



1993

Compliance with selected educational policies in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee Catholic elementary school system

Thomas C. Martin
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martin, Thomas C., "Compliance with selected educational policies in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee Catholic elementary school system" (1993). *Dissertations*. 3010.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3010

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.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1993 Thomas C. Martin

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

COMPLIANCE WITH SELECTED EDUCATIONAL POLICIES
IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE
CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SYSTEM

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

THOMAS C. MARTIN

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 1993

Abstract

Thomas C. Martin

Loyola University Chicago

COMPLIANCE WITH SELECTED EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE

CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SYSTEM

The purpose of the study was to determine the level of compliance that a selected set of policies had in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee Catholic Elementary School System and to determine the reasons that schools were not in compliance with these policies. Demographic information about the schools and their principals was also sought to determine if demographics had any role in the level of compliance.

The population consisted of 102 principals who responded to a mailed questionnaire out of a total possible of 163 principals in the system. Thirty-seven policies were chosen from the system's policy manual for this study. This was not a random selection, but the policies were selected because of their possible controversial nature, their prior history of problems, or their suspected lack of compliance. The policies were selected with the assistance of the Catholic Schools Office in Milwaukee.

For each policy item in the survey, principals were asked if they were in compliance and if not, they were prompted to choose one or two reasons from a given list for

the entire item or give their own reason for the lack of compliance. Principals were also asked for factual data about themselves and their schools.

The results were analyzed by using the t-test, the chi-square statistic, and the Pearson correlation coefficient. It was learned that the mean number of policies in compliance of this set of policies was 29.37 of a possible thirty-seven policies. The range was from eighteen to thirty-seven policies.

The policies most often in non-compliance were on the testing of fire alarms (not fire drills), the principal's control of funds, and the parish pastor's evaluation process of the principal.

The reasons given most often for lack of compliance were that the local policy was preferred over the system's policy, a lack of the policy's existence, and a variety of reasons classified as "other."

Demographic factors about the school and the principal had no significant effect on the level of policy compliance.

Copyright by Thomas C. Martin, 1993
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the elementary school principals in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee who contributed by their responses to the questionnaire.

Much appreciation is extended to the Office for Schools, Child and Youth Ministries of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee under Superintendent of Schools, Dr. John Norris. Special gratitude is extended to Dr. Janet Smith and the Reverend Louis Darnieder, Ph.D., for their support and cooperation.

Further appreciation is extended to the writer's dissertation committee whose suggestions and advice were most beneficial in making this study a most enjoyable experience. My committee chairman, Dr. Max Bailey, is especially noted because he has given me much valuable encouragement. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Philip Carlin and Dr. Arthur Safer, committee members, for their constructive help.

A special note of appreciation goes to the Assistant Dean of the School of Education, Dr. Kay Smith, for her tremendous encouragement over the years and for her friendship.

Finally, the writer expresses special appreciation for and dedicates this work to my parents Gus and Bernice Martin, to my sister Maureen, and to my brother-in-law Sam Coniglio for their unending love and support throughout the years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	2
GENERAL QUESTIONS	3
RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	4
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	7
2. CATHOLIC SCHOOL BOARD MOVEMENT	9
DIOCESAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS	13
CATHOLIC BOARDS AND THE POLICY FUNCTION	15
3. POLICIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE LITERATURE.	19
BASIC RESEARCH INTO CATHOLIC SCHOOL POLICIES	37
4. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	43
METHODOLOGY	43
RESEARCH SAMPLE	44
SURVEY INSTRUMENT	46
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	47
5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	48
RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLICIES AND REASONS	49

RESULTS DEALING WITH SCHOOLS AND THEIR TOTALS	57
TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	59
DISCUSSION	67
THE POLICIES	67
THE REASONS	72
THE SCHOOLS	73
THE THEORY AND THE LITERATURE	74
SUMMARY	76
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	77
CONCLUSIONS	77
RECOMMENDATIONS	80
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	82
APPENDIX ONE	84
APPENDIX TWO	132
DOCUMENT ONE: LETTER SENT TO ALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE	132
DOCUMENT TWO: RESEARCH SURVEY INSTRUMENT	134
DOCUMENT THREE: LIST OF POLICY STATEMENTS FROM THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE POLICY MANUAL	144
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	171
VITA	179

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1.	RANK OF THE FREQUENCY OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES 51
2.	POLICY QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE 53
3.	RANK OF THE FREQUENCY OF REASONS GIVEN BY SCHOOLS 56
4.	GRAND TOTAL FOR ALL SCHOOLS BY TOTAL NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE AND PERCENTS 58
5.	HYPOTHESIS 1: GENDER 60
6.	HYPOTHESIS 2: VOCATION 60
7.	HYPOTHESIS 3: FULL-TIME ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL 60
8.	HYPOTHESIS 4: NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS 60
9.	HYPOTHESIS 5: SCHOOL ENROLLMENT 61
10.	HYPOTHESIS 6: NUMBER OF YEARS AS PRINCIPAL HERE 61
11.	HYPOTHESIS 7: TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS AS PRINCIPAL 61
12.	HYPOTHESIS 8: NUMBER OF RELIGIOUS AS TEACHERS 61
13.	HYPOTHESIS 9: PARISH SUBSIDY TO SCHOOL 61
14.	RESULTS OF HYPOTHESES 10-18 BY CHI-SQUARE 63
15.	RESULTS OF HYPOTHESES 19-24 BY PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" WITH SIX INDEPENDENT VARIABLES 65
A-1.	DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ABOUT THE RESEARCH SAMPLE 84
A-2.	ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ABOUT THE SAMPLE 85

A-3. SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA 86

A-4. ADDITIONAL SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA 90

A-5. AMOUNT OF COMPLIANCE BY SCHOOLS REPORTED FOR
EACH POLICY 94

A-6. REASONS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE BY SCHOOLS REPORTED
FOR EACH POLICY 97

A-7. RANKING OF SCHOOLS BY OVERALL PERCENT OF
POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE (OMITTING
MISSING ITEMS) 100

A-8. RANKING OF SCHOOLS BY THE TOTAL NUMBER OF
POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE 102

A-9. TOTAL NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE:
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION 104

A-10. SCHOOL-BY-SCHOOL COMPLIANCE REPORT 105

A-11. FREQUENCY OF REASONS CHOSEN FOR NON-COMPLIANCE
WITH POLICIES BY EACH SCHOOL 109

A-12. T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE
INDEPENDENT VARIABLE "GENDER" FOR THE
DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" . 114

A-13. T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE
INDEPENDENT VARIABLE "VOCATION" FOR THE
DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" . 115

A-14. T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE
INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: "PRESENCE OF FULL-TIME
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL" FOR THE DEPENDENT
VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" 116

A-15. T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE INDEPENDENT
VARIABLE "FULL-TIME TEACHERS" FOR THE DEPENDENT
VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" 117

A-16. T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE INDEPENDENT
VARIABLE "SCHOOL ENROLLMENT" FOR THE DEPENDENT
VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" 118

A-17.	T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE "YEARS AS THIS SCHOOL'S PRINCIPAL" FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE"	119
A-18.	T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE "TOTAL YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL" FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" .	120
A-19.	T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE "NUMBER OF RELIGIOUS AS TEACHERS" FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE"	121
A-20.	T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE "PARISH SUBSIDY TO SCHOOL" FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE"	122
A-21.	CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: "GENDER OF PRINCIPAL"	123
A-22.	CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: "VOCATION OF PRINCIPAL"	124
A-23.	CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: "PRESENCE OF FULL-TIME ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL"	125
A-24.	CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: "NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS" . .	126
A-25.	CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: "SCHOOL ENROLLMENT"	127
A-26.	CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: "YEARS AS THIS SCHOOL'S PRINCIPAL"	128

A-27. CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE:
 "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT
 VARIABLE: "NUMBER OF YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL" . . 129

A-28. CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE:
 "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT
 VARIABLE: "NUMBER OF RELIGIOUS AS TEACHERS" . 130

A-29. CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE:
 "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" BY INDEPENDENT
 VARIABLE: "PARISH SUBSIDY" 131

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

For many years American school boards and other governmental bodies have been establishing policies to run their operations more efficiently and provide for a system of rules that apply fairly and consistently. School boards set regulations, guidelines and policies for public education in the United States. However, many policies that are set by boards of education or other governmental bodies often result in various levels of compliance or implementation. For the purposes of this study, the terms "compliance" and "implementation" will be used interchangeably although their connotations often vary to some extent.

This report is focused on the implementation process for school policies and the barriers that inhibit full compliance. In particular the focus was on the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Milwaukee School System that, like other organizations managing education, publishes a policy manual for its parish schools through its Office for Schools, Child, and Youth Ministries. The Milwaukee Catholic School System has 163 elementary schools with over 33,000 students.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The goal of the study was to evaluate the rule and policy compliance effort in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee Elementary School System. Studying the compliance process can inform policy makers about the variables that can be adjusted to improve the realization of a system's goals and objectives. Well-written policies can greatly assist school administrators to meet their responsibilities objectively and consistently.

This study has added to the current body of research on policy compliance and policy implementation processes. It has suggested the state of the policy monitoring process of a large, parochial school system with generalizations to other similar systems in the United States. Diocesan school boards and possibly public school boards should benefit from this study as it offers guidance on assuring the proper compliance with their policies and rules by local school entities.

The research sought to identify the factors that were the causes of the lack of full compliance with policies and regulations: lack of trained personnel, lack of resources, lack of facilities or equipment, disagreement with the policy, or ignorance of the policy's existence. Finally the

study determined the effects of several independent variables upon the dependent variable: level of compliance. These independent variables were school size, school subsidy from the parish church, lay or religious status of the principal, the principal's number of years of experience as principal, the principal's number of years of experience as principal at that school, the gender of the principal, the number of full-time staff, the number of full-time religious on staff, and the presence or absence of a full-time assistant principal.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What research has been done in the area of policy compliance and policy implementation?
2. Do some policies and regulations enjoy less than 100% compliance in the Milwaukee Catholic elementary school system?
3. What are the major reasons that some schools are not exactly following archdiocesan policies?
4. In considering the system, what are the significant reasons that some policies are not being fully implemented?
5. What demographic characteristics are significantly related to schools having lower or higher levels of compliance?

The examination of the literature into policy compliance is reported in Chapter Three. The results to and

discussion about questions 2, 3, and 4 are found in Chapter Five. The relationship of the demographic characteristics (independent variables) to the rate of policy compliance (dependent variable) was studied in light of the following research hypotheses and the results and discussion are reported in Chapters Five and Six.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses provided the basis for demographic research and are stated in null form.

1. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the gender of the principal.

2. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the status of the principal as lay or religious.

3. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the number of full-time teachers.

4. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the presence of a full-time assistant principal.

5. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the enrollment of the school.

6. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the length of tenure of the principal in this school.

7. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the number of years of experience for the principal.

8. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the number of religious on the faculty.

9. There is no significant difference in the mean number of policies in compliance based on the amount of parish subsidy.

10. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the number of policies in compliance with the gender of the principal.

11. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the number of policies in compliance with the status of the principal as lay or religious.

12. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the number of policies in compliance with the number of full-time teachers.

13. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the

number of policies in compliance with the presence of a full-time assistant principal.

14. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the number of policies in compliance with the enrollment of the school.

15. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the number of policies in compliance with the length of tenure of the principal in this school.

16. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the number of policies in compliance with the number of years of experience for the principal.

17. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the number of policies in compliance with the number of religious on the faculty.

18. There is no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies for the cross-tabulation of the number of policies in compliance with the amount of parish subsidy.

19. There is no significant correlation between the number of policies in compliance and amount of parish subsidy.

20. There is no significant correlation between the number of policies in compliance and the size of the school enrollment.

21. There is no significant correlation between the number of policies in compliance and the number of years the principal has been at the school.

22. There is no significant correlation between the number of policies in compliance and the total number of years the principal has been a principal.

23. There is no significant correlation between the number of policies in compliance and the number of full-time teachers.

24. There is no significant correlation between the number of policies in compliance and the number of religious as teachers.

The above null hypotheses 1-9 were tested by the t-test; hypotheses 10-18 were tested by the chi-square (λ^2) statistic; hypotheses 19-24 were tested by the Pearson correlation coefficient.

Thirty-seven policies were chosen from the Archdiocese of Milwaukee Policy Manual for elementary schools and each was analyzed individually to seek out the reasons given for their individual lack of full compliance. The entire set of selected policies was examined in light of the total number of the various reasons give for lack of compliance.

Conclusions and recommendations were based upon this

examination of the data. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized for this analysis.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

For the purposes of generalization, this results of this study are limited because only one Archdiocesan school system was studied. Other Catholic school systems may be smaller or larger and may or may not have a diocesan board of education. Where they exist, these boards of education may vary greatly in their authority and policy-making role.

The policies chosen for examination for this study represented only a small portion of the total number of policies in existence in the system. The results and conclusions of this study should only reflect the policies chosen and not the entire set of policies and the entire school system.

The study was also limited by the return of the survey instrument. The rate of return was 63%.

CHAPTER TWO
CATHOLIC SCHOOL BOARD MOVEMENT

Roman Catholics view their responsibility for education as a vital part of the mission of the Church. The National Council of Bishops wrote: "Education is an expression of the mission entrusted by Jesus to the Church He founded."¹ From the Vatican in Rome, the Pope controls the Catholic Church including its basic educational policies. Since the Catholic Church has a hierarchical structure, educational authority is delegated to bishops of dioceses, parish pastors, and local school administrators.

A diocese is a geographical area designated by the Catholic Church led by a leader chosen by the Pope. This leader is called the Ordinary of the diocese and he may be a cardinal, archbishop, or bishop. Some larger and more important dioceses are termed archdioceses and are led by an archbishop or cardinal. In the United States there are 161 dioceses and thirty-six archdioceses.

Dioceses are subdivided into smaller units called parishes led by a priest called the pastor of the parish.

¹National Conference of Catholic Bishops, To Teach as Jesus Did, p. 3.

The Ordinary controls all Church-related issues in the diocese, and he delegates similar authority to pastors for these issues in the parishes. The pastor has the responsibility for the religious education of the children in his parish, but this is often delegated to the Catholic school's principal. Both the bishop of the diocese and the pastor of each parish usually have boards of education to advise them on educational concerns and goals.

Over the years the control of Catholic education has been in the hands of local bishops, clergy, and religious. In fact, the bishop of the diocese has total authority over the schools in his diocese in his role as defined in the Church's Canon Law. The bishop possesses wide authority and discretionary powers to rule for the spiritual and financial good of his diocese.

Bishop John Neuman of Philadelphia established the first diocesan school board, called the Central Board of Education, in 1852. The board was to exercise some amount of control over the diocesan schools. In 1863 Archbishop John Purcell of Cincinnati established a School Board of Examiners to certify teachers who passed an exam and care for the schools. Bishop Devenger of Ft. Wayne, Indiana, established a diocesan school board in 1879 to oversee any actions to improve the schools. In 1884 the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore ordered the establishment of a Catholic elementary school in every parish in the United States, and

for every diocese, a "school commission and a diocesan examination commission." The purposes of these commissions were to test the teachers for competency and to visit and examine the conditions of the schools for the bishop.²

In 1858, the Diocese of Evansville, Indiana held a religious meeting of local priests called a synod. This synod defined the role of the superintendent of schools and an advisory diocesan school board. The superintendent was to be the representative of the bishop and had the duty to set the school calendar, curriculum, textbooks, examinations and the certification of teachers, to represent the diocese to the State of Indiana, to make reports to the bishop on the progress of the schools, and to improve the schools as needed.³

Most early diocesan boards were filled with clergy and few members of the laity. The trend continued until the middle 1960s with a dramatic increase in the number of lay members on diocesan boards due to the influence of the Second Vatican Council. In 1968 there were eighty-two dioceses and archdioceses that had system-wide school

²Lourdes Sheehan, "A Study of the Functions of School Boards in the Educational System of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States"(Ed.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1981), 52-55.

³"Second Diocesan Synod of Evansville", 1858, 26-27, quoted in James Deneen, "Status of System-wide School Boards in Catholic Diocese of the United States" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1968), 24.

boards. By 1972 the number had increased to 131 and currently the number of diocesan boards is 150. The Archdiocese of Milwaukee dissolved their board in the late 1980s.

In 1965 the National Catholic Educational Association gave its enthusiastic support to the Catholic school board movement. It was in the spirit of Vatican Council II (1962-1965) that the laity were to be permitted to be a part of the decision making process in many areas in which only the clergy had previously participated. Also it was felt that the federal or state governments were more likely to give tax moneys to the Catholic schools if they were controlled by representative boards of citizens. The American spirit of democracy also played a role in this movement. The laity had the opportunity to partake in advising and governing local schools and subsequently local parishes also.

The American bishops issued a statement on education, To Teach as Jesus Did, in 1973, which called for "representative structures . . . to be the normative means by which the community, particularly Catholic parents, address . . . educational needs, objectives, programs and resources." Membership on these boards was to be from many points of view.⁴ Also, requests for shared responsibility,

⁴National Conference of Catholic Bishops, To Teach as Jesus Did, (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1978), 38-39.

participatory decision-making, and democratic representation in policy-making were made by many groups and individuals.⁵

DIOCESAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS

A diocesan school system is usually comprised of parish elementary schools, parish high schools, high schools owned by religious communities, and sometimes religious education programs for those attending public schools. The chief educational officer is the superintendent of schools, a position once filled exclusively by clergy, but now filled with other religious and lay people.

The school system operates usually with a diocesan school board whose power and authority depend on the bishop of the diocese. The diocesan board usually has authority in one of three ways: advisory, legislative, subject to approval of the bishop, or legislative and autonomous with respect to the bishop. Its members can be selected by the bishop, elected, or chosen by other means.

Such boards of education often have powers in some or all these areas: length of school day, teaching qualifications, salary schedules, retirement programs, benefits, curriculum, admission of pupils, tuition, appointment of the superintendent, opening or closing of schools, health and safety, relations with public school

⁵Sheehan, 76.

entities, agreement with state laws for education, and religious education programs. They are empowered to set policies for the parish schools in that diocese. Local parish school boards are not free to develop policies contrary to diocesan policies.

A parish school board would have a much different set of policies than those of a diocesan board. Diocesan policies would usually cover areas requiring a uniformity of action and procedure, while local boards are concerned with parish affairs best handled by local decisions. A few additional examples of proper diocesan policies would be the following: safety/health/efficiency standards, integration, nondiscriminatory admissions and parent-teacher relations and communications. On the other hand, proper policies for local parish policies would be the following: discipline, dress code, standards for hiring staff, determination of local tuition and budget, guidelines for the purchase of equipment and furnishings, and guidelines for off-grounds activities.⁶

Local parish school boards are often classified in a similar manner to diocesan school boards as to their role and authority. Yet the local pastor has the final authority over the board and the bishop has the ultimate word in the chain of command in the diocese. However, the influence of

⁶Mary-Angela Harper, Ascent to Excellence in Catholic Education, (Waterford, CT.: Croft-Noi, 1980), 65-67.

the laity in parish schools of today cannot be denied. The board movement is still very active and increasing its effect on local decisions and practices. Catholic lay people are eager to be involved in these boards, and with fewer religious and clergy available, parishes have come to depend on the laity.

CATHOLIC BOARDS AND THE POLICY FUNCTION

Catholic school boards are essentially different from public school boards because of the faith dimension present in Catholic schools. American bishops developed the model for these boards in their pastoral report To Teach as Jesus Did. The Catholic board is seen by Harper as a maturing of the faith community in Christ and as serving as the "voice" of the People of God in educational matters. One of the board's major tasks is to articulate the educational mission of the local faith community.⁷

The Catholic school policy making process is different from the public school model because the policies, the policymakers, the implementors and the process itself are all infused with their relationship to the teachings of Jesus. Policies must embody the values of the Gospel and the Catholic faith. The board should regularly monitor the implementation of its policies by the administration. Every board member may not be pleased with the specific method of

⁷Ibid., 13-14.

implementation, but the administrator should show that the policy is being followed or give good reasons to revise or eliminate it.

Harper reported on the characteristics of good Catholic policies. Being guided by the Gospel teachings, such policies will:

- allow the administrator plenty of breathing and maneuvering space, telling him/her what to do, but never how;
- respond to or anticipate an educational need;
- state its thought in clear, simple and nontechnical language;
- be written down in permanent form and be 'findable';
- be systematically indexed and placed in a loose-leaf notebook called a manual;
- be communicated to the board's publics and especially to those who are affected by the policy;
- be evaluated regularly.⁸

Murdick wrote that "all policies are based on the policy elements which the board identifies. Policy elements are in effect the value judgments and concerns which the board expresses whenever it is asked to look at a problem and to define or select a policy which will guide the administrator in dealing with that problem or similar problems yet to arise. It is the principal as executive officer of the board who recommends a policy. He does not make it. He has no right to insist on board support for

⁸Ibid., 43.

this or that policy recommendation. He informs the board, he advises the board, but he does not, and should not, control the board."⁹

Murdick also held that the board should monitor the school's operation as reflected in administrative decisions. Regular reporting of such administrative actions is a means of reassuring the board concerning administrative decisions and a means of reassuring the administrator regarding board support and confidence in him. The board should request evidence of success and failure of school board policies in order, not to place blame, but to make an honest appraisal. The board must be aware of the manner in which board policy is being implemented.¹⁰

The NCEA stated that the function of a parish board of education is not to administer the school, but to establish and enforce policy. Once the educational program has been established in terms of accepted goals, approved program and budget, the principal has the freedom and a duty to exercise her professional leadership and judgment in the management of the school. Only when an administrative action represents a violation of existing policy, or the need of a

⁹Olin Murdick, "Catholic Boards of Education: Structure and Process," NCEA Bulletin (August 1969): 22.

¹⁰Ibid., 22-23.

policy, does an administrative decision become the proper concern of the board.¹¹

The issue in discussion is one of deciding if, in fact, the diocesan policies are being observed and at what degree of compliance. Further questions would ask the causes for any lack of full compliance with diocesan policies. This study addresses these issues. The Catholic school system is not as large as the public school system, but one cannot deny the significance of the numbers and the extensive influence of Catholic education in the United States today.

