded as a major source of concern.

### School Finance and Business Management, Contract Findings

The principal's managerial responsibility in the seventh Critical Task Area, School Finance and Business Management include the tasks related to performing the following functions:

1. Coordinating the designated school expenditures to the school program needs.
2. Completing the processes necessary for the computation of budget requests for the central office.
3. Accounting for school monies and school property.

As noted in Table One, pages 61 and 62, nine of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements in the sample contained statements which potentially define, restrict, or limit the principal's managerial role in this area. While the agreements with such statements do not focus on specifying expenditures for the school programs, the agreements have in all nine cases noted that teachers shall be in a position to advise the building principal of how the allocation for the school shall be spent.

Seven of the nine professional negotiations agree-



ments, as cited in Table Nine below state that the building

Table 9

Number of Statements which Restricted, Defined, or Limited  
the Principals' Managerial Functions in the  
Critical Task Area of  
SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT  
(Number of agreements containing statements: 9)

Functions:	Number of agreements with statements re- ferring to this func- tion:
1. Coordinating the designated school expenditures to the school program needs	7
2. Completing processes necessary for the computation of budget requests to the central office	0
3. Accounting for school monies and school properties	2

administrator, the principal, shall provide for teacher participation in determining how to spend the money that has been made available to the building. These statements directly refer to the first function of the principal in this area: coordinating the designated school expenditures to the school program needs. Once again, the contracts place the teachers in an advisory position for the expenditure of funds. Thus, the principal is required to consider teacher input, but is not required to adhere to the recommendations made by the faculty.

Somewhat of a variance to the above mentioned statements appears in a few agreements. One contract defines a requisition procedure that the principal must implement. The agreement requires the principal to inform the teacher if the request will be granted. This statement is a restriction defining a procedure, not a restriction on the principal's judgement.

One agreement specifies that the principal inform the faculty of the amount budgeted per teacher for supplies. The clause does not specify that the principal may not determine if purchases are to be approved. Another contract states that a sum of ten dollars be allocated per teacher for supplementary supplies. Once again, it is the principal who approves the items purchased with these monies. The principals' power to allocate is stated in this agreement. The principal may allocate additional funds as he/she deems necessary.

There were no statements directly referring to the principal's role for the second function, completing the processes necessary for the computation of budget requests for the central office, unless the previously mentioned agreement requirement, to give teachers the opportunity to make supply recommendations, would be considered part of the principals' function. The principal still has to decide whether or not the teacher recommendations are appro-

priate. One agreement specifies that an allocation of \$11,000 shall be provided for library and science needs. This statement does not refer directly to the principal; the impact of such a statement would only indirectly affect the allocation of funds to a particular school for a particular year. Programmatically, such an allocation would hopefully benefit a school program.

Two statements are within the category of the third function, accounting for school properties. Principals are required to make an inventory of supplies available to each teacher. Providing an inventory is a defined procedure which the principal is required to perform, but which the principal may assign to building staff. Another contract states that the principal shall make final building orders available to the staff. Once again, the agreement is stipulating a minimal procedure the principal must follow. Such a procedure does not affect the principal's judgement in determining the selection of supplies.

#### School Finance and Business Management, Interview Findings

As indicated, nine of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements contained statements which specified procedures for the principal in functions related to school finance and business management. The agreements stated that the principal shall provide for teacher participation in

determining how to spend the allocation that has been made available to the attendance center. The interviews clearly showed that the required involvement of staff has not been restrictive. Nor did principals consider this requirement definitive. It was a procedure which according to all principals was a reasonable and appropriate component to determining the instructional materials which will be purchased. In spite of the fact that principals, by contract, had the option to decide ultimately on the materials to be purchased, the interviews indicated that they rarely exercised this option. They found the involvement of staff in selection of materials to be a sound managerial process. The techniques for the involvement of staff vary from allocating funds by grade level or department to assigning the resource center director to collect, compile and prioritize the staff's requests. One principal did note that if the supply request seemed appropriate but above the actual allocation, there was an "activity fund" which is a source of funds. The activity fund, the product of collected fines, picture sales, and the like, was a source held by the principal for special purchases. According to a few principals, the inclusion of the statement to involve teachers in material selection was the result of insecure teachers who claimed that there was favoritism demonstrated by principals in the approval of requests. It is highly questionable if a professional ne-

gotiations agreement can be effective, or even instrumental, in eliminating favoritism in any area. Favoritism, good or bad, is a subjective discretion enjoyed by principals.

