



University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

8-1-1972

A Study of the Role of the Superintendent of Schools in Teacher Negotiations in Class "C" and "D" School Districts in Nebraska

Samuel Morley Townsend
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Townsend, Samuel Morley, "A Study of the Role of the Superintendent of Schools in Teacher Negotiations in Class "C" and "D" School Districts in Nebraska" (1972). *Student Work*. 2596.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2596>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
IN TEACHER NEGOTIATIONS IN CLASS "C" AND "D"
SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN NEBRASKA

A Field Project
Presented to the
Department of Educational Administration
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

by
Samuel Morley Townsend
August 1972

UMI Number: EP74140

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74140

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of The Graduate College of the
University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree Specialist in Education.

Graduate Committee Gerald Rachtos Educational Administration
Name Department
Jack A. Hill Syst. of Management

Kenneth Bushholder
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
History and Status of Professional Negotiations in Nebraska.	3
Statement of the Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	6
Procedure.	6
Definition of Class C and D Schools.	7
Definition of Terms.	7
Summary.	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	10
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	17
Analysis of Data	28
IV. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	36
APPENDIX "A" - Letters.	38
APPENDIX "B" - Questionnaire.	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. The Number and Percent of Replies on the Question Concerning the Superintendents' Participation in Negotiation and Membership in Local Teacher Association.	19
II. Number and Percent of Roles Engaged in by Superintendents as Either "Teacher Negotiator" or "Board Negotiator"	20
III. Negotiation Activities Engaged in by Superintendents as Executive Officer of the Board.	22
IV. Opinions of Superintendents Concerning Degree of Emphasis Placed on Various Activities Engaged in During the Negotiation Process	25
V. Opinions of the Superintendents on the Role They Will Have in Future Negotiations.	26
VI. Opinions Regarding the Effect That Participation in Negotiations Has Had on the Superintendent as an Educational Leader	27

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the following persons for their valuable suggestions and assistance in preparing this study:

Dr. Kenneth Burkholder, Professor of Educational Administration, under whose valuable guidance this study was prepared.

Dr. George Rachford, Professor of Educational Administration and Dr. Jack Hill, Professor of Business Administration for their helpful suggestions as members of my committee.

The superintendents who assisted materially by completing the questionnaires.

I would also like to give due credit to my wife, Carol, for her inspiration and encouragement through the writing of this study.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Collective bargaining by governmental employees and their employers is a reality in many divisions of state government. As of 1972, twenty-eight of the fifty states had enacted laws governing the process of collective bargaining between the state and its public employees. Seventeen of these twenty-eight states had separate and specific provisions in their laws for the process of collective bargaining between public school teachers and their boards of education.¹

Collective negotiations between teachers and school boards has become a well known fact of life to school administrators in those states where negotiation laws have been enacted.

The advent of negotiations between public school teachers and boards of education brought about a new and different kind of responsibility for the superintendent of schools. This new responsibility was to fulfill a role as an active participant in the negotiation process that had been delegated to him by the local board of education.

Nebraska is one of the states that recently enacted legislation

¹American Association of School Administrators, *Critical Incidents in Negotiation* (Washington, D. C. 1971), p.2.

governing collective negotiations between teachers and boards of education. As had happened in other states this legislation established an additional role for school superintendents in Nebraska to participate in the negotiations proceedings.

The Nebraska Legislature provided for professional negotiations for public school teachers when it passed Legislative Bill 485, the Nebraska Professional Negotiations Act, in 1967. This enactment made it legally permissible for certified employees of a school district to negotiate with their employers on matters of employment conditions.

This new legislative enactment required that boards of education negotiate items of employment conditions submitted to them by teacher representatives. As an executive employee of the board, participation in professional negotiations became an important responsibility in the area of personnel administration and financial management for the superintendent.

Few guidelines exist to help the superintendent, and the negotiation process in education in Nebraska is conducted in a variety of ways. The role played by the superintendent of schools in the negotiation process varies from district to district. The superintendent must judge for himself which role best suits the needs of his school system. An investigation concerning negotiation procedures being used in comparable school districts and the experience of many superintendents in the negotiation procedure would be helpful in establishing guidelines for boards of education and superintendents to follow.

History and Status of Professional Negotiations in Nebraska

Prior to the enactment of professional negotiation legislation in 1967, teachers in many school districts in Nebraska met informally with their boards of education relative to matters of employee relations. Such meetings usually consisted of discussions of items such as salaries, teacher assignment and fringe benefits. The teachers' interest in such items were usually stated as requests or recommendations. The board of education was under no legal obligation to accept the teacher requests and in fact was not required to even discuss such items with teachers should the board choose not to do so.