¹¹Olin Murdick, Voice of the Community, (Washington, D.C.: NCEA Papers, Series II, No. 7, 1973), 44.

CHAPTER THREE

POLICIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE LITERATURE

Implementation is the part of policy making that comes between the statement of the policy and the effect that the policy has on the intended audience. There is usually a major difference in the composition of the groups of people who develop policies and those people who are charged with complying with the policies. It is very possible that even well-written and well-intended policies may not be effectively carried out. A poorly designed policy will probably never achieve the goals for which it was written, but an outstanding policy has no guarantee of success either.

There have been many examples in governmental situations where policies just did not get carried out to satisfaction. Edwards points out that in 1962 President Kennedy ordered U.S. troops to the University of Mississippi to control rioting caused by the attempted admission of a black student, James Meredith. However, as hours passed and no action had occurred, President Kennedy discovered that

the general in charge was still waiting for orders from the pentagon.¹²

President Nixon found out that fighting the bureaucracy was quite a challenge and that sometimes half his directives went unfulfilled. President Carter felt that the bureaucracy was one of the worst problems he had to confront. Even court decisions have difficulty in being implemented. The Supreme Court declared school prayers unconstitutional in 1962 and yet some local school boards failed to do anything to implement that decree even after several years had passed.¹³

President Johnson's plan for the Great Society and the War on Poverty probably had trouble because of their difficulties of administration.¹⁴ Busing to achieve school desegregation has faced great difficulties in its implementation on the local level. Civil rights legislation has met with resistance in some locations.

Our nation's courts rarely implement their own decisions. They rely on administrators and legislatures to carry out the remedies they prescribe. Courts may continue to supervise the implementation of their decisions, but they

¹²George Edwards, Implementing Public Policy (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1980), 2.

¹³Ibid., 4-5.

¹⁴Donald Van Meter and Carl Van Horn, "The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework," Administration and Society 6 (February 1975): 449.

lack the capacity to implement their own decisions, Legislatures also have difficulty when they turn legislated reforms over to administrative agencies that are often hostile and resistant.¹⁵

Public school districts have boards of education that are very similar in function to their Catholic counterparts. Many significant responsibilities are delegated to public school district boards of education. Knezevich listed these as follows:

1. To satisfy the spirit as well as the word of state laws dealing with education and of the regulations of the state education authority.
2. To ascertain goals of public education and prepare general policies in tune with them.
3. To select a superintendent of schools.
4. To strive continuously to improve the educational opportunities for all children in the district.
5. To create policies that will attract and retain professionals needed to obtain educational objectives.
6. To provide educationally efficient and safe school and plant facilities.
7. To plan for and obtain necessary financial resources to achieve educational goals.
8. To keep the people of the district informed and aware of status, progress, and problems of their schools.
9. To appraise activities of the district in light of its objectives.

¹⁵Richard Elmore and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Reform and Retrenchment (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company/The Rand Corporation, 1982), 17-20.

10. To discharge its responsibilities as a state agency by participating in statewide¹⁶ efforts to promote and improve public education.

Policies state the intentions of governing bodies and are considered guidelines for discretionary action.

Administrators are to observe these rules in carrying out the directives or aims of the governing body. A policy is defined by Knezevich as:

- A general statement of intent to act in a particular manner when confronted with a given situation or to achieve a given result at some future point in time.
- A guideline to future courses of action to be pursued to insure consistency and fairness.
- A means through which a board expresses and maintains control.
- A statement usually phrased in broad enough terms to include all issues likely to be involved, but at the same time be specific enough to apply to a particular situation.
- A statement either specific or broad, covering one or many dimensions of an issue, or simply defining limits to be observed in reaching a decision on a given matter.¹⁷

Written sets of policies are essential to the smooth operation of the school district. Such policies clarify responsibilities of various entities in the district. They minimize inconsistencies and provide continuity of action. Public relations are improved and pressure from special-

¹⁶Stephen Knezevich and H.C. DeKock, The Iowa School Board Member (Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa Association of School Boards, 1960), 17-18.

¹⁷Stephen Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1975), 321-322.

interest groups is reduced. Administrators could face less criticism from the public as they are following the wishes of the board. The board has a sense of direction and can better evaluate its programs. The staff and board members are better informed.¹⁸

Nelson and Crum wrote that "school boards control the keys to the attainment of a high quality education. They have the power and the responsibility to establish the policies, set the priorities, and provide the incentive and the rewards essential to cultivating excellence in the public schools of America. They are an important and integral part of our American school system and are indispensable to the achievement of excellence in our schools. The principal function of a school board is to set policy. No organization can function effectively and achieve the goals and objectives desired without clearly established policies."¹⁹

Van Horn developed a model for Intergovernmental Policy Implementation, which he felt could have wide application to many policy-making situations. It has the following components:

¹⁸American Association of School Administrators and National School Boards Association, Written Policies for Schoolboards (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1955), 6.

¹⁹Jay Nelson and Lewis Crum, "The Power and Challenges of Local School Boards," American Education 19, no. 10 (December 1983): 10.

I. Policy Standards and Resources:

Adequacy of funding and other incentive
 Degree of clarity in policy standards and objectives
 Degree of contraindications in policy standards and objectives
 Degree of specificity in procedures for implementing the policy
 Degree of change required by the policy standards and objectives

II. The National Policy Environment:

Communication: accuracy, clarity, consistency, and timeliness of communications by federal officials
 Enforcement: the use of norms, incentives, and sanctions, including plan reviews, technical assistance, program reviews, evaluations, and audits
 Policy change: the role of national political actors and interest groups in the modification and application of the policy

III. The Local Policy Environment:

Attitudes of officials and administrators toward the policy's standards and objectives, including their understanding and extent of agreement or disagreement with them
 Attitudes of interest groups and citizens, including their understanding and extent of agreement or disagreement with them
 Characteristics of the local implementing agency: the competence of the agency staff and the degree of support they receive from political officials
 Local economic and social conditions: the extent of need for the policy and the sufficiency of resources within the jurisdiction to support it

IV. Program Performance:

Who governs?
 How are the funds used?
 Who benefits?²⁰

²⁰Carl Van Horn, Policy Implementation in the Federal System (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1979), 15.

Policy implementation, as defined by Van Meter and Van Horn, "encompasses those actions individuals or groups that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions."²¹ They feel that there should be a distinction made between policy performance (implementation) and policy impact. Performance is the measure of the degree anticipated services are delivered or carried out, while the impact of a policy measures the outcomes or results of the policy. The fact that a policy was implemented effectively would not necessarily guarantee a significant impact since it might have been a poorly conceived policy to start. An examination of the implementation process would yield some insight into how a system succeeds or fails in putting its policies into meaningful action.²²

Policies can be classified according to the amount of change involved and the amount of goal consensus among the implementors. Smaller changes are more likely to be accepted than major ones. Compliance will be more effective when it does not require drastic changes in implementing body. If the implementors have a significantly greater belief in the policy's goals, there is an increased chance for the policy's success. If only minor changes are mandated and goal consensus is high, implementation will be

²¹Van Meter and Van Horn, 449.

²²Ibid., 448-449.

more successful than cases requiring major changes and having low goal agreement.²³

Van Meter and Van Horn found several characteristics that may affect an organization's ability to implement policy:

- the competence and size of the agency's staff;
- the degree of hierarchical control within the agency;
- the agency's political resources (support among executives);
- the vitality of the organization;
- the degree of "open" communication within the agency;
- the agency's formal and informal linkages with the "policy-making" or "policy-enforcing" body.²⁴

They posit three general explanations for unsuccessful compliance efforts. First, the effectiveness of the communication process can weigh significantly on the outcome of a mandated policy. Policies might not be well publicized or they might not be understood correctly by the implementors. For example, if a policy mandates certain immunizations for a student entering the school system, administrators must know exactly which immunizations are required and which are optional.

Second, successful implementation is a function of the implementing agency's capacity to do what it is expected to do. Factors involved could be overworked and/or poorly

²³Ibid., 458-461.

²⁴Ibid., 471.

trained staff, insufficient information or financial resources, and impossible time constraints.

Third, implementation efforts may fail because implementors refuse to do what they are supposed to do. They may reject the goals of their superiors because those goals may disagree with their personal values; the goals may violate the implementors' sense of self-interest; the goals may significantly change the organization and its methods that the implementors want to maintain.²⁵

Cerych found that there are four ways in which the implementation process can be affected negatively. Those actors that may have lost in the policy formation stage may often carry over their fight into the implementation phase. Implementation may be influenced by the nature of the original pressures for reform and by the degree to which the adopted policy responds to them. Also the process will be affected by the nature of the goals and values that may be affected by the new policy, especially if they are not widely shared or well-defined. Compliance may also be affected by the degree of compatibility between the new policy with its effects and the prevailing system.²⁶

Tymko wrote that "a policy may be unsuccessful for a variety of reasons: among other things, the policy may be

²⁵Ibid., 478-483.

²⁶Ladislav Cerych, "Higher Education Reform: The Process of Implementation (Towards a Conceptual Framework)," Education Policy Bulletin 7, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 12.

ill-conceived, changing conditions may make it obsolete, or it may be improperly implemented." He examined high school accreditation in Alberta, Canada and found that the policy implementation process did not work as well as expected.²⁷

Tymko's study made five conclusions about the implementation process. The environment is a significant factor in the process. The environment needed to be simplified in order to implement the policy. A balancing of interests is needed by all of the implementors. There must be a congruence between the policy issues, the policy, and any implementation strategies. The implementors need a positive attitude about compliance with the new policy.²⁸

LaRocque studied two school district policies in Western Canada: community relations and elementary school self-assessment. LaRocque found that three different sets of actors in the policy process had widely differing views of the implementation process for these two policies.

The school board viewed the process in a manner classified by LaRocque as the Classical or Technological Model. School board members viewed a well-formulated policy and its appropriate introduction as all that is needed to have policy compliance. District employee groups adopted the Political Model, in which policy compliance is

²⁷J. Lawrence Tymko, "Policy Implementation in Education", The Canadian Administrator XX, no. 1 (October 1980): 1.

²⁸Ibid., 5-6.

characterized by bargaining and negotiations by both the policy-makers and the employee groups or associations. persuasion, inducements, and coercion may be needed for policy compliance. School staff members followed the Cultural or Evolutionary Model in which policy-makers and implementors come from backgrounds so diverse in nature that there may not even be an accepted procedure for reaching agreements. Change does not occur quickly and for any policy to succeed, there must be problem solving, adaptation, and professional growth.

These conflicting viewpoints caused the amount of compliance with these two policies to be much less than had been expected by the policy-makers. LaRocque concluded that policy implementation is a very difficult procedure and much more training is needed for all actors in the process.²⁹

Edwards focused on the problems encountered in implementing public policy decisions. He listed four factors that could greatly affect policy success: communication, resources, bureaucratic structure, and disposition (attitude of the implementors to the given policy). He felt that if a policy fails to be in full compliance, the reasons for this failure must come from a combination of these four factors.³⁰

²⁹Linda LaRocque, "Policy Implementation in a School District: A Multiperspective Approach," Canadian Journal of Education 11, no. 4 (1986): 497-505.

³⁰Edwards, 20.

Edwards felt that the success of an organization, in part, depends on the policy implementation process. When organizational change is imposed from outside the organization, this process often requires a significant amount of change within that organization. When a new policy is successfully assimilated, the effectiveness of the organization should become greater.³¹

In 1986 Armstrong, Anderson, Odden, and Huddle conducted a research project on the methods by which states could support local school improvement projects. They found a four-stage model for school improvement was effective in describing the efforts of state agencies and governments. The four steps are initiation, initial implementation, complete implementation, and institutionalization.³²

In the first stage of initiation, local schools and districts perceive a need to begin a school improvement project. They adopt a plan after some research and discussion. In step two, initial implementation, teams are set up to provide district training. Staff members often reap immediate rewards such as better teaching skills or satisfaction. Enthusiasm builds for the program.

³¹Ibid., 21.

³²Jane Armstrong, Beverly Anderson, Allan Odden, and Gene Huddle, Maintaining the Momentum for Education Reform: How States can Support Local School Improvement (Denver: Education Commission of the States, April 1986), 5.

In complete implementation, step three, real outcomes can be measured such as achievement scores and an improved school climate. In stage four, the program becomes institutionalized. Here the school makes needed changes to sustain these new outcomes. These changes then become part of the normal operating procedures for the school.³³

Armstrong et al. listed the factors that increased the possibility of the new policy's success. These factors included a knowledgeable principal, training, staff teams to collect data and organize the plan, staff development, incremental staff involvement, communication, checking of progress, use of funding, and immediate rewards for the staff. And complete implementation was fostered by the visible program results, technical assistance to guide the program, the fidelity of implementation in keeping activities on course and the monitoring and reporting of the progress made to the entire school community.³⁴

Mock conducted a study of the Ontario school boards and their efforts to implement a policy on race and ethnocultural equity for their schools. Mock learned that there were seven key factors in the successful compliance with these policies:

- attitude, support and commitment of senior administrators

³³Ibid., 5-6.

³⁴Ibid., 15-20.

- political will of the decision makers
- recognition of racism and a desire to eradicate it
- adequate internal and external resources
- community involvement for input, validation and monitoring
- clearly defined responsibility and accountability
- effective in-service training at all levels of the system.³⁵

Mock ended by concluding: "Where there are policies, things happen; where there are not, they do not."³⁶

Clemmer wrote that policy implementation is usually affected by two principal factors: one, the reasonableness and thoroughness of the supporting regulations and two, the ease by which the policy's "enforcers and abiders" can gain access to current versions of the policy. An organization must insure that all employees are operating under all current approved policies. If a school or employee is not in full compliance with a policy, the policy should be evaluated and then enforced if needed. However, the evaluation of the policy might suggest that the policy needs revision. If so, the board or the proper agency should proceed with the revision and the dissemination of the new

³⁵Karen Mock, Implementing Pace and Ethnocultural Equity Policy in Ontario School Boards (Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1990), vii-viii.

³⁶Ibid., 60.

policy. Policy development should be an ongoing process as a result of policy implementation efforts.³⁷

Bardach felt that "even the most robust policy - one that is well designed to withstand the implementation process - will tend to go awry. The classic symptoms of underperformance, delay, and escalating costs are bound to appear."³⁸ "At one level the implementation process surrounding any policy mandate can usefully be construed as the playing out of numerous political and bureaucratic 'games.'"³⁹

Zantal-Weiner studied the problem of implementing a particular State of Maryland discipline policy for handicapped students. She learned that five factors played a significant role in the degree to which the policy was implemented by various local educational agencies (LEAs). One was that the policy had a lack of operating guidelines. The greater the number of elaborations of the policy became, the better the policy was implemented. The professionals who were to implement the policy suffered from role

³⁷Elwin Clemmer, The School Policy Handbook (Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1991), 187-189.

³⁸Eugene Bardach, The Implementation Game: What Happens After a Bill Becomes a Law, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1977), 5.

³⁹Ibid., 9.

confusion and they developed coping mechanisms that tended to subvert the goals of the policy.⁴⁰

Third it was found that those who knew the policy the best should be the ones directly involved in its implementation. The policy was also hampered by limited materials and human resources. The lack of monetary resources also made it difficult to monitor the policy implementation efforts. Finally the policy had better compliance in those LEAs in which the parents were actively involved in working with the school personnel on the discipline problems of their children.⁴¹

In addition to the above problems, other factors may be impediments to successful policy compliance. There can be a lack of attention to policy implementation. Administrators may be too busy in their daily routines or they may not have the expertise to administer the policy properly. There may be little incentive for them to carry out policies. At times, it may be that no one cares if the policy is enforced or ignored.

There must be a fine line drawn between a policy being too vague and thus open to many differing interpretations and a policy being so specific that difficulty arises in its application to real examples. The amount of discretion

⁴⁰Katherine Ann Zantal-Weiner, "Implementation of a Discipline Policy for Handicapped Students"(Ed.D. diss., University of Maryland, 1986), 140-142.

⁴¹Ibid., 143-146.

allowed to individual administrators can also vary widely causing unequal applications of the particular policy. Governing bodies must decide how much flexibility is expected on the local level of administration, but this is often not clearly defined. Some may think they understand the policy only to find that they are very far from the intended meaning.

The instructions for the complying with a given policy should be consistent. If differing guidelines are used for a policy, there is a very good chance that the policy will not be administered evenly. Inconsistent communications can occur when many individuals are permitted to give interpretations of a policy. As the number of interpreters becomes fewer, the more consistent will be the communication and policies will have a greater chance of success.

Policies are often not self-executing; they may require some form of positive or negative sanction to promote the action desired. Some implementors may find that they have very little incentive to implement a particular policy. Personnel could be rewarded with praise, promotions or bonuses. Or they could be criticized, transferred, or dismissed. However, there is no guarantee that such a system may provide the level of compliance wanted.

In bureaucracies the amount of "red tape" and paperwork can doom a policy or program even before it has the chance to get started. In a bureaucracy, a common problem is that

no one staff member is actually charged with the policy's implementation. Instead such responsibility is often diffused and the result is often that little gets accomplished.

Policies that are controversial or respond to crises may also have trouble in their implementation. Controversial policies may not be too popular with some administrators and may not be implemented at all. Policies that try to respond to an emergency may become lost during the crisis as attention is focused elsewhere. The policies may be too inflexible to apply to some very difficult situations.

Of course, the more complex the policy or program becomes, the greater the probability that it will not be implemented as planned. These intricate policies may have too many goals and too many instructions to insure proper compliance.

One should not judge the effectiveness of a program unless it has been fully implemented. It is very possible for a potentially good policy not to have a chance to succeed and be revoked due to the lack of full compliance. It is also very possible to have an ineffective policy continued due to the lack of good and reliable information on its implementation. However, if a school board is aware of the potential problems inherent in policy making, then the chances of successful policy compliance will be enhanced.

BASIC RESEARCH INTO CATHOLIC SCHOOL POLICIES

Joanne Planek (1981) at Loyola University wrote her dissertation: "An Analysis of Factors Which Interfere With the Full Implementation of Archdiocesan Policies by Local Schoolboards in the Archdiocese of Chicago." Planek stated the role of the Archdiocesan School Board from its policy manual, School Policies and Administrative Regulations for Elementary Schools: "The policies of the Archdiocesan School Board shall be policies of the local school board."⁴² Local school boards derive their authority from the Archbishop of Chicago as the Corporate Sole, and are under his supervision. Planek learned that there had never been a study of the policy manual to determine the level of its implementation or the reasons for any low compliance. She wanted to examine certain independent variables as to their effect on compliance levels. Some of these variables were enrollment, staff size, experience of the principal, lay or religious principal, and presence of an assistant principal. A questionnaire was developed based on these policies and sent to 330 parish school board chairpersons and there was a total of 127 completed responses. The questionnaire that she developed had forty-two items on specific policies. Interviews were held with ten chairpersons whose responses

⁴²Joanne Planek, "An Analysis of Factors Which Interfere With the Full Implementation of Archdiocesan Policies By Local Schoolboards in the Archdiocese of Chicago" (Ed.D. diss. Loyola University, 1981), 3.

did not indicate a high level of compliance with the set of policies.

In examining the results of the survey, Planek learned that some policies were found to be in full compliance with the policy manual. Some of these policies were the following: 1. Prior notice must be given to the teacher when there is dissatisfaction with his/her work or conduct. 2. A child entering first grade must be six years of age on or before December 1 of that school year. 3. The school must maintain an accurate record of each child's attendance. 4. students are encouraged to attend Mass on a daily basis.

Concerning other policies, the range of non-compliance reached a high of eighty-two schools out of 127 on one policy on the frequency of fire drills. Thirty-six schools reported full compliance. Seventy-two schools reported frequent compliance; three reported some compliance; fifteen reported other compliance or none. Some board chairpersons said that they were not aware of the full requirements of the policy as regarding having two drills in both September and October and once a month thereafter. Some said it was much work to run the drills and they felt that the students knew the procedure sufficiently well enough for safety. Two suburban schools reported that once a month was enough since their buildings were relatively new and thus safe enough. Two city schools ran fire drills only when the Fire Department conducted them and this was only

three times in that school year. Complacency and/or ignorance of the policy seemed to be the major factors in non-implementation of this policy.

The policy in second place for lack of compliance was the policy that mandated four steps (a serious infraction, parental conference, a period of probation and/or suspension, and a warning letter to the parents) to be taken before a child is expelled from the school. Seventy-eight of the 127 schools did not follow all four steps. Forty-nine schools did follow all four steps. Several schools reported that a warning letter or suspension was not needed. Some just followed local procedures that had been effective and did not see the need to follow the official policy.

Sixty-nine of the 127 schools did not comply fully with the policy that mandated the following courses be required: religion, communication arts, mathematics, social studies, science, physical education, and fine arts. Human sexuality was encouraged to be in the curriculum. Physical education was offered in 90% of the schools, fine arts in 81%, and human sexuality in 50%. Lack of facilities and lack of sufficient funds were the two major factors in non-compliance for physical education and fine arts. Lack of agreement for the need of a course in human sexuality was the major reason that it was not being offered in half the schools.

Non-compliance from fifty-six of the 127 schools was determined for the policy that required that each school have a religion chairperson appointed by the principal and approved by the pastor. Some schools were not aware of the full requirements of this policy. Some felt that the pastor, not the principal, should make the appointment. Some felt that, in a small school, the principal should hold this position.

Policy required that all titles used in the local schools must be officially approved by the Archdiocesan School Board. There were many reasons for the lack of compliance with this mandate. Some schools did not have confidence in the approved book list. Some felt that publishers' representatives could present valid arguments to choose texts not on the list. Others felt that the decision should be made locally after a study of all possible texts had been completed.