The agreement which specified the requisition procedure which must be followed was identified as restrictive to the two principals interviewed in the district. When asked about the strategies which the principals employ to avoid the required requisition procedure, one principal simply complied with the required procedure. The other principal incorporated her own component to the procedure. This principal incorporated a modified program planning system as a first step. The procedure involved identifying program objectives and citing materials essential to accomplish the stated objective. This procedure, according to the principal, provided her with important programmatic information which she claimed was basic to having adequate insights to make a decision according to the contract required requisition procedure.

The agreement statement requiring that teachers each have ten dollars for supplementary supplies was not restrictive according to principals. They claimed that this amount was usually spent by each teacher before the ten dollars became a contract item. They claimed that the item simply was "formalized petty cash."

School Finance and Business Management, Analysis

The limitations cited in nine of the fifty-one professional negotiations agreements are very narrow in scope and minor in their impact on the principal's responsibilities for a school's finances and business management. This minor impact is evident if the most common requirement of the principal which is cited in the agreement is considered: principals shall have teacher participation, advice, or input in determining how the allocation for the school shall be spent. The presence of such statements put teachers solely in an advisory role; their input or advice must be included but it does not have to be incorporated into final decisions concerning purchasing. Regardless of the fact that principals more often than not do involve and incorporate teacher recommendations into building purchases, the contract requirements do not even require principals to adhere to teacher recommendations. Securing teacher input is a very minor component in the total planning and budgeting processes required of the principal. Not only is planning based on program priorities and needs not included in the agreements, there is also no mention of time restrictions, type or frequency of teacher input, processes to establish priorities, or actual budgeting cited.

The statements in the agreement merely recognize the

need to include teachers' recommendations. The extent of inclusion is not specified.

The agreement which specified the district shall spend \$11,000 for library and science supplies was not a direct restriction for principals. This statement did according to the interviews define a budget item for the central office. One principal did note that the required allocation slightly lessened the amount available for the particular year for the schools comprising the district. Thus, the stipulation did indirectly limit spending in the individual buildings.

The statements which required principals to make an inventory of supplies were not, according to the interviews, restrictive. The principals noted that an annual inventory has been a necessary item in facilitating the faculty's awareness of available supplies. This inventory was not even a restriction on the principals' time, since they delegated this task to several staff members.

The requirement to make final building orders to staff was considered to be a minor restriction. Knowing that the staff has access to the final orders, caused principals to invest more time in the selection process to assure a supply list that would be equitable and would genuinely reflect program needs.

To summarize, principals indicated minor limitations

because of the statements in the agreements in this area. Generally, they noted that the procedures required by contract were reasonable practices which have caused a minor, if any, inconvenience. Moreover, statements of this type were found in relatively few contracts. Thus, not only are the "restrictions" regarded by the principals as minor, but also the references themselves are minimal.

To summarize, the extent of restrictions was minimal. They merely required principals to seek the input of staff in making purchasing selections, and in two isolated cases to make available to the faculty copies of the final orders. Principals' discretion to budget and purchase specific instructional aids was not hampered.



## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY

This study was based on the premise that the managerial functions and discretionary powers of the elementary school principal are changing, and perhaps diminishing as a result of the scope of current professional negotiations agreements. This premise was based on recent professional literature which claim that the principal's functions, activities, responsibilities and authority are being defined and limited by the decisions which emerge from professional negotiations and result in written agreements between boards of educations and teacher organizations which restrict the principal's role. The current scope of professional negotiations agreements along with the increased popularity of shared decision-making, the improved professionalism of teachers, and the emergence of larger districts have all been recognized in the professional literature as factors contributing to the changing role of the principal.

The purpose of this study was to determine if the content of current professional negotiations define, limit or restrict principals managerial functions in their major areas of responsibility. Specifically, was there anything

stated in a sample of current professional negotiations agreements which defines or limits the "traditional" managerial role of the elementary principal. Further, the study was designed to analyze these statements and determine the strategies and their effectiveness in circumventing the role definitions and restrictions stated in the professional negotiations agreements. The following questions were addressed in the study:

- 1) What do current writers identify as the major managerial areas of responsibility of the principal?
- 2) What are the managerial functions common to most principalships within the identified areas of responsibility?
- 3) What areas of responsibility of the principalship are included in the professional negotiations agreements?
- 4) Similarly, which specific managerial functions within the identified areas of responsibility are included in the professional negotiations agreements?
- 5) How are the principal's managerial functions being defined or restricted in the collected sample of professional negotiations agreements?
- 6) Are professional negotiations agreements defining or restricting the principal's managerial role only

in certain areas or certain functions?