This situation began to change during the decade of the nineteen fifties. Teachers began to work through their state and national professional organizations to secure legislation to make collective bargaining with boards of education permissible. These efforts were intensified in 1962 when the National Education Association, the largest professional teacher organization, representing approximately one million teachers, passed a resolution which insisted on the right of professional teacher associations to participate with boards of education in the determination of policies of common concern, including salary and other conditions of employment.²

With this beginning the National Education Association, along

²Robert Woodworth and Richard Peterson, Collective Negotiation For Public And Professional Employees (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co. 1969), p. 322.

with state associations, began to work diligently for the right to bargain collectively for their membership. These efforts resulted in many state legislatures passing legislation providing for professional negotiations between boards of education and teachers and for the right of the professional organization to intervene in the process.

The Nebraska Professional Negotiations Act, which was enacted in 1967, was permissive in nature, but provided a meeting ground for boards of education and recognized teacher groups to meet and negotiate. This act applied only to certified teaching personnel and did not include other employees of the school board.

The 1967 act provided that when and if negotiations between teacher groups and school boards resulted in an agreement, the school board must adopt the agreement as part of the school district policy and must also adopt rules and regulations for the administration of such policy.

The act further provided that if the parties were unable to agree and a deadlock or impasse occurred, the dispute should be submitted to a fact-finding board. Detailed procedures for setting up the fact-finding board were also outlined in the act. Although the fact-finding board's recommendations were to be received in good faith they were not legally binding on the board of education.

While negotiations, as provided in the 1967 Legislative Bill 485, were permissive in nature, the Nebraska Legislature passed more precise legislation on December 25, 1969. On that date Legislative Bill 15 became law. This enactment provided that

in negotiations which did not result in an agreement as outlined in Legislative Bill 485, the unresolved issues should go directly to the Court of Industrial Relations which would decide the unresolved issues. The 1969 law also allowed teachers to take all issues for negotiation directly to the Court of Industrial Relations should a board of education refuse to recognize or negotiate with the teacher group. Therefore, Nebraska has two separate laws concerning professional negotiations in education.

Currently, the status of professional negotiations in Nebraska is that from a legal point of view the provisions are well outlined. However, the procedures to be followed by teacher groups, boards of education and administrators across the state are many and varied. As a result, some confusion exists as to the proper role to be played and the procedures to be used by each of these groups.

Statement of the Problem

No major investigation has been completed regarding the superintendent's role in the professional negotiation procedure in public education in Nebraska. This is particularly true in the small schools of the State. By obtaining information regarding the superintendent's role and the activities engaged in relative to negotiations it should be possible to help establish the kind of posture the superintendent should hold during the process to make his role most effective in the process.

In the smaller schools of Nebraska few, if any, guidelines are available to determine what role the superintendent should assume in the negotiation process and how it should be carried out to

utilize the superintendent most effectively in the local school district.

Purpose of the Study

This study of the superintendent's role and activities engaged in during professional negotiations between teacher groups and boards of education in the smaller schools in Nebraska was undertaken with the following purposes in mind: (1) To identify those activities relative to negotiations engaged in by the superintendent of Class C and D schools in Nebraska; (2) To determine the role the superintendents hold regarding negotiations; (3) To determine the impact that negotiations have had on the superintendency as a position of educational leadership; (4) To evaluate the role of the superintendent in the negotiation process.

Procedure

Because of the wide geographical distribution of the schools involved it was decided that a questionnaire was the most effective way to collect the information relating to the problem. It was considered that an analysis of the items in the questionnaire would yield the information needed concerning the activities of the superintendents.

The subjects from whom the information was collected were the superintendents in the Class C and D schools in Nebraska as taken from the October 1970, bulletin of the Nebraska School Activities Association.

There was a total of 274 Class C and D schools in Nebraska

in 1970. To keep the data manageable it was determined to use one-third of the schools for the study. Excluding the non-public schools, in which the negotiation law was not applicable, there was a total of 237 public schools. By the use of a set of random sample tables one-third or seventy-nine schools were selected to be included in the study. The seventy-nine superintendents of these schools were sent a questionnaire and requested to respond.

Definition of Class C and D Schools

The Nebraska School Activities Association classifies Nebraska high schools from largest to smallest according to male enrollment in the top four grades. The thirty-two largest schools make up class A. This group had a male enrollment range from 348 to 1,661 male students. The next sixty-four schools which make up class B had a male enrollment range from 129 to 332. The next one hundred and twenty-eight schools were included in class C. The class C group ranged from 57 to 128 in male enrollment. The remaining schools made up the class D group. The class D group ranged from an enrollment of 6 to an enrollment of 57 males. This study was limited to schools in the C and D group.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they are used in the study.