Forty-five schools of the 127 reported less than full adherence to the policy that said that parents should be greatly involved in the religious education of their children. Some schools simply did not afford the parents much opportunity to participate in their child's religious education. On the other hand, some schools reported that their parents did not really want to become involved and decided to let the school take up the task.

planek formulated several conclusions based on her research. Schools having less compliance with the policies seemed to have these characteristics: smaller enrollments, religious for principals, urban locations, principals with longer tenure in the same school, and local policies that were considered more relevant than selected archdiocesan policies.⁴³

Other facts emerged in the discussion of those policies that had been difficult to implement. In some schools, board chairpersons were not fully aware of all archdiocesan policies. Policies involving parental involvement were often not in compliance. Some schools did not provide proper substitutes and some did not follow the procedures to grant tenure to teachers. In cases of student expulsion, all of the proper steps were not always followed. Fire drills were not held as often as mandated in some schools.⁴⁴

The role and appointment of the religion chairperson that existed in some schools did not comply with policy. Parental participation was lower than expected in children's liturgies. Lack of financial and physical resources helped to prevent the offering of a complete curriculum. Texts and

⁴³Ibid., 161.

⁴⁴Ibid., 163.

related materials were sometimes not chosen from the archdiocesan approved lists.⁴⁵

Planek offered recommendations based on the analysis of the data. All new board members should have training on the Archdiocesan Policy Manual. Teachers should be shared among a group of local schools in the subject areas of Fine Arts and Physical Education and in a pool of qualified substitutes. In-service should be offered to expand methods of grading and evaluating students. Alternate fund-raising methods should be researched and implemented if appropriate. Teachers should have a copy of the Policy Manual.⁴⁶

Planek's study into archdiocesan policy compliance provided a good basis for research in this important area of daily operation and organization of the Catholic schools of the Chicago region. Also it opened the door by raising other research questions that need investigation for the continuing improvement of the Catholic school system in the United States. The more information that policy makers have about the factors influencing the fulfillment of their programs and goals, the more successful the entire educational system will be. To a great extent, the future promise of our society depends upon the quality of all educational programs.

⁴⁵Ibid., 163-164.

⁴⁶Ibid., 164-166.

CHAPTER FOUR
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

METHODOLOGY

The research study instrument was developed by the author in cooperation and consultation with staff members in the Catholic Schools Office for the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. Permission for the survey was granted by the Superintendent of Schools and his staff. The survey used thirty-seven policies chosen specifically for the research and not on a random basis. The survey instrument was revised several times until all parties agreed to its content validity. The policy manual for the Catholic schools in the Archdiocese is called Policies and Regulations for the Archdiocese of Milwaukee, published in April 1990 by the Office for Schools, Child, and Youth Ministries. It contains school policies, rules and guidelines for some policies, applicable Wisconsin State statutes on education, policy statements by the Wisconsin Catholic Conference of Bishops, and official forms to be used by the schools. Some of the policies are relatively new, while others originated in the 1970s. All current policies were re-approved in recent years.

Policies had been set by an Archdiocesan Board of Education, but it was dissolved by the Archbishop of Milwaukee in the late 1980s. New policies are both established, disseminated, and evaluated by the Office of the Superintendent of Schools for the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. It is interesting to note that the current approved practice is to have an administrative officer (Superintendent of Schools) perform the policy-making functions usually reserved for boards of education.

RESEARCH SAMPLE

The population chosen for this research project is the entire set of elementary school principals in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. There are 163 elementary schools with about 33,000 students.

The school principals received a cover letter detailing the nature of the study and seeking their assistance. The instrument was included and an addressed, stamped return envelope. All 163 school principals received the instrument in the mail and 102 were returned for a return rate of 63%.

The following was learned about the sample of principals and their schools from the demographic data they reported on the survey. The entire demographic report on the principals and their schools is in Appendix One - Tables A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4. The number of male principals was twenty-five and of female principals is seventy-seven.

seventy-two principals were lay and thirty were religious (nuns or priests). Their schools ranged in size from forty-seven to 503 with a mean of 240.3 students.

The schools were located in nine counties with the County of Milwaukee having forty-seven of the schools. Other counties represented are Dodge, Kenosha, Racine, Walworth, Waukesha, Fond Du Lac, Ozaukee, Sheboygan, and Washington.

The tenure of the principals in their current assignments ranged from one year to twenty-one years with a mean of 5.3 years. The total number of years they served as a principal in any school ranged from one year to thirty-three years with a mean of 10.2 years. Some schools did not report the monetary amount of subsidy that they receive from their parishes. For those schools reporting their subsidy, the range was from \$25,000 to \$844,000 with the mean at \$224,202.

The number of full-time equivalent teachers (part-time teachers counted as 0.5) ranged from 3.5 to 27.5 full-time teachers with the mean at 12.8 teachers. The number of full-time religious on the teaching staff (part-time religious teachers counted as 0.5) had a range from zero to eight and a mean of 1.2 religious. Ninety-seven schools had no full-time assistant principal, while five reported having a full-time assistant principal.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey instrument took the form of a questionnaire seeking information on the compliance or lack of compliance with thirty-seven selected policies. The Catholic Schools Office and staff certified the content validity of the survey instrument. The respondents were asked to check a box for "Yes" or a box for "No" to answer the item. For some items a response of "Yes" represented policy implementation, while a response of "No" did so for other items. There was no pattern to the answers. Some principals omitted various items or said that the items were not applicable for their schools; i.e., a "sports program" policy question for a school with no sports program or an "expulsion" policy question in a school having no expulsions.

If the answer indicated a lack of policy compliance, the respondents were prompted to choose one or two reasons from a prescribed list of reasons for lack of full implementation. Some chose one or two reasons from the given list; some added other reasons not on the given list; some did not volunteer any reasons for the lack of policy compliance. The last ten items on the survey sought demographic data about the school and information about the principal.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

After the completed surveys were returned, they were examined for usability and completeness. The input of the data was made into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) using an IBM 370 mainframe computer at Loyola University. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were obtained from the data, including means and standard deviation. The research null hypotheses were analyzed using the T-Test, the Chi-square (χ^2) statistic and the Pearson correlation coefficient.

CHAPTER FIVE
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will report the results of the research survey project on the amount of policy compliance and the reasons for the lack of compliance. It will also report the testing of the research null hypotheses. The chapter has several sections utilizing summary tables with reference to detailed tables found in the Appendix. The chapter divisions and their contents follow.

Section one - Results for individual policies and schools: Rank order of the thirty-seven policies beginning with the policy having the highest non-compliance; A list of the policy questions from the survey for easy reference; and the rank order of the frequency of the reasons given starting with the reasons given most often by school principals.

Section two - Results dealing with schools and their totals: Summary of the overall compliance rate for all schools by policy compliance totals and percents of compliance.

Section three - Tests of significance: Test results for research null hypotheses on independence of subgroups

using the t-test; Test results for research null hypotheses for frequency of subgroups using the chi-square statistic; Test results for research null hypotheses on the strength of association between variables using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient.

Section four: Discussion of the results.

Section five: Chapter summary.

RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLICIES AND REASONS

The rates of compliance with the thirty-seven policies selected for the study were tallied and summarized in rank-order in Table 1 below. A more detailed policy-by-policy report is given in the Appendix One - Table A-5. A listing of the policy questions from the survey is found in Table 2 below, while the entire survey instrument is in Appendix Two - Document B-2. The actual policies from the Archdiocese of Milwaukee manual are in Appendix Two - Document B-3.

In Table 1 the range of the amount of non-compliance is seen in rank-order. Item 11, dealing with the frequency of fire alarm tests, has the highest non-compliance rate of seventy schools of 102 schools. Items 9 and 35 had the lowest rate of non-compliance of two schools. Item 9 covers the minimum number of days in the school calendar and Item 35 asks about the compliance with starting and ending dates of athletic seasons. The mean rate was 15.7 schools of 102

schools (or 15.4%) in non-compliance per policy. The median was eleven and the mode was five.

Other policies with a high rate of non-compliance are Item 18 (sixty-one schools), Item 14 (fifty-two schools), Item 21 (forty-one), and Item 6 (thirty schools). Item 18 relates to the principal's control of funds and/or checking accounts. Item 14 asks about the pastor's evaluation of the principal. Item 21 is about the need for the signature of parents when their children do fund-raising. Item 6 asks about the school sponsoring any mixed parties or dances. The remainder of the policy results can be seen in Table 1, Table 2, and Appendix One - Table A-5.

Table 1: Rank of the Frequency of Non-compliance
with Policies (N = 102)

POLICY NUMBER FROM SURVEY	BRIEF POLICY DESCRIPTION	SCHOOLS IN NON-COMPLIANCE (f)
11	FIRE ALARM TESTED WEEKLY	70
18	PRINCIPAL'S CONTROL OF FUNDS	61
14	PASTOR'S EVALUATION OF PRINCIPAL	52
21	WRITTEN APPROVAL FOR FUND-RAISING	41
6	SCHOOL-SPONSORED DANCES	30
37	SPECIAL SERVICES FOR STUDENTS	28
24	CONSULTATION ON EXPULSIONS	22
13	PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO	20
23	REASONS GIVEN FOR NON-RENEWALS	18
3	ADMISSION OF UNDERAGE STUDENTS	17
16	BUDGET PREPARED BY PRINCIPAL	16
31	LOCALLY WRITTEN CURRICULUM PLAN	16
26	ACCIDENT INSURANCE FOR ATHLETES	15
17	FUNDS DEPOSITED WITH PARISH	14
32	EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES	14
27	ACADEMIC GRADES AS DISCIPLINE	12
29	MINIMUM LENGTH OF SCHOOL DAY	12
10	PASTOR'S RELATION TO STAFF	11

Table 1 - Continued

POLICY NUMBER FROM SURVEY	BRIEF POLICY DESCRIPTION	SCHOOLS IN NON-COMPLIANCE (f)
15	FIRE DRILLS HELD IN SCHOOL	11
28	ATHLETIC ELIGIBILITY RULES	11
12	LIMIT ON ATHLETIC PARTICIPATION	9
36	LIMIT ON NUMBER OF TEAM GAMES	9
20	DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF TUITION	8
30	CLOSING DUE TO BAD WEATHER	8
1	COMPLAINT RESOLUTION PROCEDURES	7
33	ATHLETICS, PHYS. ED., INTRAMURALS	6
2	EXPULSIONS APPROVED BY PASTOR	5
4	STUDENT RETENTION IN GRADE--PROCESS	5
5	DRESS STANDARD ADOPTED BY BOARD	5
7	PARENTS NOTIFIED ABOUT DETENTION	5
34	ADULT SUPERVISION OF PRACTICES	5
8	USE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT	4
25	STUDENT RETENTION MANDATES	4
19	LACK OF TUITION IN 1ST SEMESTER	3
22	WRITTEN NOTICE OF NON-RENEWALS	3
9	SCHOOL CALENDAR WITH 180 DAYS	2
35	TEAMS FOLLOW DATES OF SEASONS	2

Table 2: Policy Questions for Reference

1. Does your school follow the mandated procedures to handle complaints utilizing all four levels in the process? (p1312)
2. Are all cases of expulsion approved by the pastor? (2205a)
3. Does the school have a written policy regarding the admission of underage students? (p5111.1)
4. Does your school follow the procedures to handle any possible retention of students? (p5123)
5. Does your school have a dress standard for the students adopted by the local school board? (p5132)
6. Does the school sponsor any mixed parties or dances outside of school hours? (p5134)
7. If a student is to be held after school for detention, are the parents always given prior notification? (p5144.1)
8. Does your school ever use corporal punishment? (p5144.2)
9. Does your school calendar have at least 180 days in which the school is in session? (p6111)
10. Does the pastor maintain a satisfactory working relationship with the principal and staff? (p2205a)
11. Is the school's fire alarm system tested at least once a week? (p6114.1)
12. Are student-athletes in your school permitted to be on more than one team during any particular season? (p6145.2)
13. Does your school have a pupil/teacher ratio greater than 25:1? (p6151)
14. Does your pastor evaluate the principal annually, using at least two written, scheduled appraisals and based upon a written job description? (p4112)
15. Does the school hold fire drills at least once each month? (p6114.1)
16. Does the principal prepare and oversee the school budget? (p2210c)

17. Does the principal insure that all funds, such as book fees and others, are properly deposited with the parish? (p2210c)
18. Does the principal control any funds or checking accounts? (p3410)
19. Are any students asked to transfer from your school during the first semester due to non-payment of tuition? (p3240a)
20. Is the dismissal of students from your school used only as a last resort due to non-payment of tuition? (p3240a)
21. In the case of fund-raising, does the school require the written approval of the student's parent or guardian? (p3270)
22. In the last two years, have any employees been non-renewed without written notice? (p4119.2)
23. In the last two years, has the school given employees the reasons for non-renewal of their contracts? (p4119.2)
24. In the last two years, has the Catholic Schools Office been consulted before the expulsion of any student during or at the end of the school year? (p5114a)
25. In the last two years, has the school followed all mandated steps to be taken when a student is to be retained in a grade? (p5123)
26. Do all of your student athletes have accident insurance? (p5143)
27. Are academic grades ever a part of a disciplinary action? (p5144)
28. Does the school have a written set of eligibility rules for sports participants? (p5144)
29. Does the school day have the minimum of at least six hours of teaching time for grades one to five and six and one-half hours for the junior high grades? (p6112)
30. In the last two years, has the school been closed for bad weather even though the local public schools were open? (p6114.6)
31. Does the school have a locally written curriculum plan? (p6140)

32. Does the principal take responsibility for all extra-curricular activities, while the pastor does the same for all parish-based programs? (p6145)
33. Does the school have an athletic program, but no physical education or intramural program? (p6145.2a)
34. Does the school ever have a practice or a competition without the supervision of a person who is at least twenty-one years of age? (p6145.2a)
35. Are the starting and ending days of the various sports seasons followed by all school teams? (6145.2a)
36. Is the maximum number of games and tournaments adhered to for all sports seasons and teams? (p6145.22)
37. Are all students in the school who are eligible for special programs, such as Chapter or Title programs, receiving such assistance? (p6164.3)

To see which reasons for non-implementation were chosen most often by school principals, refer to Table 3. Reason 12 was mentioned 226 times by principals: "Local policy is more suited to our needs." Reason 13 ("Other") was chosen 108 times and the various reasons grouped under "Other" are too numerous to mention here, but they will be referred to in the report. Sixty-nine schools did not follow certain policies, but chose not to give a reason. Reason 9 ("Not aware of policy's enactment or existence") was given as a reason sixty-five times. The reason that was least often chosen was Reason 6 ("Policy is not important") with a total of six mentions. Other results can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3: Rank of the Frequency of Reasons Given by Schools

FREQUENCY (f)	REASON NUMBER	STATEMENT OF REASON FOR NON-COMPLIANCE WITH A POLICY
226	12	LOCAL SCHOOL POLICY IS MORE SUITED TO OUR NEEDS
108	13	OTHER REASON
69	OMITTED	NO REASON GIVEN
65	9	NOT AWARE OF POLICY'S ENACTMENT OR EXISTENCE
44	11	NOT APPLICABLE IN SOME CASES
40	2	LACK OF TIME
33	8	DO NOT AGREE WITH POLICY
29	4	LACK OF INTEREST IN POLICY
16	3	LACK OF TRAINED STAFF
11	10	CATHOLIC SCHOOLS OFFICE DOES NOT FOLLOW-UP POLICY
8	5	LACK OF FACILITIES
7	7 (TIE)	DO NOT UNDERSTAND POLICY
7	1 (TIE)	LACK OF MONEY
4	6	POLICY IS NOT IMPORTANT

Two additional tables are mentioned here for a further analysis into the choices of reasons made by the school principals. Table A-6 in Appendix One lists a policy-by-policy tabulation of the frequency of the various reasons chosen for each policy item. For example, it shows that Item 3 had these reasons listed for non-compliance: Reason 2 (three times), Reason 4 (once), Reason 8 (once), Reason 9 (once), Reason 11 (four times), Reason 12 (five times),

Reason 13 (four times) and "None Given" (twice). Other policy items are similarly analyzed to indicate why a particular policy is not being fully implemented.

Also in Appendix One, Table A-11 lists a school-by-school analysis of the frequency of the reasons that the school principal chose to explain non-compliance with a policy. For example, School 6 listed Reason 2 (once), Reason 4 (twice), Reason 10 (once), Reason 11 (once), Reason 12 (five times), and Reason 13 (once). Thus individual schools can be analyzed as to their choices of reasons.

RESULTS DEALING WITH SCHOOLS AND THEIR TOTALS

Table 4 summarizes the overall rate of compliance and percent of compliance for all 102 schools in the study. In Table 4 the mean number of policies per school in compliance was 29.37 with a range from eighteen policies to a perfect score of thirty-seven policies. Also the mean percent of policies in compliance was 83.68% with a range from 62.07% to 100%. Items that were omitted on the survey were not counted toward the percents given in Table 4.

Table 4: Grand Total for all Schools by
Number of Policies in Compliance and by Percents

STATISTIC	NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE (TOTAL = 37)	PERCENT OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE (OMITTING MISSING ITEMS)
MEAN	29.37	83.68%
MEDIAN	30.00	85.29%
MODE	30.00	88.89%
STANDARD DEVIATION	3.38	7.68%
RANGE	18 to 37	62.07 to 100.00%

In Appendix One, several tables give additional data about the individual schools. Table A-10 shows, for each school, the number and percent of policies in compliance, policies in non-compliance and policy items omitted or not applicable on the survey.

Appendix One - Table A-8 gives a ranking of schools by the number of policies in compliance. School 20 reported compliance with all thirty-seven policies, while School 19 complied with a low of eighteen policies of twenty-nine as eight other policy items were omitted.

Appendix One - Table A-7 yields similar data to the above table, but ranks the schools by percent of policies in compliance (not counting items omitted).

The frequency distribution for the number of policies in compliance can be found in Appendix One - Table A-9. Here it is seen that the mode was thirty policies in

compliance reported by a total of sixteen schools; the median is also thirty policies in compliance.

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

There are nine null hypotheses about the difference of means in the number of policies in compliance (the dependent variable) between two groups in a category (the independent variable). The full statistical summaries of the t-tests can be found in Appendix One in Tables A-12 to A-20. The null hypotheses (from Chapter One) are listed here in shortened form with their results.

RESULTS OF NULL HYPOTHESES 1 - 9 USING THE T-TEST

Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the "NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" (dependent variable) and these nine independent variables:

1. Gender of the Principal
2. Lay or Religious status of the principal ("Vocation")
3. Number of full-time teachers (below or above 11.2 teachers)
4. Presence of a full-time assistant principal
5. School enrollment (below or above 220.5 students)
6. Number of years as principal of this school (below or above 4.5 years)
7. Number of years as a principal (below or above 8.5 years)

8. Number of religious on staff (below or above 1.2 religious)
9. Size of parish subsidy to school (below or above \$176,500).

Note: there were 102 schools and thirty-seven policies.

Table 5---Hypothesis 1: Gender

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
MALE	25	29.6	1.38	DO NOT REJECT
FEMALE	77	29.3		

Table 6---Hypothesis 2: Vocation

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
LOW	30	29.4	1.17	DO NOT REJECT
HIGH	72	29.3		

Table 7---Hypothesis 3: Full-time Assistant Principal

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
YES	5	30.4	1.02	DO NOT REJECT
NO	97	29.3		

Table 8---Hypothesis 4: Number of Full-time Teachers

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
LOW	53	29.3	1.30	DO NOT REJECT
HIGH	49	29.4		

Table 9---Hypothesis 5: School Enrollment

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
LOW	52	29.4	1.43	DO NOT REJECT
HIGH	50	29.3		

Table 10---Hypothesis 6: Number of Years as Principal Here

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
LOW	57	29.4	1.18	DO NOT REJECT
HIGH	45	29.3		

Table 11---Hypothesis 7: Total Number of Years as Principal

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
LOW	54	29.3	1.10	DO NOT REJECT
HIGH	48	29.5		

Table 12---Hypothesis 8: Number of Religious as Teachers

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
LOW	69	29.3	1.14	DO NOT REJECT
HIGH	33	29.5		

Table 13---Hypothesis 9: Parish Subsidy to School

GROUP	CASES	MEAN SCORE	F-VALUE	RESULT
LOW	40	30.2	1.25	DO NOT REJECT
HIGH	62	28.8		

RESULTS OF HYPOTHESES 10-18 USING THE CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC

Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the categories of the following independent variables for the dependent variable: "NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE." This dependent variable was divided into three categories: "Low" from 18 to 28 policies in compliance; "Middle" from 29 to 31 policies; "High" from 32 to 37 policies.

The nine categorical independent variables are:

1. Gender of the principal
2. Lay or Religious status of the principal ("Vocation")
3. Number of full-time teachers (below or above 11.2 teachers)
4. Presence of a full-time assistant principal
5. School enrollment (below or above 220.5 students)
6. Number of years as principal of this school (below or above 4.5 years)
7. Number of years as a principal (below or above 8.5 years)
8. Number of religious on staff (below or above 1.2 religious)
9. Size of parish subsidy to school (below or above \$176,500).

The chi-square statistic asks if the expected frequencies are significantly different from the expected frequencies based on the percent of the distribution. If the null hypotheses are rejected, then the variables are related and not independent of each other.

Appendix One contains the full statistical results for each of these tests in Tables A-21 to A-29. The results of the nine null hypotheses are summarized here.

Table 14---Results of Hypotheses 10-18 by Chi-square

VARIABLES IN CROSS-TABULATION: "POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" WITH:	CHI-SQUARE VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE	RESULT FOR NULL HYPOTHESIS
10. GENDER	0.93587	0.62629	DO NOT REJECT
11. VOCATION	0.57380	0.75059	DO NOT REJECT
12. ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL	0.61606	0.73489	DO NOT REJECT
13. FULL-TIME TEACHERS	0.84286	0.65624	DO NOT REJECT
14. SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	0.62572	0.73135	DO NOT REJECT
15. YEARS AS PRINCIPAL HERE	1.32324	0.51602	DO NOT REJECT
16. TOTAL YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL	0.43036	0.80640	DO NOT REJECT
17. RELIGIOUS ON STAFF	0.53528	0.76518	DO NOT REJECT
18. PARISH SUBSIDY	3.06563	0.21593	DO NOT REJECT

RESULTS OF HYPOTHESES 19-24 USING CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS:

Null hypothesis: There is no significant correlation between the dependent variable: "NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE" and the six independent variables (all variables are continuous, not categorical).