- 7) How do the agreements define or restrict the decision-making component of the managerial functions?
- 8) Have professional negotiations agreements dictated that certain managerial functions be moved up or down the hierarchial decision-making ladder?
- 9) Based on interviews, what options are available to principals in exercising discretion in their managerial roles despite definitive or restrictive professional negotiations agreements?

The first step of this study involved identifying the managerial functions of the principal. An examination of current professional literature provided the framework for identifying principals managerial functions within seven Critical Task Areas. These seven areas include: tasks performed by the principal in the following areas:

Critical Task Area I: Instruction and Curriculum

Critical Task Area II: Pupil Personnel

Critical Task Area III: Staff Personnel

Critical Task Area IV: Community School Leadership

Critical Task Area V: School Plant and Transportation

Critical Task Area VI: Organization and Structure

Critical Task Area VII: School Finance and Business Management

Based on the functions and responsibilities defined

in the seven Critical Task Areas a sample of fifty-one 1976-77 professional negotiations agreements were collected from elementary school districts in Suburban Cook County. These agreements were analyzed and statements were recorded which explicitly or implicatively defined or restricted principals managerial role in the seven Critical Task Areas.

Following the identification of such statements, twenty-five elementary principals implementing professional negotiations agreements were interviewed to determine the strategies employed by principals and options available to principals in exercising discretion in their managerial roles despite the definitive or restrictive professional negotiations agreements.

### Conclusions

The conclusions are presented in two parts: first, general conclusions for the study are presented. These are followed by specific conclusions for each Critical Task Area.

#### General Conclusions

- 1) The literature identifies the following major Critical Task Areas of responsibilities of the principalship:
  - a. Instruction and Curriculum

- b. Pupil Personnel
  - c. Staff Personnel
  - d. Community School Leadership
  - e. School Plant and Transportation
  - f. Organization and Structure
  - g. School Finance and Business Management
- 2) The study demonstrated that approximately 25 per cent of the professional negotiations agreements in the sample contained no statements relevant to the seven Critical Task Areas of responsibility of the principalship. Thus, some agreements are still not specifying restrictions in the managerial role of the principal.
  - 3) The greatest number of restrictions in the agreements are found in the Critical Task Area of Staff Personnel. The Critical Task Area of Instruction and Curriculum is the second most restricted area in the agreements, followed by Pupil Personnel and Organization and Structure.
  - 4) Except for the restrictions specifying teacher evaluation procedures in the area of Staff Personnel, the restrictions found in the sample of agreements were vague in scope and focused primarily on procedures which principals must follow versus restricting the managerial discretion of the prin-

cipalship.

- 5) In areas where restrictions were present, principals strongly relied on a positive rapport with the teaching staff as a technique in circumventing the restrictiveness of statements in the agreements.
- 6) Generally, the interviews indicated principals were not very creative in their strategies to work with the restrictions which were identified in the agreements.
- 7) The administration of professional negotiations agreements requires principals to demonstrate professional and political acumen and sensitive administration.
- 8) Principals are charged with the responsibility to direct and manage the operation of the school and must comply with the terms and conditions of the contract. The principal has no authority to change, modify or violate any of the conditions of the agreement. Yet, success in implementing a professional negotiations agreement on a day-to-day basis is heavily dependent on maintaining a good working relationship in the school among the principal, the teacher organization representative and the faculty.
- 9) In contrast to the allegations made in the literature, principals are not being restricted dramati-

cally by the contents of professional negotiations agreements.

### Specific Conclusions for Each Critical Task Area

#### Instruction and Curriculum

This area had the greatest number of statements which were restrictive and definitive of the principal's role. The restrictions focused primarily on the selection of members for curriculum and inservice committees, academic freedom, and frequency and length of faculty meetings. The study showed that the principal's managerial role is being somewhat restricted; nevertheless, principals are able to exercise their influence in this area through a variety of strategies.

#### Pupil Personnel

The sample of agreements indicated that the restrictions for the principal in this area are vague in terms of scope and definition. The restrictions focused on involvement of teachers in parent complaints and procedures principals must employ in the event a student is removed from the classroom by a teacher.

#### Staff Personnel

Principals are restricted in one major function in this area, the evaluation of staff. The restrictiveness is evident in the specific planning, organizing, and imple-

menting an evaluation tool. Most principals found the evaluation of staff to be restrictive and cumbersome and reported only a limited number of strategies to circumvent the restrictions.

#### Community School Leadership

Based on the contents of the sample of professional negotiations agreements, principals were not restricted in their functions in this area. Only one agreement vaguely referred to the principal's role in managing, planning, organizing, staffing, directing and budgeting for school community relations.

#### School Plant and Transportation

The principals' role, although defined to a degree, is not restricted by the contents of professional negotiations agreements in this area.