Collective bargaining - The process by which teachers, through their designated representatives, negotiate with a board of education, through its designated representatives. The items for consideration refer to salary, working conditions, and other

matters of mutual interest to the negotiating parties.

Impasse - A deadlock reached after a reasonable period of time in which good faith negotiations have been carried on and the parties were unable to resolve some or all of the issues involved.

Fact-finding - A process of investigation of an impasse in negotiation for the purpose of determining the relevant facts and analyzing the issues that underlie a dispute, so that a report may be filed with both parties, with recommendations for a settlement of the unresolved issues.

Negotiation laws - Statutes passed by state legislatures governing the conduct of negotiation and establishing the general guidelines under which professional negotiation in school systems may be carried out.

Negotiation teams - Individuals or groups engaged in actual negotiation, one group representing teachers and the other group representing the board of education.

Summary

In Nebraska two laws govern negotiations between public school teachers and their boards of education. Legislative Bill 485, enacted in 1967, provided authority for boards of education to negotiate with teacher groups on a voluntary basis. This was permissive legislation. In 1969, Legislative Bill 15, which provided the basis of negotiation for all public employees in the state became law. As a provision of this law, teacher groups were empowered to employ its provisions after exhausting all possibilities

under Legislative Bill 485. This later law made negotiations between boards of education and teacher groups mandatory for both parties involved.

This study was undertaken to determine, summarize, and evaluate the role of the superintendent of schools in the small school districts of Nebraska in the collective bargaining process between the local teacher organization and the board of education in class C and D school districts in Nebraska and to determine the related activities in which the superintendent engages during the negotiation process.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Collective bargaining as a formal process in the field of education is relatively new when compared to the period of time over which the negotiation process has been developed between labor and management in industry. As a result there is a limited amount of material directly related to the problems in the field of education.

The sources of literature reviewed for this study were from books and periodicals which dealt most directly with negotiations in education. Articles were selected that provided material on the history and development of professional negotiations in the public school. Special emphasis was given to articles concerning the role of the superintendent in negotiations.

Attitudes of boards of education, state laws, and teacher-administrator relationships are important factors in determining the role of superintendents in the negotiation process. As stated in a publication from the American Association of School Administrators the role of the superintendent would be determined by a number of factors.

First, his own philosophy toward negotiation and personal preferences will have a major bearing on the role he will assume. Secondly, the board of education may dictate how he will function. Thirdly, state statutes often specify his role. Fourthly, the current climate of teacher-administration relations and the history of those relationships will have a bearing on the matter. A fifth factor may well be the degree to which influence from teacher organizations at the state and national levels is exerted upon the local organization to press for a certain pattern of negotiation procedure.¹

In order to clarify and define their respective positions boards of education and superintendents often need to draw up guidelines spelling out specifically the role of both the superintendent and the board in the negotiation process. In his book, Guide to School Law, Nolte confirmed this statement and also indicated that the positions of each would depend upon their ability to clarify their roles.

Each board, working with its superintendent, must come to grips with the problems inherent in collective bargaining for teachers, and draw up sound guidelines to control the activities of each. In some instances, the role of the superintendent will no doubt be greatly strengthened; in others it will be weakened, depending upon the extent to which the superintendent and board can clarify roles and follow them.²

To serve on a negotiating team and at the same time to maintain a position of educational leadership are opposing roles that

¹American Association of School Administrators, The School Administrator and Negotiation (Washington, D. C. 1968), p. 11.

²Chester Nolte, Guide to School Law (West Nyack: Parker Publishing Co. 1969), p. 16.

would be difficult for the superintendent to maintain. The superintendent, as a member of the management team, should participate in the negotiations from a position that would enable him to provide objective advice to the board of education. At the same time he should not be placed in a position which would alienate him from the teachers because his effectiveness in an educational leadership role depends upon his rapport with the teaching staff. Dempsey and Hartman took this position in the following statement from their book Collective Bargaining in Public Education: A Manual for School Administrators and Boards of Education.

By not sitting in on the collective negotiations, the superintendent of schools is in a much better position to view the negotiations that are underway in a way that is more clear than if he is actively involved. He is thus in a better position to give the board of education objective advice about the progress of negotiations. Perhaps the most important factor in not having the superintendent sit at the bargaining table is that he can maintain an image of being a friend of the teachers rather than the person who is taking bread from the children of the teachers.³

Not only should the superintendent strive to develop a feeling of mutual trust and understanding between himself and the teachers, he should also strive to develop the same feeling between the board of education and the teachers. Heald and Moore agreed that one of the superintendent's more important roles was to establish a respected relationship between the board and faculty as shown in

³Richard A. Dempsey and Lloyd C. Hartman, Collective Bargaining in Public Education: A Manual for School Administrators and Boards of Education (Swarthmore, Pa: A. C. Croft, Inc. 1970), p. 36.

this statement taken from their book on administrative relationships.