The six continuous independent variables are:

1. Size of parish subsidy to school
2. School enrollment
3. Number of years as principal of this school
4. Number of years as a principal
5. Number of full-time teachers
6. Number of religious on staff.

The full results are given here in Table 15.

Table 15: Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients
For the Dependent Variable "Policies in Compliance"
with Six Independent Variables

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

V A R	NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE	A	B	C	D	E
A	-.024	---	---	---	---	---
B	.106	.684**	---	---	---	---
C	.056	.299**	.222*	---	---	---
D	-.032	.362**	.352**	.577**	---	---
E	.090	.647**	.902**	.208*	.272**	---
F	.061	-.021	.058	.124	.240	-.022

Legend for independent variables:

"A" represents "Amount of Subsidy"

"B" represents "School Enrollment"

"C" represents "Number of Years as Principal Here"

"D" represents "Number of Years as a Principal"

"E" represents "Number of Full-time Teachers"

"F" represents "Number of Religious as Teachers"

Interpretation of symbols in this table:

" * " represents significance at the .05 level ($p < .05$).

" ** " represents significance at the .01 level ($p < .05$).

" --- " represents values not needed to be shown
(duplicates/correlations of variable with itself).

RESULTS:

The correlation of "Policies in Compliance" with "A"
(Amount of Subsidy) is not significant---Do not reject the
null hypothesis (19).

The correlation of "Policies in Compliance" with "B"
(School Enrollment) is not significant---Do not reject the
null hypothesis (20).

The correlation of "Policies in Compliance" with "C" (Number of Years as Principal Here) is not significant---Do not reject the null hypothesis (21).

The correlation of "Policies in Compliance" with "D" (Number of Years as a Principal) is not significant---Do not reject the null hypothesis (22).

The correlation of "Policies in Compliance" with "E" (Number of Full-time Teachers) is not significant---Do not reject the null hypothesis (23).

The correlation of "Policies in Compliance" with "F" (Number of Religious as Teachers) is not significant---Do not reject the null hypothesis (24).

ADDITIONAL SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS NOTED IN THIS TABLE:

1. "Amount of subsidy" with "School enrollment" at the .01 level (A with B);
2. "Amount of subsidy" with "Number of years as principal here" at the .01 level (A with C);
3. "Amount of subsidy" with "Number of years as a principal" at the .01 level (A with D);
4. "Amount of subsidy" with "Number of full-time teachers" at the .01 level (A with E);
5. "School enrollment" with "Number of years as principal here" at the .05 level (B with C);
6. "School enrollment" with "Number of years as a principal" at the .01 level (B with D);
7. "School enrollment" with "Number of full-time teachers" at the .01 level (B with E);
8. "Number of years as principal here" with "Number of years as a principal" at the .01 level (C with D);

9. "Number of years as principal here" with "Number of full-time teachers" at the .05 level (C with E);
10. "Number of years as a principal" with "Number of full-time teachers" at the .01 level (D with E).

Note: The above results (1-10) were secondary results that were not the focus of the study.

DISCUSSION

THE POLICIES

A total of thirty-seven policies was selected from about two hundred policies in the policy manual of the Milwaukee Catholic Schools Office. They were chosen because of their interesting nature, recent enactment, current problems, or possible controversy about their implementation. This was not a random sample, but a sample consisting of policies that probably were not in full compliance. No generalization to the entire set of policies should be drawn for the school system or individual schools. If a school had a compliance rate of 70% for this study, it would represent 70% of the selected thirty-seven policies and not of the more than 200 policies in the policy manual.

There was a large range in the rates of non-compliance among the selected policy group. The range of non-compliance was from a high of seventy schools to a low of two schools. Item 11 on fire alarm testing had the highest rate of non-compliance with two schools omitting the item.

That rate was 68.6% of the schools. The lowest rate of non-compliance was for two policies: Item 9 on the school calendar with no schools omitting the question and Item 35 with eleven schools omitting the question. Other facts can be obtained from a study of Table 1 and Table A-5.

The ten policies having the highest amounts of non-compliance should be considered in more detail. Item 11 requires that fire alarms be tested at least once a week, but actual drills need occur only monthly as a provision of Wisconsin state law. The important distinction is that an alarm could be tested when the school is not open, such as before school or on a weekend. More schools were not aware of this provision of this policy than any other policy. Thirty-one schools did not know of the policy's existence. Twenty-five schools preferred local policy rules and practices. Eleven schools said there was a lack of time to follow the policy. In fact this policy had the highest response in the area of lack of knowledge about the policy and the second highest reason in referring to local policy and practice.

Sixty-one schools were in non-compliance on the policy covering the principal's control of school accounts, while forty schools were in compliance, and there was one omission. Forty-three schools said that they followed local practice; eight gave other reasons; nine principals gave no reason. If there is an exception to this policy, the

account must require a second signature of the pastor or trustee. Only one school reported that they used a second signature - that of the school secretary. Principals did say that they had checking accounts for the milk fund, transfer accounts, petty cash, and other reasons. The thrust of the policy is to keep all financial transactions in one central account, but it may not be working as planned.

Fifty-two schools did not implement Item 14 requiring the pastor to evaluate the principal twice a year in written form and base the evaluation on the principal's written job description. Forty-eight schools reported compliance and there were two omissions. Four major reasons were listed by the principals for the non-implementation of the item. Fifteen preferred local practice; fourteen were not interested in the policy; fourteen gave other reasons; and eleven said there was a lack of time. From the written responses it appeared that some pastors used only one evaluation (if any), some skipped a year, and some pastors did not put the report in writing. Supervision of subordinates should be documented in written form for the protection of the rights of all parties.

Forty-one schools did not comply with Item 21 that requires the written approval of parents before their children do any fund-raising activities (Wisconsin Law). The major reasons given were lack of awareness of the policy

(fifteen schools), local policy preferences (fourteen schools), and that the policy did not apply at their school (seven principals). Some schools reported that the parents did all the fund-raising and not the children.

Item 6 showed a lack of compliance from thirty schools. It requires that the school not sponsor any mixed dances or parties and give that responsibility to the parents. Fifteen schools used local policies instead and ten schools gave no reasons for not complying with the policy. A few mentioned that the school sponsored graduation dances only.

Twenty-eight schools did not implement Item 37 that required that schools provide eligible students with special services such as Chapter and Title programs. Sixteen schools gave other reasons which generally mentioned lack of cooperation or lack of services from their local public school districts. Five schools reported a lack of facilities. Upon another reading of the policy in the manual, it does not seem to require this practice, however. The Item should have been better worded to properly represent the intent and words of the policy. Nonetheless, schools did report some level of discomfort with the actions of the local public schools.

Twenty-two schools reported the lack of compliance with Item 24. This policy required that local schools consult with the Catholic Schools Office before the expulsion of any student. Fifty schools omitted this item because they have

had no cases of expulsion in recent times. Nine principals said that this policy was applicable in all cases. Thirty schools, however, did comply with this item.

Item 13 had a non-compliance rate of twenty schools. It requires an overall pupil-teacher ratio of 25:1 or less using full-time equivalent status for all professional staff members. If this ratio could not be maintained, the principal should justify the higher ratio to the pastor, local school board and the Superintendent of Schools. Ten schools said that they preferred to follow local policy and practice and five principals reported a lack of funds.

Eighteen principals reported a lack of implementation with Item 23 that states that no reasons need to be given if a principal is not going to renew the teacher's contract. This policy was possibly intended to prevent possible lawsuits or disputes over the nature of the reasons given for non-renewal of contracts. Four schools preferred local practice, but nine schools gave no reasons for their non-compliance with the item. However, twenty-nine schools omitted the question and that was because no one had been non-renewed in recent times.

The policy having the tenth highest rate of non-compliance (seventeen schools) is Item 3. The policy requires that schools have a written policy regarding the possible admission of underage students. Five schools omitted the item and eighty schools complied with the

policy. Five principals preferred local practices and four principals said that the policy did not apply in all cases.

The other twenty-seven policies were not discussed in detail in this chapter because of their lower rates of non-compliance. Further analyses of these items can be made from Tables 1, A-5 and A-6.

It should again be noted that this selection of policies represents only a small portion of the many policies found in the entire policy manual.

THE REASONS

After reading the literature on policy implementation and consulting with personnel in the Milwaukee Catholic Schools Office, twelve reasons were selected to be offered to principals as the basic reasons for any lack of compliance. The choice of "Other" was also offered and, of course, some principals chose to give no reasons for their actions. Principals could select one or two reasons from the proposed list for each item on the survey. Write-in reasons were also suggested for principals to better state their rationale.

A total of 598 reasons was given, including 108 choices of "Other." There were sixty-nine occasions in which the principal did not give any reasons. The reason chosen most often throughout the survey of the system was Reason 12: "Local school policy/practice is more suited to our needs." It was listed 226 times or 37.8% of all reasons given.

Reason 13 "Other" was chosen 108 times or 18.1% of all reasons. Reason 9 "Not aware of policy's existence or enactment" was given sixty-five times or 10.9% of the total number of reasons. Other findings can be noted in Table 3.

The reasons that were chosen the fewest times were Reason 6 (four times) - "Policy is not important" and a tie at seven times for Reason 1 ("Lack of money") and Reason 7 ("Do not understand policy").

The reasons that individual principals gave for non-compliance with the policies can be found in Table A-11.

In considering the data in Table 3, it is evident that school principals very often choose to not follow a system-wide policy, but to follow a local policy or practice as needed. Apparently some principals feel that it is important to occasionally adapt or overlook policies to better fit the requirements of the local parish school. For example, Reason 12 (Local policy is more suited to our needs) was chosen forty-three times for Item 18 dealing with the principal's control of some checking accounts.

THE SCHOOLS

A total of 102 schools responded to the survey out of a possible 163 schools in the system for a return rate of 61.3%. A school-by-school report of their compliance and non-compliance rates can be found in Table A-10 with a full listing of reasons given in Table A-11. All schools were ranked by their total number of policies in compliance in

Table A-8 and by percent of compliance in Table A-7. No schools are identified by name in the study. Demographic data is available about the schools in Tables A-3 and A-4.

Several points should be made about some of the schools and their totals. School 20 complied with all thirty-seven of the policies and School 59 complied with thirty-six policies. School 19 reported compliance with a low of eighteen policies, while omitting eight items for a percent of 62.07%.

Tables 4 and 5 give an overall picture of the system-wide compliance with this selection of policies. This picture would vary with different selections of items. The mean total was 29.37 policies and the mean percent was 83.68%. Table A-5 shows that 37.3% of the schools complied with thirty-one or more of these policies. The qualitative meaning to these summary numbers with regard to a "report card grade" should be restricted to those personnel involved with policies in the system. Some might interpret these totals as "good" or "poor" scores, while others would consider giving any adjective to the scores as inappropriate since only a small, non-random sample of policies was used.

THE THEORY AND THE LITERATURE

The research done by Planek (1981) produced a few similar conclusions, but since her study dealt with the Archdiocese of Chicago schools, the similarities are not

many. There have apparently been no other studies of policy compliance and implementation in school systems.

The work of Edwards (1980) points out four reasons he felt could hinder policy implementation: communication, resources, bureaucratic structure, and disposition of the implementors to the given policy. It is this last item that seems to apply to this current research and its findings of the impact of local policy and practice. Local school principals seemed to believe that an archdiocesan policy can be violated in those instances in which their local situations would not be served properly by following the archdiocesan policy.

If this is generally the case throughout the system, it would raise the question of the authority of the Catholic Schools Office to administer its system. Why have a system and a set of policies if principals are not going to follow all the policies consistently and not just when it suits their needs?

The work of other researchers and theorists in policy implementation does not seem to have a significant relation to the results of this particular study. It would seem that their use of "policy implementation" might generally mean "project implementation" to others. Berman and McLaughlin defined their view of implementation as "the change process that occurs when an innovative project impinges on an

organization."⁴⁷ To those researchers, an example of a policy might be to require that all elementary school students have a class in computer studies or to require the teachers in a district to have training or a competency in word processing. These types of "project policies" might fall into the categories that other researchers have studied, while more "rule policies" would be found in this type of research.

SUMMARY

This chapter has provided the main results of this research project and a discussion of those results. Tables have presented the data and statistics on policies and their reasons for non-compliance, on individual schools and their rate of compliance and reasons for non-compliance, summary of the major results, the testing of twenty-four null hypotheses using the t-test, chi-square statistic, and the Pearson correlation coefficient. Note: additional tables are in Appendix One listing demographic data in ten categories for all 102 schools in the sample. These are Table A-3 and Table A-4.

⁴⁷Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume I: A Model of Educational Change (Santa Monica, California: Rand, 1974), 13.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will begin with a summary of the study. The basic research problem centered on the compliance of an individual school with the policies of the entire school system. A total of thirty-seven policies were chosen (not randomly) and all 163 elementary school principals in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee were surveyed through the mail as to their compliance with the policies and their reasons for any non-compliance. There were 102 replies. The research focused on the compliance rate of individual schools, the amount of compliance for each of the selected policies, and the reasons given by school principals for the lack of compliance. Demographic data was examined to see if school characteristics had a significant effect on a school's rate of compliance.

This chapter will also make conclusions based on the data and the discussion and will offer recommendations for schools and policy-makers in this school system. Areas for future investigations will be suggested and the study will be summarized.

CONCLUSIONS

For the school system:

1. There was very little correlation (not significant) between the number of policies in compliance and the following individually: the school size, number of full-time teachers, amount of subsidy, number of religious on staff, tenure of the principal in that school, and the years of experience of the principal.
2. There was a strong positive correlation between the amount of subsidy and the following individually: school size, tenure of the principal, experience of the principal, and the number of full-time teachers.
3. There was a strong positive correlation between the school size and the following individually: tenure of the principal, experience of the principal, and the number of full-time teachers.
4. There was a strong positive correlation between the tenure of the principal and the following individually: experience of the principal and the number of full-time teachers.
5. There was a strong positive correlation between the experience of the principal and the number of full-time teachers.

6. Schools with higher or lower numbers of full-time teachers had about the same number of policies in compliance.
7. Schools with lower subsidies had slightly higher rates of compliance.
8. Male and female principals scored about the same number of policies in compliance.
9. Lay and religious principals had about the same number of policies in compliance.
10. Schools with full-time assistant principals had slightly higher rates than those without. However, only five schools had an assistant principal of 102.
11. Larger and smaller schools scored about the same number of policies in compliance.
12. Principals with longer or shorter tenures in a school had about the same number of policies in compliance.
13. Principals with greater number of years of experience scored slightly higher than those with less experience as a principal.

For the set of policies:

14. Policies on fire alarm testing, control of funds by the principal, the evaluation of the principal by the pastor,

parental approval for a child's fund-raising, and the sponsoring of dances and parties by the schools had the highest amount of non-implementation.

15. The highest response for the reasons for non-compliance was the decision to follow local policy or practice and not follow archdiocesan policy.

For individual schools:

16. Some schools are not complying with many of these selected policies, while other schools are doing much better. But only one school was in total compliance with this set of policies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On policies:

1. Some policies need a re-evaluation, better publicity, stronger sanctions, better follow-up by the Catholic Schools Office, or perhaps their elimination from the manual if no longer needed or valid. These would be those that were highest in non-compliance:

-Item 11 on fire alarm testing;

-Item 18 on the principal's use of funds and checking accounts;

- Item 14 on the principal's evaluation by the pastor;
- Item 21 on parental approval for their child's fund-raising efforts;
- Item 6 on mixed parties or dances that are school sponsored;
- Item 37 on the availability of special programs for eligible students;
- Item 24 on the consultation with the Catholic Schools Office in cases of expulsions;
- Item 13 on pupil-teacher ratio;
- Item 23 on the reasons for the non-renewal of staff;
- Item 3 on the admission of underage students.

2. A general review of all policies should be made by the system.
3. All principals and pastors should review the policy manual and perhaps attend a workshop on the set of policies.
4. All principals new to the system should have policy compliance and awareness as part of their pre-service training.
5. Principals and pastors need to follow all policies on all occasions unless they are given other permission by the Catholic Schools Office.

6. Teachers in all schools should have ready access to the policy manual.
7. Local school boards and pastors should hold principals more accountable for the full implementation of all policies and should take account of their own school's compliance.
8. The Catholic Schools Office needs to hold local principals, pastors, and school boards more accountable for the full implementation of all policies. Perhaps some form of sanction should be established to promote better compliance.
9. Local school boards and pastors should not require the principal to violate archdiocesan policies or condone the practice where it exists.
10. Catholic Schools Office personnel should re-emphasize the need to follow all policies consistently and fully explain the rationale for any current or new policy.
11. The Archbishop of Milwaukee and the Catholic Schools Office should consider the re-establishment of the Archdiocesan Board of Education as a policy-making body and allow the Catholic Schools Office to drop its dual role as policy-maker and system administrator.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. A study should be made to examine other policies in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee school system.
2. This study could be replicated in other diocesan school systems.
3. An in-depth analysis of the reasons principals do not comply with policies should be made. Personal interviews might be a good way to conduct the study.
4. This study could be extended to examine the responses by pastors and local school board members.
5. A similar study should be made in large public school systems to determine the policy compliance rate and the reasons for non-compliance.
6. A study should be made on the Milwaukee Catholic Schools Office emphasizing its roles in policy-making and policy-administration and possible conflicts.
7. A study should be made to determine if the lack of an archdiocesan school board in Milwaukee affects the rate of policy compliance by the schools in the system.

APPENDIX ONE

Table A-1: Demographic Data about the Research Sample

GENDER OF PRINCIPAL:

MALE: \underline{N} = 25 of 102; Percent = 24.5%;
FEMALE: \underline{N} = 77 of 102; Percent = 75.5%.

VOCATION STATUS:

RELIGIOUS: \underline{N} = 30 of 102; Percent = 29.4%;
LAY: \underline{N} = 72 of 102; Percent = 70.6%.

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT:

MEAN = 240.3 Students;
MEDIAN = 217.0 Students;
STD. DEV. = 111.3 Students;
RANGE = 47 to 503 Students.

LOCATION:

WAUKESHA COUNTY \underline{N} = 13;
WASHINGTON COUNTY \underline{N} = 7;
DODGE COUNTY \underline{N} = 2;
FOND DU LAC COUNTY \underline{N} = 5;
KENOSHA COUNTY \underline{N} = 7;
MILWAUKEE: CITY \underline{N} = 28;
MILWAUKEE COUNTY: SUBURB \underline{N} = 19;
OZAUKEE COUNTY \underline{N} = 6;
RACINE COUNTY \underline{N} = 10;
SHEBOYGAN COUNTY \underline{N} = 6;
WALWORTH COUNTY \underline{N} = 2.

YEARS AS PRINCIPAL OF THIS SCHOOL:

MEAN = 5.3 Years;
MEDIAN = 4.0 Years;
MODE = 2.0 Years;
STD. DEV. = 4.5 Years;
RANGE = 1 to 21 Years.

Table A-2: Additional Demographic Data about the Sample

TOTAL OF YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL:

MEAN = 10.2 Years;
 MEDIAN = 8.0 Years;
 MODE = 2.0 Years;
 STD. DEV. = 7.7 Years;
 RANGE = 1 to 33 Years.

PARISH SUBSIDY TO SCHOOL:

MEAN = \$224,202 (74 schools);
 MEDIAN = \$172,500;
 STD. DEV. = \$172,883;
 RANGE = \$25,000 to \$844,000.
 28 schools omitted this question.

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS (COUNT PART-TIMERS AS 0.5):

MEAN = 12.8 Teachers;
 MEDIAN = 11.0 Teachers;
 MODE = 8.0 Teachers;
 STD. DEV. = 5.5 Teachers;
 RANGE = 3.5 to 27.5 Teachers.

NUMBER OF RELIGIOUS ON STAFF (COUNT PART-TIMERS AS 0.5):

MEAN = 1.2 Religious;
 MEDIAN = 1.0 Religious;
 MODE = 0.0 Religious;
 STD. DEV. = 1.4 Religious;
 RANGE = 0.0 to 8.0 Religious.

FULL-TIME ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL:

YES: N = 5 of 102; Percent = 4.9%;
 NO: N = 97 of 102; Percent = 95.1%.