#### Organization and Structure

The restrictions in the agreements for this Critical Task Area referred to defining educational practices for the principal. The restrictions in this area were vague, because of the comprehensiveness of this area, and were minor since they were so dependent upon the judgement of the principal.

#### School Finance and Business Management

The restrictions in this area were narrow in scope and minor in their impact on the principal's responsibi-



lities for a school's finances and business management. The statements in the agreements merely recognized the need to include teachers' recommendations, but the extent of inclusion was not specified in the agreements.

### Implications/Recommendations

While the scope of professional negotiations agreements is most restrictive in the areas of Staff Personnel and Instruction and Curriculum, there is no guarantee that such agreements will not rapidly increase in scope. In an effort for boards, central office and building administrators to be prepared to negotiate and implement teacher-board contracts specific steps should be employed to protect management rights of boards and administrators:

- 1) School boards should select a negotiating team that is representative of all levels of management in the district. Principals should be represented on the team since they will be able to judge if a proposal for the professional negotiations agreement is feasible and can be put into effect at the building level. The teacher organization should not be allowed to erode the board's authority by limiting the principal's role to that of a caretaker of the attendance center.
- 2) Following the ratification of the professional

negotiations agreement between the board of education and the teacher organization, principals should be provided with training in contract administration. Principals must realize that the agreement is potentially a limit on their authority and they must learn to work within its framework. Since principals are the first level of management, the superintendent and board must assure principals that they can and will function in their new or modified roles and relationships with unionized or organized employees. The principal is the key administrator in a sound employee relations program.

- 3) Principals will have to realize that paternalism and a positive rapport with the building faculty may not always work. According to contract, every staff member must be treated equally. The agreement must be followed, management decision must be reasonably consistent, and principals as managers must interpret the language of the agreement uniformly. If principals do not do this, principals can ultimately cause the erosion of their own rights.
- 4) Principals must realize that they can act on those items on which the agreement is silent. The only limitation on their action is having a good reason

for the action and the responsibility of explaining that reason if asked. If principals remain silent on an issue, not included in an agreement, their silence can cause problems, grievances, and loss of their own rights.

- 5) Principals must know the intent, the application, and the implications of the language of the agreement. They must know the role and scope of their authority. Principals must be educated in labor relations; this can be provided through a good management oriented inservice program.

The protection of managerial responsibilities for principals in the seven Critical Task Areas can also be accomplished by the negotiating team accepting certain basic principles of labor relations.

- 1) It is essential that the negotiations team be knowledgeable about the required scope of bargaining with the teacher organization. The team should be able to distinguish between the mandatory subjects of bargaining and the permissive subjects of bargaining.
- 2) The negotiations team must accept the idea that negotiations do not represent a one-way street, where the board gives and the teacher organization takes. Boards of education cannot remain in a de-

fensive position, but must take an offensive position by developing good counter proposals, putting forward their own demands.

- 3) The professional negotiations agreement should be kept short and succinct, thus limiting the scope of negotiations and possible vagarities. Vague, undefined clauses in an agreement are given to many interpretations which ultimately may be to the disadvantage of the principal implementing the agreement.
- 4) Professional negotiations agreements usually contain a board's rights clauses which serves as the skeleton of the agreement. All the other articles in the agreement take away from the rights of the board. This clause, in effect, reserves all rights to the board except those specifically given away to the teacher organization. The board should if it has not given this away already, include a management clause that specifically states that it has the right to determine curriculum, textbook selection, school facilities and budget, number and kinds of teachers, and the management organization. Principals as the designated managers of the board would thus be protected from losing their managerial rights.

The scope and language of the negotiated agreement is the responsibility of the negotiations team which has to see to it that the agreement is well-written, has a strong management rights clause, and covers only the mandatory subjects of bargaining.

There are many facets to protecting the managerial role of the principal through the language of the negotiations agreement. The protection of the principals' managerial role involves more than just negotiating the language of the agreement. The process involves serious attention to such variables as the negotiations team, input from building principals, cooperation between the board and the entire administration within the school system, the cooperation between districts on the scope of negotiations at local, state, and national levels; and recognition of the importance of the negotiations process which, in effect, can determine the whole operational framework of a school district. Protecting the managerial rights of the principal demands attention and determination.