Table A-3: School Demographic Data

LEGEND:

A: 1 = MALE 2 = FEMALE

B: 1 = RELIGIOUS 2 = LAY

C: YEARS AS PRINCIPAL IN THIS SCHOOL

D: TOTAL YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL

ID	TOTAL	PERCT	A	B	C	D
1	35.00	94.59	2	2	5	5
2	29.00	80.56	2	1	7	20
3	27.00	77.14	2	2	2	8
4	33.00	91.67	1	2	14	18
5	29.00	85.29	1	2	21	21
6	22.00	62.86	1	2	6	20
7	30.00	81.08	1	2	1	21
8	33.00	91.67	2	2	7	19
9	28.00	84.85	2	1	15	15
10	35.00	94.59	2	1	8	21
11	31.00	86.11	2	1	20	33
12	32.00	88.89	1	2	3	4
13	26.00	70.27	2	2	2	6
14	22.00	66.67	2	1	2	27
15	32.00	86.49	2	1	4	25
16	32.00	86.49	2	1	3	15
17	33.00	89.19	2	2	2	2
18	34.00	91.89	2	2	6	6
19	18.00	62.07	2	2	5	5
20	37.00	100.00	1	2	2	2
21	28.00	87.50	2	2	8	12
22	34.00	91.89	2	2	17	17

ID	TOTAL	PERCT	A	B	C	D
23	28.00	90.32	1	2	1	21
24	32.00	88.89	1	2	3	11
25	25.00	75.76	2	2	1	4
26	29.00	78.38	1	2	1	1
27	33.00	91.67	2	2	3	3
28	30.00	81.08	2	1	5	10
29	30.00	88.24	2	1	4	15
30	29.00	82.86	2	1	4	23
31	28.00	75.68	2	1	2	8
32	32.00	86.49	2	2	2	2
33	26.00	76.47	2	2	9	27
34	32.00	88.89	2	2	1	3
35	31.00	86.11	2	2	2	2
36	33.00	94.29	1	2	11	18
37	31.00	86.11	2	2	11	11
38	28.00	82.35	2	2	4	4
39	29.00	80.56	2	2	7	7
40	28.00	84.85	2	2	6	15
41	29.00	80.56	2	2	4	4
42	28.00	87.50	2	1	2	2
43	27.00	81.82	1	2	15	23
44	31.00	88.57	2	1	6	12
45	27.00	79.41	1	2	5	5
46	32.00	88.89	2	1	9	20
47	30.00	88.24	1	2	5	12
48	26.00	74.29	2	1	1	11
49	28.00	77.78	2	2	3	3
50	30.00	85.71	2	2	6	13
51	26.00	92.86	2	2	5	5

ID	TOTAL	PERCT	A	B	C	D
52	26.00	72.22	2	1	15	19
53	33.00	94.29	2	2	2	2
54	28.00	80.00	2	2	2	11
55	27.00	72.97	2	1	2	2
56	28.00	77.78	2	1	3	11
57	23.00	74.19	2	2	1	3
58	24.00	66.67	1	2	2	8
59	36.00	97.30	1	1	3	18
60	30.00	83.33	2	2	6	6
61	30.00	85.71	2	1	8	8
62	31.00	88.57	2	1	20	28
63	30.00	88.24	1	2	4	7
64	30.00	85.71	1	2	4	17
65	29.00	90.63	2	2	7	7
66	25.00	75.76	2	1	7	27
67	29.00	80.56	2	2	1	3
68	28.00	80.00	2	2	8	8
69	29.00	82.86	2	2	2	2
70	31.00	88.57	2	2	6	6
71	24.00	68.57	1	2	11	15
72	25.00	83.33	2	2	4	4
73	30.00	81.08	2	1	3	3
74	30.00	83.33	1	2	3	10
75	32.00	86.49	2	2	2	2
76	31.00	86.11	2	1	4	8
77	24.00	70.59	1	2	9	9
78	29.00	82.86	2	2	12	12
79	31.00	88.57	2	2	2	2
80	32.00	88.89	1	2	6	7

ID	TOTAL	PERCT	A	B	C	D
81	27.00	77.14	2	1	3	3
82	30.00	81.08	2	1	5	5
83	32.00	88.89	2	2	1	1
84	34.00	94.44	2	2	3	15
85	31.00	86.11	2	2	7	9
86	25.00	71.43	2	2	2	2
87	29.00	85.29	2	1	2	18
88	30.00	90.91	2	2	15	16
89	32.00	88.89	2	2	3	3
90	24.00	80.00	2	2	6	6
91	26.00	74.29	1	2	2	2
92	24.00	70.59	2	2	1	1
93	33.00	91.67	2	2	1	1
94	23.00	79.31	2	1	2	19
95	30.00	81.08	2	2	10	16
96	33.00	91.67	2	1	5	15
97	34.00	91.89	2	1	8	8
98	30.00	81.08	2	2	3	3
99	30.00	83.33	2	2	2	2
100	33.00	94.29	1	2	1	1
101	29.00	78.38	1	2	4	4
102	34.00	91.89	1	2	2	11

Table A-4: Additional School Demographic Data

LEGEND:

E: PARISH SUBSIDY

F: SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

G: NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS

H: NUMBER OF RELIGIOUS AS TEACHERS

I: FULL-TIME ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL 1 = YES 2 = NO

ID	TOTAL	PERCT	E	F	G	H	I
1	35.00	94.59	---	250	12.5	0.5	2
2	29.00	80.56	---	133	9.5	1.0	2
3	27.00	77.14	---	266	13.5	0.0	2
4	33.00	91.67	400000	450	22.0	1.0	2
5	29.00	85.29	360000	403	26.5	2.0	2
6	22.00	62.86	180000	378	21.0	0.0	2
7	30.00	81.08	60000	100	10.0	0.0	2
8	33.00	91.67	844000	480	20.0	0.0	2
9	28.00	84.85	---	104	7.5	1.0	2
10	35.00	94.59	33000	190	8.5	4.5	2
11	31.00	86.11	---	233	14.0	1.0	2
12	32.00	88.89	100000	330	23.0	1.0	1
13	26.00	70.27	100000	135	9.5	1.0	2
14	22.00	66.67	---	288	14.0	2.5	2
15	32.00	86.49	100000	297	10.0	1.0	2
16	32.00	86.49	100000	142	9.5	1.5	2
17	33.00	89.19	65000	155	8.0	0.0	2
18	34.00	91.89	502000	500	27.5	2.0	1
19	18.00	62.07	330000	267	17.0	0.0	2
20	37.00	100.00	175000	107	6.0	0.0	2

Table A-4 - Continued

ID	TOTAL	PERCT	E	F	G	H	I
21	28.00	87.50	191000	163	10.5	0.0	2
22	34.00	91.89	253000	228	12.5	0.0	2
23	28.00	90.32	---	217	11.0	0.0	2
24	32.00	88.89	280000	316	17.5	2.0	2
25	25.00	75.76	---	147	8.5	0.0	2
26	29.00	78.38	75000	215	10.5	2.0	2
27	33.00	91.67	240000	207	12.0	0.0	2
28	30.00	81.08	80000	476	17.0	1.0	2
29	30.00	88.24	---	281	11.0	3.0	2
30	29.00	82.86	426000	442	20.0	2.5	2
31	28.00	75.68	40000	405	17.0	1.0	2
32	32.00	86.49	302000	205	9.5	1.0	2
33	26.00	76.47	290000	393	20.5	1.0	2
34	32.00	88.89	25000	150	8.0	0.5	2
35	31.00	86.11	174000	171	9.5	0.0	2
36	33.00	94.29	160000	210	8.0	8.0	2
37	31.00	86.11	40000	217	13.0	1.0	2
38	28.00	82.35	500000	312	20.0	0.0	2
39	29.00	80.56	185000	208	8.5	0.0	2
40	28.00	84.85	500000	412	22.0	1.0	2
41	29.00	80.56	---	75	6.0	1.0	2
42	28.00	87.50	166000	135	8.0	1.0	2
43	27.00	81.82	425000	430	21.0	0.0	2
44	31.00	88.57	602000	460	22.0	1.0	1
45	27.00	79.41	34000	216	16.5	0.0	2
46	32.00	88.89	64000	232	10.0	2.0	2
47	30.00	88.24	411000	480	26.0	0.5	1
48	26.00	74.29	---	122	8.0	2.0	2
49	28.00	77.78	200000	256	12.0	0.0	2

ID	TOTAL	PERCT	E	F	G	H	I
50	30.00	85.71	180000	270	15.0	0.0	2
51	26.00	92.86	200000	155	7.0	0.0	2
52	26.00	72.22	480000	311	14.5	4.0	2
53	33.00	94.29	120000	200	11.0	1.0	2
54	28.00	80.00	176000	188	10.0	1.0	2
55	27.00	72.97	57000	225	9.5	3.0	2
56	28.00	77.78	271000	213	9.0	2.0	2
57	23.00	74.19	---	246	14.5	4.0	2
58	24.00	66.67	---	170	7.0	1.0	2
59	36.00	97.30	400000	503	23.0	4.0	2
60	30.00	83.33	---	168	10.5	0.0	2
61	30.00	85.71	118000	198	12.0	1.0	2
62	31.00	88.57	---	176	10.0	4.0	2
63	30.00	88.24	500000	418	22.5	0.0	2
64	30.00	85.71	348000	405	22.0	1.0	2
65	29.00	90.63	116000	225	9.5	0.0	2
66	25.00	75.76	618000	250	12.0	2.0	2
67	29.00	80.56	---	244	15.0	0.5	2
68	28.00	80.00	105000	137	9.5	0.0	2
69	29.00	82.86	---	233	10.5	0.0	2
70	31.00	88.57	171000	192	11.5	1.0	2
71	24.00	68.57	---	230	11.5	0.0	2
72	25.00	83.33	150000	146	6.0	0.0	1
73	30.00	81.08	35000	66	5.0	2.0	2
74	30.00	83.33	110000	173	9.0	4.0	2
75	32.00	86.49	200000	228	11.0	0.0	2
76	31.00	86.11	146000	178	11.5	3.0	2
77	24.00	70.59	150000	262	10.0	6.0	2
78	29.00	82.86	---	196	9.5	0.0	2

ID	TOTAL	PERCT	E	F	G	H	I
79	31.00	88.57	154000	192	12.5	2.0	2
80	32.00	88.89	442000	226	14.0	0.0	2
81	27.00	77.14	---	297	15.5	0.0	2
82	30.00	81.08	186000	164	13.0	3.0	2
83	32.00	88.89	---	224	13.0	2.0	2
84	34.00	94.44	---	285	16.5	0.0	2
85	31.00	86.11	---	395	23.0	0.0	2
86	25.00	71.43	---	127	9.0	0.0	2
87	29.00	85.29	460000	350	15.5	3.5	2
88	30.00	90.91	274000	280	8.0	0.0	2
89	32.00	88.89	94000	112	8.0	0.0	2
90	24.00	80.00	75000	47	3.5	0.0	2
91	26.00	74.29	---	175	11.0	2.0	2
92	24.00	70.59	---	145	9.0	2.0	2
93	33.00	91.67	---	57	6.0	1.0	2
94	23.00	79.31	30000	63	4.0	1.0	2
95	30.00	81.08	525000	454	27.5	1.5	2
96	33.00	91.67	86000	104	8.0	1.0	2
97	34.00	91.89	100000	193	8.0	3.0	2
98	30.00	81.08	---	125	8.5	1.5	2
99	30.00	83.33	150000	191	15.0	1.0	2
100	33.00	94.29	150000	260	11.0	0.0	2
101	29.00	78.38	143000	203	10.0	0.0	2
102	34.00	91.89	59000	250	16.0	2.0	2

**Table A-5: Amount of Compliance by Schools
Reported for each Policy (N = 102)**

ITEM	POLICY	COMPLY OF 102 (f)	%	NOT COMPLY (f)	%	OMIT ITEM (f)
1	COMPLAINT RESOLUTION PROCEDURES	90	88.2	7	6.9	5
2	EXPULSIONS APPROVED BY PASTOR	90	88.2	5	4.9	7
3	ADMISSION OF UNDERAGE STUDENTS	80	78.4	17	16.7	5
4	STUDENT RETENTION IN GRADE	95	93.1	5	4.9	2
5	DRESS STANDARD ADOPTED BY BOARD	97	95.1	5	4.9	0
6	SCHOOL- SPONSORED DANCES	72	70.6	30	29.4	0
7	PARENTS NOTIFIED ABOUT DETENTION	97	95.1	5	4.9	0
8	USE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT	98	96.1	4	3.9	0
9	SCHOOL CALENDAR WITH 180 DAYS	100	98.0	2	2.0	0
10	PASTOR'S RELATION TO STAFF	91	89.2	11	10.8	0
11	FIRE ALARM TESTED WEEKLY	30	29.4	70	68.6	2
12	LIMIT ON ATHLETIC PARTICIPATION	90	88.2	9	8.8	3

ITEM	POLICY	COMPLY OF 102 (f)	%	NOT COMPLY (f)	%	OMIT ITEM (f)
13	PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO	81	79.4	20	19.6	1
14	PASTOR'S EVALUATION OF PRINCIPAL	48	47.1	52	51.0	2
15	FIRE DRILLS HELD IN SCHOOL	91	89.2	11	10.8	0
16	BUDGET PREPARED BY PRINCIPAL	86	84.3	16	15.7	0
17	FUNDS DEPOSITED WITH PARISH	86	84.3	14	13.7	2
18	PRINCIPAL'S CONTROL OF FUNDS	40	39.2	61	59.8	1
19	LACK OF TUITION IN 1ST SEMESTER	99	97.1	3	2.9	0
20	DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF TUITION	85	83.3	8	7.8	9
21	WRITTEN APPROVAL FOR FUND-RAISING	47	46.1	41	40.2	14
22	WRITTEN NOTICE OF NON-RENEWALS	96	94.1	3	2.9	3
23	REASONS GIVEN FOR NON- RENEWALS	55	53.9	18	17.6	29
24	CONSULTATION ON EXPULSIONS	30	29.4	22	21.6	50
25	STUDENT RETENTION MANDATES	90	88.2	4	3.9	8
26	ACCIDENT INSURANCE FOR ATHLETES	72	70.6	15	14.7	15

ITEM	POLICY	COMPLY OF 102 (f)	%	NOT COMPLY (f)	%	OMIT ITEM (f)
27	ACADEMIC GRADES AS DISCIPLINE	88	86.3	12	11.8	2
28	ATHLETIC ELIGIBILITY RULES	86	84.3	11	10.8	5
29	MINIMUM LENGTH OF SCHOOL DAY	88	88.3	12	11.8	5
30	CLOSING DUE TO BAD WEATHER	94	92.2	8	7.8	0
31	LOCALLY WRITTEN CURRICULUM PLAN	85	83.3	16	15.7	1
32	EXTRA- CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES	88	86.3	14	13.7	0
33	ATHLETICS, PHYS. ED., INTRAMURALS	92	90.2	6	5.9	4
34	ADULT SUPERVISION OF PRACTICES	95	93.1	5	4.9	2
35	TEAMS FOLLOW DATES OF SEASONS	89	87.3	2	2.0	11
36	LIMIT ON NUMBER OF TEAM GAMES	86	84.3	9	8.8	7
37	SPECIAL SERVICES FOR STUDENTS	72	70.6	28	27.5	2

Table A-6: Reasons for Non-compliance by Schools Reported for each Policy

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of time
3. Lack of trained staff
4. Lack of interest in policy
5. Lack of facilities
6. Policy is not important
7. Do not understand policy
8. Do not agree with policy
9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
11. Not applicable in some cases
12. Local school policy is more suited to our needs
13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

P O L I C Y	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	N O N E G I V E N
#	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1		2				1		1		1	1	3		
2											1	3	1	
3		3		1				1	1		4	5	4	2
4								2	2			1		
5				1		1						2	1	1
6								3	1	1	1	15	3	10
7			1							1	1	2	1	
8										1		1		2
9												1	1	
10		2		2			2	1				1	4	1
11		11	3	4		1	1	1	31			25	4	1

Table A-6 Continued

POLICY #	REASON 1	REASON 2	REASON 3	REASON 4	REASON 5	REASON 6	REASON 7	REASON 8	REASON 9	REASON 10	REASON 11	REASON 12	REASON 13	NONE GIVEN
12				1				2			1	3	1	2
13	5				2			1	1			10	3	2
14		11	3	14				2	2		1	15	14	2
15								1			1	5	4	1
16		1						1		1	4	7	4	1
17			1								1	13		
18			2					1			1	43	8	9
19												2	1	1
20								2	1		2	1	1	2
21		1		1			1	3	15		7	12	4	4
22								1			1		1	
23			1					1		1		4	3	9
24				1				2	2	2	9	4	1	4
25			1	1			1					2		

Table A-6 Continued

P O L I C Y	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	N O N E G I V E N
#	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
26									5	1		5	3	2
27											1	6		5
28							1					7	4	
29									1			7	7	
30								1				7		
31		7	2	1	1				1			1	6	1
32		1		1			1	2	1			7	1	3
33												1	1	4
34			2					1	1				1	
35								1			1			
36			1	1				1		1	2	3	3	
37	2	1	1		5						4	4	16	

Table A-7: Ranking of Schools by Overall Percent of Policies in Compliance (Omitting Missing Items)
(Thirty-seven policies were studied.)

PERCENT IN COMPLIANCE	SCHOOL ID	TOTAL IN COMPLIANCE	NUMBER OMITTED	NUMBER ANSWERED
100.00	20	37	0	37.00
97.30	59	36	0	37.00
94.59	1, 10	35	0	37.00
94.44	84	34	1	36.00
94.29	36, 53, 100	33	2	35.00
92.86	51	26	9	28.00
91.89	18, 22, 97, 102	34	0	37.00
91.67	4, 8, 27, 93, 96	33	1	36.00
90.91	88	30	4	33.00
90.63	65	29	5	32.00
90.32	23	28	6	31.00
89.19	17	33	0	37.00
88.89	12, 24, 34, 46, 80, 83, 89	32	1	36.00
88.57	44, 62, 70, 79	31	2	35.00
88.24	29, 47, 63	30	3	34.00
87.50	21, 42	28	5	32.00
86.49	15, 16, 32, 75	32	0	37.00
86.11	11, 35, 37, 76, 85	31	1	36.00
85.71	50, 61, 64	30	2	35.00
85.29	5, 87	29	3	34.00
84.85	9, 40	28	4	33.00
83.33	60, 74, 99	30	1	36.00

Table A-7 - Continued

PERCENT IN COMPLIANCE	SCHOOL ID	TOTAL IN COMPLIANCE	NUMBER OMITTED	NUMBER ANSWERED
83.33	72	25	7	30.00
82.86	30, 69, 78	29	2	35.00
82.35	38	28	3	34.00
81.82	43	27	4	33.00
81.08	7, 28, 73, 82, 95, 98	30	0	37.00
80.56	2, 39, 41, 67	29	1	36.00
80.00	54, 68	28	2	35.00
80.00	90	24	7	30.00
79.41	45	27	3	34.00
79.31	94	23	8	29.00
78.38	26, 101	29	0	37.00
77.78	49, 56	28	1	36.00
77.14	3, 81	27	2	35.00
76.47	33	26	3	34.00
75.76	25, 66	25	4	33.00
75.68	31	28	0	37.00
74.29	48, 91	26	2	35.00
74.19	57	23	6	31.00
72.97	55	27	0	37.00
72.22	52	26	1	36.00
71.43	86	25	2	35.00
70.59	77, 92	24	3	34.00
70.27	13	26	0	37.00
68.57	71	24	2	35.00
66.67	14	22	4	33.00
66.67	58	24	1	36.00
62.86	6	22	2	35.00
62.07	19	18	8	29.00

**Table A-8: Ranking of Schools
by the Total Number of Policies in Compliance
(Thirty-seven policies were studied.)**

TOTAL IN COMPLIANCE	SCHOOL ID	NUMBER OMITTED	NUMBER ANSWERED	PERCENT IN COMPLIANCE
37	20	0	37.00	100.00
36	59	0	37.00	97.30
35	1, 10	0	37.00	94.59
34	18, 22, 97, 102	0	37.00	91.89
33	36, 53, 100	2	35.00	94.29
33	4, 8, 27, 93, 96	1	36.00	91.67
33	17	0	37.00	89.19
32	12, 24, 34, 46, 80, 83, 89	1	36.00	88.89
32	15, 16, 32, 75	0	37.00	86.49
31	11, 35, 37, 76, 85	1	36.00	86.11
30	28, 73, 82, 95, 98	0	37.00	81.08
30	60, 74, 99	1	36.00	83.33
30	50, 61, 64,	2	35.00	85.71
30	29, 47, 63	3	34.00	88.24
30	88	4	33.00	90.91
29	26, 101	0	37.00	78.38
29	2, 39, 41, 67	1	36.00	80.56
29	30, 69, 78	2	35.00	82.86
29	5, 87	3	34.00	85.29

Table A-8 - Continued

TOTAL IN COMPLIANCE	SCHOOL ID	NUMBER OMITTED	NUMBER ANSWERED	PERCENT IN COMPLIANCE
29	65	5	32.00	90.63
28	31	0	37.00	75.68
28	49, 56	1	36.00	77.78
28	54, 68	2	35.00	80.00
28	38	3	34.00	82.35
28	9, 40	4	33.00	84.85
28	21, 42	5	32.00	87.50
28	23	6	31.00	90.32
27	55	0	37.00	72.97
27	3, 81	2	35.00	77.14
27	45	3	34.00	79.41
27	43	4	33.00	81.82
26	13	0	37.00	70.27
26	52	1	36.00	72.22
26	48, 91	2	35.00	74.29
26	33	3	34.00	76.47
26	51	9	28.00	92.86
25	86	2	35.00	71.43
25	25, 66	4	33.00	75.76
25	72	7	30.00	83.33
24	71	2	35.00	68.57
24	77, 92	3	34.00	70.59
24	90	7	30.00	80.00
23	57	6	31.00	74.19
23	94	8	29.00	79.31
22	6	2	35.00	62.86
22	14	4	33.00	66.67
18	19	8	29.00	62.07

Table A-9: Total Number of Policies in Compliance
(Frequency Distribution)

NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS - FREQUENCY (f)	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
18	1	1.0	1.0
22	2	2.0	2.9
23	2	2.0	4.9
24	5	4.9	9.8
25	4	3.9	13.7
26	6	5.9	19.6
27	5	4.9	24.5
28	11	10.8	35.3
29	12	11.8	47.1
30	16	15.7	62.7
31	9	8.8	71.6
32	11	10.8	82.4
33	9	8.8	91.2
34	5	4.9	96.1
35	2	2.0	98.0
36	1	1.0	99.0
37	1	1.0	100.0

Table A-10: School-by-School Compliance Report

SCHOOL ID	NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE	NUMBER OMITTED	NUMBER OF ACTUAL RESPONSES	PERCENT OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE
1	35	0	37.00	94.59
2	29	1	36.00	80.56
3	27	2	35.00	77.14
4	33	1	36.00	91.67
5	29	3	34.00	85.29
6	22	2	35.00	62.86
7	30	0	37.00	81.08
8	33	1	36.00	91.67
9	28	4	33.00	84.85
10	35	0	37.00	94.59
11	31	1	36.00	86.11
12	32	1	36.00	88.89
13	26	0	37.00	70.27
14	22	4	33.00	66.67
15	32	0	37.00	86.49
16	32	0	37.00	86.49
17	33	0	37.00	89.19
18	34	0	37.00	91.89
19	18	8	29.00	62.07
20	37	0	37.00	100.00
21	28	5	32.00	87.50
22	34	0	37.00	91.89
23	28	6	31.00	90.32
24	32	1	36.00	88.89
25	25	4	33.00	75.76
26	29	0	37.00	78.38