#### Recommendations for Further Study

This study examined the impact of professional negotiations agreements on the managerial role of the elementary principal. As a result of the processes involved in completing the study, and as a result of the findings, it is

recommended that specific components of the principal's managerial role and professional negotiations be examined in greater depth. Thus, it is recommended that the following topics be treated in future studies:

- 1) An in-depth examination and analysis of the literature alleging that professional negotiations are diminishing the role of the elementary principal.
- 2) A study identifying the extent, frequency and effectiveness of elementary school principals' involvement in professional negotiations.
- 3) A study analyzing the inservice procedures and techniques used by boards to assist elementary principals in the implementation of the agreement between the teacher organization and the board.
- 4) A study determining if professional negotiations agreements have caused a more direct teacher organization-board relationship; are teachers via the organization communicating more with the board/central administration, versus directly with the principal, as a result of professional agreements?
- 5) An in-depth examination of teacher evaluation procedures present in professional negotiations agreements.
- 6) A study focusing on staff satisfaction with teacher evaluation procedures in elementary districts with

and without professional negotiations agreements.

- 7) A longitudinal study examining the progressive scope of professional negotiations agreements over a period of several years.
- 8) A study analyzing the options and strategies used by principals in their role as instructional leaders.

## REFERENCES

- American Association of School Administrators. The Right Principal for the Right School. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1967.
- Booth, Ronald R. and Carlson, Milton. Collective Bargaining in Illinois Schools, 1975-1976. Springfield, Il.: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1976.
- Booth, Ronald R. and Carlson, Milton. How Collective Bargaining Affects Decision Making in Illinois Schools, 1974-1975. Springfield, Il.: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1975.
- Braun, Robert J. Teachers and Power. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1972.
- Butkeiwicz, C. A. "A Study of the Effects of Professional Negotiations on the Role of Selected Secondary School Principals in Maryland." Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1973. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, Vol. XXXIV.
- Chase, Francis S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching." Phi Delta Kappa, 1950.
- Epstein, Benjamin. What is Negotiable? in Professional Negotiations Pamphlet Number One. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969.
- Griffen, Michael F. "The Role of the Principal in Collective Negotiations." APSS Know How, XXV, January 1975.
- Gove, Philip Babcock and The Merriam-Webster Editorial Staff. Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1937.



- Guilii, O. J. "A Study of Selected Effects of Collective Negotiations with Teacher Organizations on the Decision-Making Role of the Elementary Principal." Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, Vol. XXXIII.
- Gulick, Luther. "Notes on the Theory of Organization," in L. Gulick and L. Urwick (eds.), Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.
- Hitt, William D. Educational Management. Columbus, Ohio: Batelle Laboratories, 1977.
- Hooks, A. R. "A Study of the Relationship Between Collective Negotiations and the Activities of the Secondary School Principal." Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, Vol. XXX.
- Hughes, Clarence. Some Basics for Boards of Education. Annawan Community Unit School District No. 226. Annawan, Illinois, 1975.
- Koerner, James D. Who Controls American Education? Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Lipham, James M. and Hoeh, James A., Jr. The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Love, T. M. "The Impact of Teacher Negotiations on School System Decision-Making." Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1968. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968
- Lutz, Frank W. "The Principal as a Personnel Manager." ISR Journal, II, Winter, 1970.
- McCumsey, N. L. "The Effects of Professional Negotiations on Secondary School Principals' Decision-Making Functions." Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, Vol. XXVIII.

- Morton, R. J. "Decision-Making Responsibilities of the Elementary Principal Before and After Professional Negotiations." Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, Vol. XXXIII.
- Moskowitz, S. D. "The Teachers' Council and Democratic Administration." The NASSP Bulletin, XXIV, 1950.
- Nicholson, Everett W. and Nasstrom, Roy R. "The Impact of Collective Negotiations on Principals." The NASSP Bulletin, IVIII, October, 1974.
- Pierce, Paul Revere. The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship. Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago, 1935.
- Potts, V. R. "A Study of the Relationship of Professional Negotiations to the Administrative Tasks Performed by High School Principals in Michigan." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, Vol. XXXI.
- Randles, Harry E. "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts." The National Elementary Principal. November/December, 1975.
- Renaud, A. J. "The Effects of Professional Negotiations upon the Leadership Role of the Elementary School Principal." Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1973. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, Vol. XXXIV.
- State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education. The School Code of Illinois. "Principals' Duties." St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1977.
- Watson, Bernard C. "Teacher Militancy and Collective Negotiations." Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, ed. by Richard W. Saxe. Springfield, Il.: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Therese Nijole Daugirdas has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Melvin P. Heller, Director  
Chairman and Professor  
Administration and Supervision  
School of Education, Loyola

Dr. Philip Carlin  
Associate Professor  
Administration and Supervision  
School of Education, Loyola

Dr. Jasper Valenti  
Professor  
Administration and Supervision  
School of Education, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Jan. 2, 1979

Date

M.P. Heller

Director