Table A-10 - Continued

SCHOOL ID	NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE	NUMBER OMITTED	NUMBER OF ACTUAL RESPONSES	PERCENT OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE
27	33	1	36.00	91.67
28	30	0	37.00	81.08
29	30	3	34.00	88.24
30	29	2	35.00	82.86
31	28	0	37.00	75.68
32	32	0	37.00	86.49
33	26	3	34.00	76.47
34	32	1	36.00	88.89
35	31	1	36.00	86.11
36	33	2	35.00	94.29
37	31	1	36.00	86.11
38	28	3	34.00	82.35
39	29	1	36.00	80.56
40	28	4	33.00	84.85
41	29	1	36.00	80.56
42	28	5	32.00	87.50
43	27	4	33.00	81.82
44	31	2	35.00	88.57
45	27	3	34.00	79.41
46	32	1	36.00	88.89
47	30	3	34.00	88.24
48	26	2	35.00	74.29
49	28	1	36.00	77.78
50	30	2	35.00	85.71
51	26	9	28.00	92.86
52	26	1	36.00	72.22
53	33	2	35.00	94.29

Table A-10 - Continued

SCHOOL ID	NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE	NUMBER OMITTED	NUMBER OF ACTUAL RESPONSES	PERCENT OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE
54	28	2	35.00	80.00
55	27	0	37.00	72.97
56	28	1	36.00	77.78
57	23	6	31.00	74.19
58	24	1	36.00	66.67
59	36	0	37.00	97.30
60	30	1	36.00	83.33
61	30	2	35.00	85.71
62	31	2	35.00	88.57
63	30	3	34.00	88.24
64	30	2	35.00	85.71
65	29	5	32.00	90.63
66	25	4	33.00	75.76
67	29	1	36.00	80.56
68	28	2	35.00	80.00
69	29	2	35.00	82.86
70	31	2	35.00	88.57
71	24	2	35.00	68.57
72	25	7	30.00	83.33
73	30	0	37.00	81.08
74	30	1	36.00	83.33
75	32	0	37.00	86.49
76	31	1	36.00	86.11
77	24	3	34.00	70.59
78	29	2	35.00	82.86
79	31	2	35.00	88.57
80	32	1	36.00	88.89

Table A-10 - Continued

SCHOOL ID	NUMBER OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE	NUMBER OMITTED	NUMBER OF ACTUAL RESPONSES	PERCENT OF POLICIES IN COMPLIANCE
81	27	2	35.00	77.14
82	30	0	37.00	81.08
83	32	1	36.00	88.89
84	34	1	36.00	94.44
85	31	1	36.00	86.11
86	25	2	35.00	71.43
87	29	3	34.00	85.29
88	30	4	33.00	90.91
89	32	1	36.00	88.89
90	24	7	30.00	80.00
91	26	2	35.00	74.29
92	24	3	34.00	70.59
93	33	1	36.00	91.67
94	23	8	29.00	79.31
95	30	0	37.00	81.08
96	33	1	36.00	91.67
97	34	0	37.00	91.89
98	30	0	37.00	81.08
99	30	1	36.00	83.33
100	33	2	35.00	94.29
101	29	0	37.00	78.38
102	34	0	37.00	91.89

Table A-11 - Continued

S C H O O L ID	R E A S O N 1	R E A S O N 2	R E A S O N 3	R E A S O N 4	R E A S O N 5	R E A S O N 6	R E A S O N 7	R E A S O N 8	R E A S O N 9	R E A S O N 10	R E A S O N 11	R E A S O N 12	R E A S O N 13
14		1						1	3			4	2
15											1	5	
16		1	2				2	1					
17				1					3		1	3	
18								1	1		1	1	
19		1	2	1					2			5	2
20													
21			1						1			2	
22			1									2	2
23							1						
24											1	1	
25		2		1								5	1
26	1	1						1				3	1
27	1								1				
28								4				3	
29				1				1				2	
30												5	3
31		1						6	1			5	
32		2									1	4	1
33		1	2						2	1		3	
34								1				2	1
35											1	5	
36									1				

Table A-11 - Continued

S C H O O L	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N	R E A S O N
ID	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
62								1			3		
63		1		1								2	
64				1					1			3	1
65	1											2	
66									2			1	7
67				2					3	1	1	2	
68									1			3	5
69		1		2				1				1	2
70									1			2	1
71		1			2	2	1	1			1	6	
72									1			2	1
73					1						2	1	
74				2							1	3	1
75				3					1			1	2
76									1			1	2
77		2			1			2					
78		1	1					1				3	2
79	1				1							3	
80												3	1
81										1		7	1
82		1							2		1		3
83								1	1			2	1
84												1	2
85		1										1	
86				2				2	2		1	4	

Table A-11 - Continued

S C H O O L ID	R E A S O N 1	R E A S O N 2	R E A S O N 3	R E A S O N 4	R E A S O N 5	R E A S O N 6	R E A S O N 7	R E A S O N 8	R E A S O N 9	R E A S O N 10	R E A S O N 11	R E A S O N 12	R E A S O N 13
87		1	1						2			3	
88												1	1
89												3	1
90									2			1	2
91									2		1	5	
92		2		1			1		2			3	1
93									1		2		
94		1		2		1						1	2
95								1	1		3	2	
96	1				1							1	1
97												1	1
98									1		1	2	3
99		1	1	1									4
100													2
101		1							1		2	1	2
102									1			2	
T O T A L	7	4 0	1 6	2 9	8	4	7	3 3	6 5	1 1	4 4	2 2 6	1 0 8

Table A-12: T-Test for Independent Samples of the Independent Variable "Gender" for the Dependent Variable: "Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
MALE	25	29.6	3.818	0.764
FEMALE	77	29.3	3.252	0.371

F-VALUE = 1.38 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.295

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.45 DF = 100
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.651

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.42 DF = 36.01
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.679

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-13: T-Test for Independent Samples of the Independent Variable "Vocation" for the Dependent Variable: "Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
RELIGIOUS	30	29.4	3.213	0.587
LAY	72	29.3	3.473	0.409

F-VALUE = 1.17 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.655

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.12 DF = 100
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.907

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.12 DF = 58.45
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.905

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-14: T-Test for Independent Samples of the
Independent Variable "Presence of Full-time
Assistant Principal" for the Dependent Variable:
"Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
YES	5	30.4	3.362	1.503
NO	97	29.3	3.393	0.344

F-VALUE = 1.02 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 1.000

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.69 DF = 100
2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.489

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.70 DF = 4.43
2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.519

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-15: T-Test for Independent Samples of the Independent Variable "Full-time Teachers" for the Dependent Variable: "Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
LOW	53	29.3	3.178	0.437
HIGH	49	29.4	3.623	0.518

F-VALUE = 1.30 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.355

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = -0.22 DF = 100
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.828

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = -0.22 DF = 95.82
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.828

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-16: T-Test for Independent Samples of the Independent Variable "School Enrollment" for the Dependent Variable: "Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
SMALL	52	29.4	3.089	0.428
LARGE	50	29.3	3.696	0.523

F-VALUE = 1.43 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.207

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.09 DF = 100
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.925

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.09 DF = 95.52
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.925

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-17: T-Test for Independent Samples of the Independent Variable "Years as this School's Principal" for the Dependent Variable: "Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
LOW	57	29.4	3.273	0.433
HIGH	45	29.3	3.555	0.530

F-VALUE = 1.18 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.555

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.10 DF = 100
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.918

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 0.10 DF = 90.68
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.919

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-18: T-Test for Independent Samples of the Independent Variable "Total Years as a Principal" for the Dependent Variable: "Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
LOW	54	29.3	3.476	0.473
HIGH	48	29.5	3.307	0.477

F-VALUE = 1.10 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.731

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = -0.36 DF = 100
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.722

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = -0.36 DF = 99.52
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.721

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-19: T-Test for Independent Samples of the Independent Variable "Number of Religious as Teachers" for the Dependent Variable: "Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
LOW	69	29.3	3.322	0.400
HIGH	33	29.5	3.554	0.619

F-VALUE = 1.14 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.629

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = -0.29 DF = 100
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.770

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = -0.29 DF = 59.45
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.776

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-20: T-Test for Independent Samples of the Independent Variable "Parish Subsidy to School" for the Dependent Variable: "Policies in Compliance"

CASE	NUMBER	MEAN	STD. DEV.	STD.ERROR
LOW	40	30.2	3.112	0.492
HIGH	62	28.8	3.473	0.441

F-VALUE = 1.95 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.469

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 1.95 DF = 100
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.054

SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE:

T-VALUE = 2.00 DF = 89.78
 2-TAIL PROBABILITY = 0.049

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

**Table A-21: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
 "Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable: "Gender of Principal"**

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	MALE	FEMALE	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	8 8.8 22.2% 32.0%	28 27.2 77.8% 36.4%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	8 9.1 21.6% 32.0%	29 27.9 78.4% 37.7%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	9 7.1 31.0% 36.0%	20 21.9 69.0% 26.0%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	25 24.5%	77 75.5%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 0.93587
 DF = 2
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.62629

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

**Table A-22: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
 "Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable: "Vocation of Principal"**

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	RELIGIOUS	LAY	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	11 10.6 30.6% 36.7%	25 25.4 69.4% 34.7%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	12 10.9 32.4% 40.0%	25 26.1 67.6% 34.7%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	7 8.5 24.1% 23.35%	22 20.5 75.9% 30.6%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	30 29.4%	72 70.6%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 0.57380
 DF = 2
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.75059

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-23: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
 "Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable:
 "Presence of Full-time Assistant Principal"

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	YES	NO	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	1 1.8 2.8% 20.0%	35 34.2 97.2% 36.1%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	2 1.8 5.4% 40.0%	35 35.2 94.6% 36.1%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	2 1.4 6.9% 40.0%	27 27.6 93.1% 27.8%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	2 4.9%	97 95.1%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 0.61606
 DF = 2
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.73489

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

**Table A-24: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
 "Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable: "Number of Full-time Teachers"**

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	LOW	HIGH	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	26 24.4 72.2% 37.7%	10 11.6 27.8% 30.3%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	24 25.0 64.9% 34.8%	13 12.0 35.1% 39.4%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	19 19.6 65.5% 27.5%	10 9.4 34.5% 30.3%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	69 67.6%	33 32.4%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 0.53528

DF = 2

SIGNIFICANCE = 0.76518

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

**Table A-25: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
 "Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable: "School Enrollment"**

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	LOW	HIGH	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	19 18.4 52.8% 36.5%	17 17.6 47.2% 37.0%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	20 18.9 54.1% 38.5%	17 18.1 45.9% 34.0%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	13 14.8 44.8% 25.0%	16 14.2 55.2% 32.0%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	52 51.0%	50 49.0%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 0.62572
 DF = 2
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.73135

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-26: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
"Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable: "Years as This School's Principal"

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	LOW	HIGH	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	21 20.1 58.3% 36.8%	15 15.9 41.7% 33.3%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	18 20.7 48.6% 31.6%	19 16.3 51.4% 42.2%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	18 16.2 62.1% 31.6%	11 12.8 37.9% 24.4%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	57 55.9%	45 44.1%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 1.32324

DF = 2

SIGNIFICANCE = 0.51602

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

**Table A-27: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
 "Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable: "Number of Years as a Principal"**

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	LOW	HIGH	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	20 19.1 55.6% 37.0%	16 16.9 44.4% 33.3%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	18 19.6 48.6% 33.3%	19 17.4 51.4% 39.6%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	16 15.4 55.2% 29.6%	13 13.6 44.8% 27.1%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	54 52.9%	48 47.1%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 0.43036
 DF = 2
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.80640

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

Table A-28: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
 "Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable: "Number of Religious as Teachers"

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	LOW	HIGH	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	26 24.4 72.2% 37.7%	10 11.6 27.8% 30.3%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	24 25.0 64.9% 34.8%	13 12.0 35.1% 39.4%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	19 19.6 65.5% 27.5%	10 9.4 34.5% 30.3%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	69 67.6%	33 32.4%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 0.53528
 DF = 2
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.76518

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

**Table A-29: Chi-square Statistic for Dependent Variable:
 "Policies in Compliance"
 by Independent Variable: "Parish Subsidy to School"**

COUNT EXPECTED VALUE ROW PERCENT COLUMN PERCENT	LOW	HIGH	ROW TOTAL PERCENT
LOW COMPLIANCE	11 14.1 30.6% 27.5%	25 21.9 69.4% 40.3%	36 35.3%
AVERAGE COMPLIANCE	14 14.5 37.8% 35.0%	23 22.5 62.2% 37.1%	37 36.3%
HIGH COMPLIANCE	15 11.4 51.7% 37.5%	14 17.6 48.3% 22.6%	29 28.4%
COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT	40 39.2%	62 22.6%	102 100%

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC = 3.06563
 DF = 2
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.21593

NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL.

APPENDIX TWO

DOCUMENT ONE

COVER LETTER SENT TO ALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE

March 2, 1993

Dear Principal:

I am writing you to seek your assistance in completing my research at Loyola University in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.

The following survey is based upon the Policies and Regulations manual issued by the Office for Schools, Child, and Youth Ministries of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. It has been approved and supported by Dr. Norris, Dr. Smith and Rev. Darnieder from the Department of Education. Factual data is being sought on certain procedures carried out in the elementary schools of the Archdiocese. The thrust of the research is to determine the amount of compliance with various policies or guidelines during this school year and to determine the reasons for any lack of compliance. Your full and honest cooperation will make this project a success. No names of individuals or schools will be used in

the final report. Your school's confidentiality is guaranteed. The Catholic Schools Office will receive a copy of the finished report including the data, conclusions and recommendations.

The survey requires only about fifteen (15) minutes of time to complete. You may use pen or pencil to mark your responses. Spaces are provided for you to list one or two reasons for the lack of full compliance with a given rule. Choose one or two of the given reasons listed at the bottom of each page. Simply state the code number in the spaces provided. A return envelope is included. Please return the survey by March 10. Thank you for your help in my doctoral research.

DOCUMENT TWO: RESEARCH SURVEY INSTRUMENT

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

1. Does your school follow the mandated procedures to handle complaints utilizing all four levels in the process? (p1312)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

2. Are all cases of expulsion approved by the pastor? (2205a)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

3. Does the school have a written policy regarding the admission of underage students? (p5111.1)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

4. Does your school follow the procedures to handle any possible retention of students? (p5123)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

5. Does your school have a dress standard for the students adopted by the local school board? (p5132)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of time
3. Lack of trained staff
4. Lack of interest in policy
5. Lack of facilities
6. Policy is not important
7. Do not understand policy
8. Do not agree with policy
9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
11. Not applicable in some cases
12. Local school policy is more suited to our needs
13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

6. Does the school sponsor any mixed parties or dances outside of school hours? (p5134)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

7. If a student is to be held after school for detention, are the parents always given prior notification? (p5144.1)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

8. Does your school ever use corporal punishment? (p5144.2)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

9. Does your school calendar have at least 180 days in which the school is in session? (p6111)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of time
3. Lack of trained staff
4. Lack of interest in policy
5. Lack of facilities
6. Policy is not important
7. Do not understand policy
8. Do not agree with policy
9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
11. Not applicable in some cases
12. Local school policy/practice is more suited to our needs
13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

10. Does the pastor maintain a satisfactory working relationship with the principal and staff? (p2205a)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

11. Is the school's fire alarm system tested at least once a week? (p6114.1)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

12. Are student-athletes in your school permitted to be on more than one team during any particular season? (p6145.2)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

13. Does your school have a pupil/teacher ratio greater than 25:1? (p6151)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of time
3. Lack of trained staff
4. Lack of interest in policy
5. Lack of facilities
6. Policy is not important
7. Do not understand policy
8. Do not agree with policy
9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
11. Not applicable in some cases
12. Local school policy/practice is more suited to our needs
13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

14. Does your pastor evaluate the principal annually, using at least two written, scheduled appraisals and based upon a written job description? (p4112)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

15. Does the school hold fire drills at least once each month? (p6114.1)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

16. Does the principal prepare and oversee the school budget? (p2210c)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

17. Does the principal insure that all funds, such as book fees and others, are properly deposited with the parish? (p2210c)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of time
3. Lack of trained staff
4. Lack of interest in policy
5. Lack of facilities
6. Policy is not important
7. Do not understand policy
8. Do not agree with policy
9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
11. Not applicable in some cases
12. Local school policy/practice is more suited to our needs
13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

18. Does the principal control any funds or checking accounts? (p3410)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

19. Are any students asked to transfer from your school during the first semester due to non-payment of tuition? (p3240a)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

20. Is the dismissal of students from your school used only as a last resort due to non-payment of tuition? (p3240a)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

21. In the case of fund-raising, does the school require the written approval of the student's parent or guardian? (p3270)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of time
3. Lack of trained staff
4. Lack of interest in policy
5. Lack of facilities
6. Policy is not important
7. Do not understand policy
8. Do not agree with policy
9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
11. Not applicable in some cases
12. Local school policy is more suited to our needs
13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

22. In the last two years, have any employees been non-renewed without written notice? (p4119.2)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

23. In the last two years, has the school given employees the reasons for non-renewal of their contracts? (p4119.2)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

24. In the last two years, has the Catholic Schools Office been consulted before the expulsion of any student during or at the end of the school year? (p5114a)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

25. In the last two years, has the school followed all mandated steps to be taken when a student is to be retained in a grade? (p5123)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of time
3. Lack of trained staff
4. Lack of interest in policy
5. Lack of facilities
6. Policy is not important
7. Do not understand policy
8. Do not agree with policy
9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
11. Not applicable in some cases
12. Local school policy is more suited to our needs
13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

26. Do all of your student athletes have accident insurance?
(p5143)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

27. Are academic grades ever a part of a disciplinary
action? (p5144)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

28. Does the school have a written set of eligibility rules
for sports participants? (p5144)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

29. Does the school day have the minimum of at least six
hours of teaching time for grades one to five and six
and one-half hours for the junior high grades? (p6112)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of time
3. Lack of trained staff
4. Lack of interest in policy
5. Lack of facilities
6. Policy is not important
7. Do not understand policy
8. Do not agree with policy
9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
11. Not applicable in some cases
12. Local school policy/practice is more suited to our
needs
13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

30. In the last two years, has the school been closed for bad weather even though the local public schools were open? (p6114.6)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

31. Does the school have a locally written curriculum plan? (p6140)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

32. Does the principal take responsibility for all extra-curricular activities, while the pastor does the same for all parish-based programs? (p6145)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

33. Does the school have an athletic program, but no physical education or intramural program? (p6145.2a)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

- 1. Lack of money
- 2. Lack of time
- 3. Lack of trained staff
- 4. Lack of interest in policy
- 5. Lack of facilities
- 6. Policy is not important
- 7. Do not understand policy
- 8. Do not agree with policy
- 9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
- 10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
- 11. Not applicable in some cases
- 12. Local school policy is more suited to our needs
- 13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

REMEMBER TO CHOOSE YOUR REASONS FROM THE LIST GIVEN BELOW.

34. Does the school ever have a practice or a competition without the supervision of a person who is at least 21 years of age? (p6145.2a)

YES NO

If YES, list one or two reasons: _____

35. Are the starting and ending days of the various sports seasons followed by all school teams? (6145.2a)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

36. Is the maximum number of games and tournaments adhered to for all sports seasons and teams? (p6145.22)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

37. Are all students in the school who are eligible for special programs, such as Chapter or Title programs, receiving such assistance? (p6164.3)

YES NO

If NO, list one or two reasons: _____

REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES/PROCEDURES

- 1. Lack of money
- 2. Lack of time
- 3. Lack of trained staff
- 4. Lack of interest in policy
- 5. Lack of facilities
- 6. Policy is not important
- 7. Do not understand policy
- 8. Do not agree with policy
- 9. Not aware of policy's enactment/existence
- 10. Catholic Schools Office does not follow-up on policy
- 11. Not applicable in some cases
- 12. Local school policy is more suited to our needs
- 13. Other reason -- please state briefly next to item.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR 1992-93 SCHOOL YEAR

38. _____ Principal: (Enter 1 or 2)
 1. Male 2. Female
39. _____ Principal: (Enter 1 or 2)
 1. Religious 2. Lay
40. _____ School enrollment (as of October 1, 1992)
41. _____ School location:
 R. Dodge County S. Fond Du Lac County
 T. Kenosha County U. City of Milwaukee
 V. Milwaukee County Suburb W. Ozaukee County
 X. Racine County Y. Sheboygan County
 Z. Walworth County Q. Washington County
 P. Waukesha County
42. _____ Total years as principal of the school,
 including 92-93
43. _____ Total years as a principal, including 92-93
44. _____ Parish subsidy to school (Nearest thousand,
 as \$25,000)
45. _____ Number of full-time faculty (part-timers = 0.5)
46. _____ Number of religious on faculty (part-timer =0.5)
47. _____ Full-time assistant principal (Enter 1 or 2)
 1. Yes 2. No

DOCUMENT THREELIST OF POLICY STATEMENTS FROM THE
ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE POLICY MANUAL
-----ITEM 1 (P1312)Complaints Concerning School/Religious Education PersonnelConciliation Procedures for Parents

Level One: Verbal Appeal

1. Any parent who has a concern shall discuss the matter with the principal/teacher/other Christian Formation minister hereafter known as the parish employee within ten (10) working days in an effort to clarify and resolve the concern within the local confines.

Level Two: Written Appeal

2. If the situation is not adjusted in a manner satisfactory to the parent or if no steps have been taken toward improvement, then within five (5) working days a written statement signed by the parent should be submitted to the parish employee. If mutually agreeable, both parties may request from the Director/ Superintendent of Schools a resource person skilled in dealing with conflicts to assist them in resolving/managing the situation.

Level Three: Appeal to Local Conciliation Committee

3. If the matter is not adjusted in a manner satisfactory to the parent or if no steps have been taken toward improvement, then within the next five (5) working days, the concerned parent shall submit a written statement to the local Conciliation Committee, setting forth the nature of the problem. The local parish community should establish its own Conciliation Committee and determine its process and time lines.

Within the next five (5) working days, the local Conciliation Committee shall meet separately with the concerned parent and parish employee to clarify the issue.

4. Within five (5) working days of those hearings, the local Conciliation Committee shall hold a group meeting or meetings of resolution that would include the local Conciliation Committee, the aggrieved parent and the parish employee.

If the matter is not thus resolved, all three parties involved shall draft a written statement to provide insight into the problem. The process continues.

Within five (5) working days of the joint meeting, the local Conciliation Committee shall:

- support the parent and take action to resolve the matter;
- or inform the parent in writing that the issue in their opinion should be withdrawn;
- or request in writing a hearing with the Conciliation Committee of the Office for Schools, Child & Youth Ministries

If the local Conciliation Committee does not support the parent, the parent may appeal to the Conciliation Committee of the Office for Schools, Child s Youth Ministries on his/her own behalf.

Level Four: Appeal to Archdiocesan Conciliation Committee

5. The request for a hearing with the Conciliation Committee of the Office for Schools, Child & Youth Ministries shall be made through the Superintendents Office. It shall contain the statements of the parties concerned.

6. The Office for Schools, Child & Youth Ministries shall maintain a list of persons to serve on the Conciliation Committee. The parties concerned shall nominate five candidates from which the Director/ Superintendent of Schools shall select an Ad Hoc Committee of three.

7. Upon receipt of the written statement, the Conciliation Committee will set up a hearing within ten (10) working days, at a mutually convenient time and place, for discussion of the concern with all parties involved.

8. If the matter is still unsettled, the Conciliation Committee will set up a hearing with the Director/Superintendent at a convenient time and place for all parties concerned. At this hearing, all persons involved should be present.

9. Within ten (10) working days the Director/Superintendent will submit a written decision to the parties concerned.

10. In all cases above, where there is reference to five (5) or ten (10) working days, This shall be revised to fifteen (15) total days whenever summer/holiday vacation time would come into this span.

ITEM 2 (P2205a) and ITEM 10The Pastor: (Parish Administrator) Specific Areas of Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of the pastor in parish educational programs flows from his status in canon law and in civil law.

1. The pastor is responsible for employing qualified educational administrators and evaluating their performances annually.

2. When the pastor has delegated staff hiring to an educational administrator, he still retains the right of consultation. The pastor will maintain a satisfactory working relationship with the administrators and their staffs.

3. The pastor shall make the final decision regarding the admission of students in all educational programs. He shall consult with the respective administrator.

4. All cases of expulsion of students need the approval of the pastor.

5. Educational activities that involve publicity or fund-raising are subject to the pastor's approval.

6. The pastor/designee is responsible for the financial administration of the educational programs.

a. He pays the salaries of the staff in accordance with current archdiocesan policy.

b. He observes legal requirements regarding withholding pay, social security, and workman's compensation. He also observes the archdiocesan regulations regarding health and accident insurance for religious and lay staff, and group life and retirement for lay employees.

c. He, with the appropriate administrator and parish council, determines the tuition charges for all parish educational programs.

d. No student shall be terminated during the first semester for nonpayment of the agreed upon tuition fee. Non-payment of an agreed upon prior year's tuition may result in non-admission for the following school year. Dismissal of a student in the second semester for non-payment of financial obligations is used only as a last resort when the parent or

guardian has failed to demonstrate sufficient good faith in attempting to meet these obligations.

e. He maintains the parish plant and provides proper necessary furnishings for the buildings. This includes the cleanliness of the building, adequate lighting, satisfactory operation of the heating system, and necessary repairs.

f. He must provide adequate equipment and instructional materials. Book rental and supply fees are used exclusively for the purchase of books and supplies. It may be necessary from time to time to provide additional instructional materials and equipment from sources other than book rental fees.

ITEM 3 (P5111.1)

Admission

Early Admission Into First Grade and Kindergarten

The State Statutes provide for admission of special cases into first grade. Section 115.28(8) states: The State Superintendent shall prescribe procedures, conditions, and standards under which admissions to kindergarten and first grade may be made at ages earlier than those specified in Section 11s.14 in exceptional cases.

The State Superintendent has recommended that each local school board adopt an admission policy that includes procedures for the admission of exceptional cases, regardless of the regular admission age requirement, and that parents be made aware of these procedures.

In Catholic schools children who have reached age requirements are given priority for admittance into first grade or kindergarten before consideration is given to underage children.

Local schools should develop written policies that relate to whether such early entrance will be considered and if so when and how parents are to apply for early entrance consideration.

ITEM 4 (P5123 and P5123: a and b) and ITEM 25Promotion/Retention

In schools that allow for flexibility of instruction within grades, retention of a student will be done judiciously after considering grade standards as well as the many factors affecting retention. When retention seems likely, parents are contacted several times during the year relative to Rule 5123 (b).

Students shall not be considered for more than one (1) retention during their school career. Final decisions on retention will rest with the local school authorities.

The school's policy, program and procedure for retention should be clearly articulated in the student handbook.

GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERING RETENTION OF STUDENTS

1. Chronological Age - The student who is in the younger half of the class is less likely to be penalized by adding a year to his/her academic life.

2. Intellectual Ability - The slow learning student (I.Q., 70-90) may achieve below grade level and retention will only temporarily alleviate this discrepancy. In addition, the slow learning student often drops out of school because of increased chronological age.

3. Physical Size - The early maturing student, already larger than his or her peers, might well suffer indignities if placed with smaller students or may inflict such indignities on others.

4. Present Grade Placement - Retention should normally take place during kindergarten, first, or second grade. Retention beyond this point usually compounds the student's problems.

5. Siblings - Family difficulties often arise when retention causes the placement of siblings in the same grade.

6. Peer Relationships - retention may adversely affect the relationship of the student within the community/neighborhood group with which he or she closely identifies.

7. Group Decision - The school principal, school supportive personnel, parents and classroom teacher should be involved in a decision to retain the student.

8. Child's Attitude - Ideally the student should be a partner in the group decision for retention or promotion. When the student child is part of the planning a more favorable attitude results.

9. Parental Involvement - When retention is being considered parents are to be contacted several times during the year to be appraised of the student's progress and needs.

10. Individual School Procedures - Each school should incorporate these guidelines into a standard procedure to be followed when considering the retention/promotion of students. A student should not be retained more than once during the elementary years.

11. The school must ascertain whether the retention will help or hinder the learning deficit.

Summarization of each procedural step should be retained in the administrative file and signed by those participating in the conference.

A. Procedural Step I (End of first nine-week marking period) Teachers should discuss extreme learning difficulties exhibited by students with the school principal to develop a program for remedial action prior to considering retention.

B. Procedural Step II (End of second nine-week marking period) The principal or the teacher with the principal's approval should discuss the retention possibility with the parent.

1. Conferences with parents should include the reasons for the recommendations in addition to samples of the student's work, standardized test scores etc.

2. Conference objectives should aim toward a mutual decision between the parents and the school.

C. Procedural Step III (May 1) - A conference will be held with the parent, principal and teacher to inform the parents of the school's final decision.

ITEM 5 (P5132)

Dress Code

The local school board/education committee will be responsible for developing acceptable standards of dress for students.

The community in which the school is located, custom, and the economic conditions of the people should be considered in the matter of dress.

ITEM 6 (P5134)

Social Functions

Parents are responsible for the after school social activities of their elementary school children. Mixed parties, dances, and similar functions outside of school hours are not held under the sponsorship or direction of the elementary school.

ITEM 7 (P5144.1)

Detention

In the cause of safety and to avoid interference with transportation schedules, detention should be avoided. The prior notification of a parent is required for a (necessary) detention of any minor student. The school is liable for the safety of the students, who serve detention, on their way home.

ITEM 8 (P5144.2)

Corporal Punishment

Corporal punishment is defined as the use of physical punishment after an offense. It shall not be used by a school employee. Self-defense is not corporal punishment unless the force used is greater than necessary to repel the attack. Use of reasonable physical force necessary to protect the interest of a third party is not corporal punishment. (Example: Use of reasonable force to protect a student from attack by another student.)

This attitude that corporal punishment shall never be used follows naturally from belief in the worth and dignity of each individual and our belief in the school as a faith community where a climate of Christian love, mutual understanding, respect and trust prevail.

ITEM 9 (P6111)School Calendar

Following Wisconsin law concerning the length of the school year, schools will be in session 180 days.

A calendar of the school year is prepared by each school in the Archdiocese and submitted to the Superintendent for approval.

In the event of an emergency, a disaster, or extreme weather conditions, schools will follow the decisions of the local public school district with regard to closing school. The Catholic schools will remain open or will close with the public schools. The decision of the Superintendent of the public school district where the Catholic school is geographically located will be followed.

ITEM 10 (P2205a) . . . SEE ITEM 2

ITEM 11 (P6114.1) and ITEM 15

Fire

Wisconsin Law requires schools to hold monthly fire drills and to submit a report of these drills to the Department of Public Instruction, the Industrial Safety and Buildings Division, and the local Fire Chief, and to retain a copy of the report in the school file. The report must be sent prior to June 30 of each year.

Requirements of the State code are:

That all fire alarm systems shall be tested at least once a week and a record of such tests shall be kept.

That all exit doors be equipped with hardware that will permit doors to open from the inside by turning a single knob or handle or pressing a single bar or plate without using a key.

That all exit doors be available as an exit when building is occupied.

That all halls, doors and stairs be free of obstruction.

That all fire escapes and exit doors be kept clear of ice and snow.

A school public address system, if available, shall be used as a secondary warning device in the event the fire alarm system malfunctions.

All occupants, with no exceptions, shall leave the building whenever a fire alarm is sounded.

The local fire department makes all rules and regulations with regard to the use of candles and open flames within the school.

Procedures for Fire Emergencies

1. Designate assembly area(s) to be used for evacuating personnel, bearing in mind the factors of adequate distance and the possibility of inclement weather.
2. Designate responsible persons who will accompany evacuating personnel to ascertain that all are accounted for and to report those unaccounted for by checking the class roll.
3. The one discovering a fire that cannot be fought with available hand extinguisher should immediately do the followings
 - A. Sound internal fire alarm.
 - B. Call the fire department.
 - C. Notify principal's office what is on fire and where.
 - D. In the absence of other instructions, evacuate to the predesignated areas.
4. Recall or dismiss evacuated personnel in the assembly area, as appropriate.

ITEM 12 (P6145.2a)

Athletics

General Regulations: Elementary Schools and Parish Based Programs

1. No elementary school student may participate in any phase of a formal high school (grades 9-12) athletic program. This includes practice sessions.

2. A student-athlete may compete in only one sport - on only one team, in only one league during a sport season; that is a student-athlete on a parish-based team who attends a public school may play on either the parish team or the public school team, but not both.

3. All practice and games (independent, league and tournament) must take place during each defined sport season. The sport seasons are defined as follows:

- a. Fall season: Football - August 15 - October 31
Soccer - August 15 - October 31
Girls Volleyball - August 15 - November 15
- b. Winter season: Boys Basketball November 1 - March 31
Girls Basketball November 16 - March 31
Girls Volleyball November 16 - March 31
- c. Spring season: April 1 - End of School Year

4. Only teams comprised of players from a single school/parish and in existence during the entire sport season should be eligible to participate in school or parish sponsored tournaments.

5. A team's entire competitive season must be completed before any member of that team may begin participation in another sport. This restriction applies to practices as well as games or matches.

EXAMPLE: A player participating with the football or soccer team must complete the entire football or soccer season before participating in any practices, games, matches, scrimmages, etc. for another sport . . . such as basketball or volleyball.

6. Competitive athletic programs are to be limited to grades 5, 6, 7, and 8.

7. Eligibility to compete will be determined by the player's effort and conduct in school. Such determination will be made by the school principal; written criteria and process shall be published in the parent/student handbook.

8. There is to be no practice nor competition without competent adult supervision. An adult is a person who is 21 years of age.

9. There is to be no practice nor competition during the hours school is in session.

10. Travel to games must be kept to a reasonable distance especially on days preceding a school day. Therefore, games

scheduled at later evening hours are discouraged on days preceding school days. The players' health and education must be safeguarded by the school.

11. A game is defined as competitive play between two teams of different schools during which time and score are kept. A scrimmage is defined as play between two teams of different schools during which no time or score is kept and during which coaches may interrupt action to give coaching advice.

12. No student may participate in any phase of a school/parish sponsored interscholastic athletic program without a physical examination by a licensed physician every two years.

13. Players must be insured for both travel and participation. If not, schools could be liable for injuries.

14. Title IX of the Civil Rights Act requires that equal opportunity be provided to both sexes to participate in athletics. It requires that all physical education classes be coeducational, however, it allows separation during the participation in contact sports and explicitly per-its grouping of students by ability.

15. Leagues or conferences provide a structure that helps to make athletic programs more effective. It is recommended that all teams belong to a league or conference. If possible, the league or conference should be organized on an area-wide or geographical basis.

16. Each league or conference shall have a Board of Control to establish game rules, procedures, and discipline within the league or conference which are in compliance with archdiocesan policy and regulations.

a. Membership shall consist of an equal number of principals, athletic directors, and coaches. Voting members are the appropriate parish or school administrator.

b. The Board of Control shall establish specific regulations for each sport in conformity with the policies and regulations of the Archdiocese.

c. The Chairperson of the Board of Control shall act as the executive officer of the league or conference.

d. The Board of Control shall establish schedules for each sport at the beginning of the sport season. Such schedules shall include the time of the events.

e. The chairperson of each league's Board of Control shall communicate all schedules, rules, changes, etc. to the appropriate parish and/or school administrators, and to the Director of Elementary Schools.

ITEM 13 (P6151)

Class Size

Variables that affect class size are:

1. Grade level
2. Achievement ability of pupils
3. Physical facilities
4. Availability of supportive personnel
5. Consultation with teachers, parents, board members/education committee and the administrator.
6. Pupil/Staff ratio

a. In the elementary schools, a ratio of 20-25 pupils to one professional should be maintained. (Pupil/ Teacher ratio is determined by dividing the total number of students by total number of professional staff, which includes administrators, guidance counselors, librarians/ media personnel. Part-time teachers, such as Art, Music, Physical Education, etc., are counted in terms of full-time equivalency (FTE)).

b. In the secondary schools, the ratio should be 17-20 students to one professional staff person.

c. If these norms cannot be maintained, the principal must be able to justify any lower or higher ratio to the pastor and school board/education committee, and Director/ Superintendent of Schools.

ITEM 14 (P4112)

Personnel

Educational Administrators: Evaluation

Educational administrators are those personnel who are responsible for the staff and pupils in the program. They include the principal of the school and the director of

religious education as well as any other full-time personnel engaged in an educational program.

Educational administrators must be evaluated annually by the employer on job performance. Two scheduled appraisals must occur prior to the final evaluation. All evaluations must be in writing and signed and dated by both parties.

Evaluation of the performance is based on a written job description as well as any other written agreements

ITEM 15 (P6114.1) . . . SEE ITEM 11

ITEM 16 (P2210 c) and ITEM 17

The Principal

The principal, working with staff, parents and students and with the approval of the parish council, shall provide leadership for developing educational programs.

A. Staff:

1. Define the school's philosophy, goals, and objectives with the staff and parents.
2. Develop, implement, and evaluate with the faculty educational programs consistent with:
 - a. the Gospel Message and Christian Tradition
 - b. the philosophy of the school
 - c. the needs of the children
 - d. current educational and multicultural trends
 - e. the culture of the local and world community
 - f. archdiocesan policies
 - g. state and federal laws
3. Include the total staff in developing the educational process.
4. Develop procedures for hiring and orientation of personnel.
5. Establish criteria for the assignment, promotion, transfer, and termination of personnel.
6. Encourage, coordinate, supervise and evaluate professional growth of staff members.

B. Students:

1. Endeavor to meet the needs of the student body by creating a Christian atmosphere.
2. Arrange systemic procedures for continual assessment of the religious, academic, social, physical and emotional growth of the pupils.
3. Coordinate the health, safety, counseling services available to staff and pupil personnel.
4. Maintain accurate pupil personnel records and reporting procedures according to established policies.
5. Provide entrance, orientation, placement, and follow-up for new pupils.
6. Develop procedures for coordinating activities directly under the sponsorship of the school.

C. Parents and Community:

1. Seek to maintain open channels of communication within the entire school community.
2. Make a planned effort through quality performance and two-way communication to influence the parish and general public so that they will respect and support the school.

D. Business Management:

1. Develop a budget consistent with both long-range and short-range goals of the educational program.
2. Submit the prepared budget to the agent responsible for reviewing and approving it.
3. Oversee the dispersal of approved funds.
4. Maintain an accurate accounting system according to archdiocesan policy.

E. School Plant and Facilities:

1. Supervise the operation of the school plant in accordance with state law, fire regulations, and local building codes.
2. Develop plans for the orderly improvement of the school plant.

3. Oversee the purchase, maintenance, replacement, storage, and inventory of instructional supplies and equipment.

4. Aid, whenever necessary, in the keeping of property inventory and insurance records

5. Plan cooperatively with staff to insure maximum use of all materials.

ITEM 17 . . . SEE ITEM 16

ITEM 18 (P3410)

Expenditures

System of Accounts

1. Accurate financial records are required in every educational program.

2. One complete copy of Confidential Financial Statement School is to be sent to the Archdiocesan Business Office by August 15th.

3. Contributions from organizations shall be properly recorded under number 3000. Gifts donated for a specific purpose or the use of a particular person or activity shall be used in accordance with the intention of the donor, but the gift should be recorded nonetheless.

4. If a contribution is other than money, its equivalent value in money should be noted, e.g., athletic equipment, science equipment, etc.

5. Ordinarily all funds of the parish, whether it be for church operation, building and ground operation, religious education program, school operation, etc., should be administered through one central checking account under the direction of the pastor and trustees of the parish.

It is recognized that in some situations this regulation cannot be implemented. If an organization maintains its own checking account it is required:

a. To provide to the pastor and trustees an annual budget.

b. To provide to the pastor and trustees the monthly accounting of transactions, both receipts and expenditures. This monthly report should include a comparison of the year-to-date transactions with the year-to-date budgeted figures.

c. To require a second signature of either the pastor or the trustees for all separate checking accounts.

6. Each principal of the archdiocesan secondary schools shall submit a preliminary balanced budget to the Superintendent by March 1st for the subsequent fiscal year and a finalized balanced budget by October 1st for the current fiscal year. The fiscal year shall be July 1 to June 30.

ITEM 19 (P3240) and ITEM 20

Tuition and Fees

Each parish school must have a tuition charge. That amount shall be determined by the Parish Council/governing board. Expenditures for school operating costs should be proportionate to the amount of the parish income as determined by local needs.

Each parish must give consideration to parish families unable to pay the established tuition. Consideration is also to be given to parish families with several children attending Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

Each parish should develop its own written policies regarding:

1. Parish families who desire Catholic School education for their children and are unable to pay the tuition;
2. Families who do not belong to the parish and desire Catholic School education for their children.

The tuition charge shall be paid to the school account. Each school should offer parents a variety of tuition payment plans.

Tuition should represent the parent's fair share of the school's budget. The support of the entire parish community is also needed.

The total amount collected as tuition should not be less than 40% of the school budget. The category tuition includes registration, graduation and book fees. It also includes

Third Source Revenue derived from trust and endowment funds and proceeds from school sponsored fund raisers. The percentage of budgeted school revenue generated by tuition should not exceed 60% nor be less than 40%. If a parish school cannot implement this policy (40%) for any school year, a written communication stating its plan should be sent to the Superintendent of Schools 60 days before the beginning of the school year.

When schools implement a tuition program, it is suggested that the minimum tuition of twenty (20) percent of the per-pupil cost be established for the first year, progressively moving toward the recommended goal within five (5) years.

No student shall be terminated during the first semester for nonpayment of the agreed upon tuition fee. Nonpayment of an agreed upon prior year's tuition may result in non-admission for the following school year.

Dismissal of a student in the second semester for nonpayment of financial obligations is used only as a last resort when the parent or guardian has failed to demonstrate sufficient good faith in attempting to meet these obligations.

Other fees, such as books, graduation, registration, bus are to be charged by the school and shall be paid to the school account.

Religious education programs shall have a charge for their educational services and/or supplies. Such fees shall be determined by the Parish Council. The entire parish shall subsidize this program as needed.

This entire policy shall be interpreted in light of the Archdiocesan Policy on Parish Membership.

According to the Internal Revenue Service, tuition, fees, or any other payments to a parish or parish school as a consideration for participation in a parish education program or attending a secondary school are not deductible as contributions on the income tax return.

ITEM 20 . . . SEE ITEM 19

ITEM 21 (P3270)Sales: Student Participation

A minor under 12 years of age may work in a fund-raising sale for a non-profit organization, a public school or a private school under the following conditions:

(a) Each minor must give the nonprofit organization, public school or private school written approval from the minor's parent or guardian.

(b) Each minor under 9 years of age or each group containing one or more minors under 9 years of age must be physically accompanied by a parent or a person at least 16 years of age.

Minors 12 years of age or older may be employed in street trades, and any minor may work in fund-raising sales for nonprofit organizations, public schools or private schools.

ITEM 22 (P4119.2) and ITEM 23Non-Renewal of Contract

If the employer is unwilling to renew the contract, the employer shall notify the employee, in writing, on or before the contract date of non-renewal, as to its intent to non-renew. No reason need be given for such non-renewal.

If an employee is to be non-renewed, the Department for Human Resources (Archdiocese of Milwaukee) shall be notified on or before the contract date of non-renewal, as well. Where unemployment compensation is provided, personnel who are non-renewed are eligible for such.

If an employee is unwilling to renew his/her contract, he/she shall notify the employer in writing on or before the date specified in the contract that he/she will not be renewing the contract.

ITEM 23 . . . SEE ITEM 22

ITEM 24 (P5114 a)DisciplineProbation, Suspension, and ExpulsionProbation:

A student may be placed on probation for a trial period by the school principal. After conferences are held with the student's parents or guardian and relevant school personnel, the principal sets conditions for release from the probation. The principal's decisions are final.

Suspension:

1. Suspension is justified only in unusual circumstances and is normally an in-school suspension.
2. Prior to any suspension, the student must be advised of the reason for the proposed suspension. The parent or guardian of a suspended student is given prompt notice of the suspension and the reasons for the action.
3. In-School Suspension can be directed for varying lengths of time, but shall not exceed three days. In-School Suspension conditions are to be determined by the building principal. In-School Suspension students remain the responsibility of the school.
4. Out-of-School Suspension is the responsibility of the principal. State Law directs that a maximum of three days can be imposed unless a written notice of an expulsion hearing is scheduled. Such notice shall allow not more than a total of seven consecutive school days to be served in suspension until the expulsion hearing is held.

Expulsion:

As a definition, expulsion is considered a termination of enrollment, permanently or for an extended period of time. Expulsion shall be considered as a rarity and used only as a very last measure.

Expulsion results from repeated refusal to obey school rules or conduct that endangers property, health, or safety of others, and is deemed to be in the best interest of the school.

Students asked not to return the following year are considered expelled.

The Superintendent/Designee is to be consulted before any action leading to expulsion is taken.

1. The actions and procedures for probation, suspension or expulsion shall be published in the school handbook.
2. Actions taken to suspend or expel students shall be preceded by internal school procedures, supported by defensible records.
3. Expulsion can take place only after an expulsion hearing has been held. Parents/legal guardians shall be notified in writing at least five days before the hearing is to take place.
4. The student may be represented at the hearing by counsel.
5. If the decision to expel the student is made, parents are notified, in writing, of the action. The right to appeal is made known to the parents.
6. The student, or his parent or guardian, may, within five school days following commencement of the expulsion, have a conference with the Superintendent of Schools/Designee. The Superintendent/Designee will assure that due process was provided as defined by policy.

ITEM 25 (P5123) . . . SEE ITEM 4

ITEM 26 (P5143)

Insurance

Pupil accident insurance is required for all students who participate in competitive school athletic programs

One of the following is requisite to registration in classes having a potential of personal injury:

1. Student accident insurance
 2. A statement signed by the parent certifying insurance covering personal injury of the student is maintained by the family. This information will become part of the student's school file.
-

ITEM 27 (P5144) and ITEM 28Discipline

The local school discipline plan or program shall be developed on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Parents, students and school staff members shall be represented in the planning process and shall be represented within the operation of the plan.

2. The processes and strategies incorporated into the plan shall reflect a continuing effort to enhance student self-esteem and encourage growth toward self-management.

3. Local plans shall incorporate a respect for student individuality.

4. Consequences of behavior rather than punishments for behavior shall be the norm in all disciplinary action.

5. Corporal punishment is never allowed for any purpose.

6. Consequences for aberrant behavior are never applied to an entire group as a result of the behavior of one student.

7. Consequences for social misconduct are not to be administered by way of academic punishment.

8. Academic requirements for social participation (e.g., eligibility requirements for sporting activities) should be clearly articulated in the student handbook, established on well founded educational and developmental principles, and applied uniformly throughout the student body. Otherwise, consequences for academic nonperformance are not to be administered by way of social punishments.

9. Local school plans shall be consistently applied across all grade levels respecting the developmental stage of the children.

10. Local school plans shall be published in a parent handbook.

11. Suspension and expulsion procedures are to be exercised only when a student's conduct endangers property, health or safety of others or is disruptive to the learning environment. Probation, suspension and expulsion procedures are more carefully outlined in the regulation 5114(a).

ITEM 28 . . . SEE ITEM 27

ITEM 29 (P6112)

School Day

Effective July 1, 1988, the school day shall consist of the following minimum instructional time.

Kindergarten: 437 hours per year or 2 hours and 30 minutes for five-year old children and 2 hours for four-year old children.

Grades One to Eight: 1080 hours per year or 6 hours, exclusive of lunch period.

Grades Six to Eight or Seven to Eight organizational structure: 1137 hours per year or six hours and 30 minutes, exclusive of lunch period.

Grades Nine to Twelve: 1137 hours per year or 6 hours and 30 minutes, exclusive of lunch period.

Student attendance at liturgies is encouraged. If the liturgy is celebrated daily for all students, the time period is excluded from the regular instructional hours.

If parent-teacher conferences are held in the evening, and if the students are in attendance the time may be counted as a fractional part of the five days permitted for parent-teacher conferences and/or inclement weather.

If school is dismissed at noon because of the weather, the time missed may be counted as a fractional part of the five days permitted for parent-teacher conferences and/or inclement weather.

Wisconsin State Statutes 121.02 for instructional time.

ITEM 30 (P6114.6)

Inclement Weather

The natural disasters most likely to occur and affect school operations are usually limited to severe weather. Under these circumstances, planning would be needed for these three decisions.

1. Keeping students in school.

When advised to take shelter, a plan needs to inform students exactly where the shelter areas are and to provide a list of actions necessary to move students there. The welfare of the students requires that they remain in school until they can go home safely. If a parent comes to school for a student, the principal shall excuse the student.

2. Dismissing students.

In closing the schools for a disaster or bad weather, administrators will follow the decision of the Superintendent of Public Schools in the locality where the Catholic school is geographically located.

When advised to dismiss students early, a plan should provide for informing the parents and the counseling of the students. If student buses and crossing guards are needed, the plan should provide for obtaining them.

3. Not opening schools.

Elementary and secondary schools will follow the decision of the Superintendent of Public Schools in the locality where the Catholic school is geographically located. Principals will familiarize themselves with the policy and procedures of the local public school district. If a school has students who are bused from multiple public school districts' some within which schools close and some remain open, the Catholic schools will conduct classes for those students who are in attendance.

4. Exception.

If any principal judges that an exception to the above procedures is needed for his/her school, a statement of the problem and reasons for granting the exception to the above rules shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. After evaluation of the case, he/she will inform the principal that an exception to the rules has been granted.

ITEM 31 (P6140)

Curriculum

The school curriculum envisions learning experiences designed to facilitate spiritual, intellectual, social, psychological and psycho-motor growth. The individual

student's needs, abilities and interests are considered in shaping curriculum that will develop the student's relationship to God, self and the world.

Teachers, administrators, parents, and students are involved in developing, planning, implementing, evaluating and revising the curriculum.

1. The curriculum shall reflect the stated Catholic philosophy of the school including its goals.
 2. The curriculum shall take due account of the ideals, the realities, and the diversity of American culture as well as global awareness.
 3. The curriculum shall reflect the fundamental principles of growth and development and any specific learning theories accepted by the schools. It shall recognize and make provisions for the spiritual, physical, emotional, mental and social differences among individual children.
 4. The curriculum shall provide for a wide range of learning experiences in the building of faith community and the development of all curricular areas, including aesthetic education.
 5. Emphasis shall be placed on an interdisciplinary approach.
 6. A written plan shall be developed and implemented locally that will provide for a continual evaluation and revision of the curriculum.
 7. Curriculum guidelines in all academic areas are reviewed by the Elementary School office in conjunction with an advisory committee.
-

ITEM 32 (P6145)

Extra-Class Activities

The principal has the ultimate responsibility for all extracurricular activities. The immediate supervision of a program may be delegated to qualified staff members or competent adults. Parents and other adults who serve as coaches and moderators are accountable to the principal in all school related activities that are school based.

The pastor has the ultimate responsibility for all extracurricular activities in parish-based programs. The immediate supervision of a program may be delegated by the pastor to a qualified staff member or other adults. The job

description of a person responsible will provide the parameters of this delegation. Parents and other adults who serve as coaches and moderators are accountable to the pastor or his delegate in all extracurricular activities.

ITEM 33 (P6145.22), ITEM 34, ITEM 35, and ITEM 36

Interscholastic Athletics: Elementary Schools

Basketball

Specific Regulations

1. There must be a minimum of four practice sessions on separate days before the opening game of the season.
2. Fifth and sixth grade teams may be scheduled for a maximum of 2 practices per week, each being no more than 1-1/2 hours in length. Seventh and eighth grade teams may be scheduled for a maximum of 2 practices per week, each being no more than 2 hours in length.
3. Teams are limited to playing in only one league during the season (see R6145.2 s3)
4. No fifth or sixth grade team shall be scheduled for more than 16 games during the season -- exclusive of tournament participation.
5. No seventh or eighth grade team shall be scheduled for more than 20 games during the season -- exclusive of tournament participation.
6. Teams may participate in pre-season, mid-season (holiday), and post-season tournaments subject to the following limitations:
 - 5th grade teams - limited to participation in two tournaments
 - 6th grade teams - limited to participation in two tournaments
 - 7th grade teams - limited to participation in three tournaments;
 - 8th grade teams - limited to participation in three tournaments (plus the Serra Club Archdiocesan Invitational Tournament)
7. The maximum length of the quarters of any game shall be six minutes.

8. A team may not play more than three games in any one week (exception: the weeks of the mid-season or post-season tournaments). A tournament may not schedule a team to play two games on one day.

ITEM 34 . . . SEE ITEM 33

ITEM 35 . . . SEE ITEM 33

ITEM 36 . . . SEE ITEM 33

ITEM 37 (P6164.3)

Exceptional Education

1. In compliance with P. L. 94-142, a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) evaluation will be provided by the public school system for student-referrals from parochial or private schools. When making a referral for an MDT evaluation, archdiocesan schools will follow the guidelines established by the Department of Public Instruction.

a. Parents are informed about procedures for a referral and their verbal approval for such a referral is sought before the process begins.

b. The parochial school principal requests appropriate forms from the building principal of the public school where the student resides.

c. All completed forms are returned to the building principal or to the public school central office, in accordance with the policy of the school district.

d. The parochial school principal keeps a master list of all cases referred for P. L. 94-142 services. Information on this master list should include the name and birthdate of the students, the referral date, and the name of the public school to which the referral was mailed.

e. If no action is taken within the 90-day time limit allowed for the multi-disciplinary team evaluation process, the parochial school principal notifies the Pupil Personnel Services Office to report this fact. A letter will then be

mailed to the appropriate public school personnel to encourage immediate action.

f. If the parents signed a release of the multi-disciplinary team evaluation report as a part of the referral, the parochial school should automatically receive a copy of this report after the evaluation is completed. Upon receipt of this report, the parochial school attempts to follow through with the recommendations outlined in the report. Consultation services in the interpretation and practical application of M-Team reports are available from the Division of Pupil Personnel Services on an invitational basis.

2. If the parents elect not to follow through on the recommendations of the M-Team, the Catholic school will determine whether the student's needs can be met and whether continued enrollment in the Catholic school is in the best interests of the student.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administrators and National School Boards Association. Written Policies for Schoolboards. Washington, D.C.: The Association. 1955.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. Elementary School Policies. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Catholic Education. 1987.
- Archdiocese of Milwaukee. Policies and Regulations. Milwaukee: Archdiocese of Milwaukee Department of Education. 1990.
- Armstrong, Jane, Beverly Anderson, Allan Odden, and Gene Huddle. Maintaining the Momentum for Educational Reform: How States Can Support Local School Improvement. Denver: Education Commission of the States. April 1986. (no. SI-86-1).
- Bardach, Eugene. The Implementation Game. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press. 1977.
- Bauer, Raymond and Kenneth Gergen, eds. The Study of Policy Formation. New York: The Free Press. 1968.
- Berman, Paul and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. I: A Model of Educational Change. Santa Monica, California: Rand. September 1974. (R-1589/1-HEW).
- _____. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, California: Rand. May 1978. (R-1589/8-HEW).
- Bonds, Matthew. "Special Education Programs in an Urban School District: A Focus on Policy Implementation Processes." Ed.D. diss., Vanderbilt University. 1987.

- Bowling, Sr. Ann Virginia. "Two Emerging and Evolving Administrative Structures in Catholic Education in the United States: Diocesan and Parish Boards of Education." Ed.D. diss., Wayne State University. 1968.
- Brady, Charles and Sr. Mary Sarah Fasenmyer, SCL., eds. Giving Form to the Vision. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association. 1974.
- Brent, Daniel and Carolyn Jurkowitz. School Board Study Programs: Board Member's Manual, Series 1. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association. 1983.
- Bryant, James. "An Analysis of the Decision-Making Process of a Catholic School System, with Implications for Organization and Planning." Ph.D. diss., Ohio University. 1969.
- Burdick, Jeanne Helen. "School Boards as an Agent of Change in Administration of Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools in the Archdiocese of Kansas City in Kansas." Ph.D. diss., Kansas State University. 1977.
- Burger, Michael John. "Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation." Ph.D. diss., University of Alberta. 1988.
- Campbell, Roald, Luverne Cunningham, Roderick McPhee and Raphael Nystrand. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus: Charles Merrill Publishing Company. 1970.
- Cerych, Ladislav. "Higher Education Reform: The Process of Implementation (Towards a Conceptual Framework)." Education Policy Bulletin 7 (Spring 1979): 5-21.
- Clemmer, Elwin. The School Policy Handbook. Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon. 1991.
- Christman, Jolley Bruce and Wesley C. Pugh. "Implementing a Systemwide Promotion Policy: Dilemmas for Principals and Teachers in Urban Schools." The Journal of Negro Education 58, no.2. (Spring 1989): 163-176.
- Davies, Daniel and Henry Brickell. How to Develop SchoolBoard Policies and Administrative Regulations. New London, Connecticut: Arthur C. Croft Publications. 1962.

- Davies, Daniel and James Deneen. New Patterns for Catholic Education. New London, Connecticut: Croft Educational Services. 1968.
- Deneen, James. "Status of System-Wide School Boards in Catholic Dioceses in the United States." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University. 1968.
- Drahmann, Brother Theodore, FSC. Governance and Administration in the Catholic School. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Education Association. 1985.
- _____. The Catholic School Principal: An Outline for Action. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association. 1981.
- Duke, Daniel and Robert Lynn Canady. School Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1991.
- Edwards, George C. Implementing Public Policy. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press. 1980.
- _____ and Ira Sharkansky. The Policy Predicament. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company. 1978.
- Elliott, William. "A Model for the Centralization and Decentralization of Policy and Administration in Large Catholic Diocesan School Systems." Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University. 1970.
- Elmore, Richard and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Reform and Retrenchment. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company/The Rand Corporation. 1982.
- Elmore, Richard. "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions." Political Science Quarterly 94, no. 4 (Winter 1979-80): 601-616.
- Fuhrman, Susan, William Clune and Richard Elmore. "Research on Education Reform: Lessons on Implementation of Policy." Teachers College Record 90 (Winter 1988): 237-258.
- Giandomenico, Lawrence. "Do Your Policies Reach from the Boardroom to the Classroom?" New York State School Board Association Journal (November 1989): 28-30.
- Goggin, Malcolm, Ann Bowman, James Lester and Laurence O'Toole, Jr. Implementation Theory and Practice: Toward a Third Generation. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman/ Little, Brown Higher Education. 1990.

- Greeley, Rev. Andrew. "Who Controls Catholic Education?" Education and Urban Society 9, no.2. (February 1977): 147-166.
- Grieder, Calvin, Truman Pierce and K. Forbis Jordan. Public School Administration. New York: The Ronald Press Company. 1969.
- Hall, Gene and Shirley Hord. Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press. 1987.
- Harper, Mary-Angela. Ascent to Excellence in Catholic Education. Waterford, Connecticut: Croft-Noi. 1980.
- _____. Developing Performance Excellence in Catholic Educational Policymaking. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association. 1982.
- _____. "The Principal Factor in Policymaking." Momentum V, no.2. (May 1974): 38-41.
- Hobbs, Addison. "Crossroads of Crisis: Forces at Play in the Policy-Making Arena." American Vocational Journal 51, no. 9 (December 1976): 21-23.
- Hogwood, Brian and Lewis Gunn. Policy Analysis for the Real World. New York: Oxford University Press. 1984.
- Ingram, Helen and Dean Mann, eds. Why Policies Succeed or Fail. Volume 8 - Sage Yearbooks in Politics and Public Policy. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications. 1980.
- Intriligator, Barbara. The Cycle of Special Education Policy: Implications for Policy Research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York., 26 March 1982. ERIC, ED 238 199.
- Knezevich, Stephen. Administration of Public Schools. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc. 1975.
- Knezevich, Stephen and H.C. DeKock. The Iowa School Board Member. Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa Association of School Boards. 1960.
- LaRocque, Linda. "Policy Implementation in a School District." Canadian Journal of Education 11 (1986): 486-508.

- Mazmanian, Daniel and Paul Sabatier, eds. Effective Policy Implementation. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books/D.C. Heath and Company. 1981.
- _____. Implementation and Public Policy. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc. 1989.
- McDonald, Caryl Drolen. "Factors Associated with the Implementation of Initiated State Reform Policy by Selected Illinois School Boards." Ed.D. diss., Northern Illinois University. 1989.
- McIntire, Ronald. "Develop Policies Through Teamwork." The American School Board Journal 169, no. 7 (July 1989) 34, 44.
- McKinney, Sister Mary Benet, OSB. Shared Decision-Making Revisited. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago School Office. 1977.
- McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin. "Learning from Experience: Lessons from Policy Implementation." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 9 (Summer 1987): 171-178.
- Metropolitan Separate School Board of Toronto. Planning for System Improvement in the Metropolitan Separate School Board. Toronto: Metropolitan Separate School Board. 1988.
- Mock, Karen (Principal Investigator). Implementing Race and Ethnocultural Equity Policy in Ontario School Boards. Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Education. 1990.
- Morrill, Leslie. "The Implementation of State Educational Policy: An Analysis of Three Cases in One Administration in Delaware." Ph.D. diss., University of Delaware. 1988.
- Munroe, Mary Lou. "The Development of an Exemplary Model for Regulatory Diocesan Boards of Catholic Education." Ed.D. diss., University of Denver. 1973.
- Murdick, Rev. Olin J. "Catholic Boards of Education." NCEA Bulletin (August 1969): 20-24.
- _____. The Parish School Board. Dayton, Ohio: National Catholic Education Association/NCEA Papers. 1967.

- _____. Voice of the Community. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association. NCEA Papers. Series II No. 7. 1973.
- _____. "Who Runs Catholic Schools: A Model for Shared Responsibility." Notre Dame Journal of Education 6, no. 2. (Summer 1975): 105-191.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Basic Teachings for Catholic Religious Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference. 1973.
- _____. Teach Them. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference. 1976.
- _____. To Teach as Jesus Did. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference. 1973.
- National Society for the Study of Education. Policy Making in Education. The Eighty-first Yearbook, Part I. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1982.
- Nelson, Jay and Lewis Crum. "The Power and Challenges of Local School Boards." American Education 19, no. 10 (December 1983): 10-16.
- O'Brien, Rev. J. Stephen, ed. A Primer on Educational Governance in the Catholic Church. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Education Association. 1987.
- Odden, Allan R., ed. Education Policy Implementation. Albany: State University of New York Press. 1991.
- Planek, Joanne. "An Analysis of Factors Which Interfere With the Full Implementation of Archdiocesan Policies By Local Schoolboards in the Archdiocese of Chicago." Ed.D. diss., Loyola University. 1981.
- Pressman, Jeffrey and Aaron Wildavsky. Implementation. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1979.
- Sabatier, Paul and Daniel Mazmanian. "The Implementation of Public Policy: A Framework of Analysis." Policy Studies Journal 8 (1980): 538-560.
- Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1971.
- School Study Commission. Directions for the Future for Catholic Schools in the Archdiocese of Chicago. Chicago: School Study Commission Report. 1971.

- Schneider, Anne. "Studying Policy Implementation." Evaluation Review 6 (December 1982): 715-730.
- Sheehan, Lourdes, RSM. "A Study of the Functions of School Boards in the Educational System of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States." Ed.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. 1981.
- _____. Building Better Boards: A Handbook for Board Members in Catholic Education. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association. 1990.
- _____. "Catholic School Boards Must Recognize the Authority Structure." Momentum XVI, no. 1 (February 1985): 32-33.
- Smith, Ralph. "Justifying Policy for Aesthetic Education." Studies in Art Education 20, no.1. (1978): 37-42.
- St. John, Walter. "Canons for Canny School Policies." The American School Board Journal 169, no. 7 (July 1982): 33-34.
- The Official Catholic Directory. Wilmette, Illinois: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1992.
- Tymko, J. Lawrence. "Policy Implementation in Education." The Canadian Administrator XX (October 1980): 1-6.
- Vandenbergh, Roland. The Renewed Primary School in Belgium: Analysis of the Local Innovation Policy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, D.C., April 1987. ERIC, ED 284 352.
- Van Horn, Carl E. Policy Implementation in the Federal System. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company. 1979.
- Van Meter, Donald and Carl Van Horn. "The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework." Administration and Society 6 (February 1975): 445-487.
- Ward, Sr. M. Ruth. "Patterns of Administration in Diocesan School Systems." Ph.D. diss., The Catholic University of America: 1957.
- Zantal-Weiner, Katherine Ann. "Implementation of a Disciplinary Policy for Handicapped Students." Ed.D. diss., University of Maryland. 1986.

Zeigler, L. Harmon and M. Kent Jennings with G. Wayne Peak. Governing American Schools. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press. 1974.

Zeigler, L. Harmon and Karl F. Johnson. The Politics of Education in the States. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc. 1972.

Zeigler, L. Harmon and Wayne Peak. The Political Functions of the Educational System. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. 1969.

VITA

The author, Thomas C. Martin, was born in Chicago, Illinois. He is the son of the late Gus and Bernice Martin and brother of Maureen Coniglio. He graduated from St. Patrick High School in 1966.

Mr. Martin earned the Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics in 1970 from Loyola University. He was awarded the Master of Science degree in Mathematics from Northeastern Illinois University in 1972.

The author has been an elementary school principal, secondary school assistant principal and principal, and has taught in high schools and colleges in the Chicago area.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Thomas C. Martin has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max Bailey, Director
Associate Professor and Chair
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Arthur Safer
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Philip Carlin
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

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.

April 16, 1993
Date

Max Bailey
Director's Signature