It is suggested here that the most appropriate role for the superintendent takes place long before negotiations become a reality within a local district. His most important role is to establish a history of respected working relationship between boards and faculties which can serve as a basis for mutual trust and understanding when the negotiating process comes to his community. This role requires that he provide for extensive interaction between his board and his faculty and that he seek every opportunity to place each in a good light with the other.⁴

While the role of the superintendent of schools as the administrative and executive officer of the board of education has been well defined he must also insure fair treatment of school employees by the board and, at the same time, maintain a wholesome relationship between the teachers and the people in the local community as shown in this statement by Hill and Colmey:

School systems cannot remain aloof from the main stream of history. School employees have a right to expect all the prerogatives of first class citizenship. Wise leadership on the part of all concerned will insure the development of fair and lasting patterns of school employee-community relationships.⁵

Lee Garber, who has long been a recognized authority in the field of school law, stated in an article written for the Nation's Schools that the superintendent should not be cast in

⁴James E. Heald and Samuel A. Moore, The Teacher and Administrative Relationships in School Systems (New York: Macmillian Co. 1968), p. 259.

⁵Frederick W. Hill and James W. Colmey, School Business Administration in the Smaller Community (Minneapolis: T. S. Denison Co. 1964), p. 309.

a role in the negotiation process that would have an adverse affect on his recognized position as educational leader. The following statement summarizes his position:

Experience shows and authorities agree, that putting the superintendent in the position of negotiator casts him in the role of an adversary to teachers. A role that conflicts with his currently recognized position as educational leader. A superintendent can't oppose teachers on certain matters, such as money, and be recognized as their leader on others.⁶

Members of the Educational Policies Commission in their 1965 publication viewed the superintendent as acting in a dual role in the negotiation process representing both the school board and the professional staff. The major purpose of this dual role should be to assist both groups in reaching an agreement that is of interest to all and serves to improve education at the same time.

Increasingly, teachers and their organizations are seeking and obtaining a role in the formulation of major policies, especially on personnel matters which affect the quality of their teaching, such as salaries and conditions of service. This is a development which should be encouraged, but many questions remain unanswered about the proper role of the superintendent in such negotiations. That he should have an important role is obvious. In these crucially important situations, the superintendent must act simultaneously as agent of the school board and as leader of the professional staff. He must have the confidence of board and staff and must stimulate and facilitate the finding of a

⁶Lee O. Garber, "How to Free Superintendents From Negotiation Hazards," Nation's Schools. March 1966. p. 139.

consensus which expresses the common interest of all parties in improvement of education.⁷

In industry and in the private sector of the economy the roles of the participants are more clearly defined and understood than in education. A certain amount of role ambiguity exists in negotiations in public education, particularly concerning the role of the superintendent of schools. The following quotation from the "Superintendent's Dilemma" which appeared in the American School Board Journal points out this problem for superintendents.

Role ambiguity and role conflict in collective negotiations are unique to public education. In the private sector of the American economy the negotiation process is viewed as a dyadic relationship between the employees and the employer. In public education, however, because of historic factors the negotiations process is perceived as a triadic relationship involving the employees (teachers), employer (school board), and chief school officer.⁸

A review of current literature shows that since collective bargaining is a relatively new concept in education it has not developed clear cut, well-defined roles for the participants in the process. The position of superintendent of schools is the position which most needs clarification since this position is one in which, traditionally, the occupant served as a representative of the board of education and as a leader in the educational program.

There is general agreement among authorities that the superintendent can best fill his role by serving as the administrator

⁷Educational Policies Commission, The Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools (Washington, D. C. National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1965), p. 12.

⁸Seymour Evans, "Superintendent's Dilemma," American School Board Journal, November 1967, p. 10.

for the board of education, but not to serve as a member of the negotiating team.

To illustrate this point, the statement in The Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools best illustrates this dual position of the superintendent.

In these crucially important situations, the superintendent must act simultaneously as agent of the school board and as leader of the professional staff.⁹

⁹Educational Policies Commission, loc. cit.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine what the role of the superintendent of schools was considered to be by superintendents of small schools in Nebraska who were involved in the negotiation process, to summarize the activities in this process and to evaluate that role in which superintendents of school engaged during the negotiation process between teacher groups and boards of education.

Data for this study were secured from superintendents in Class C and D schools in Nebraska by use of a questionnaire. A total of seventy-nine questionnaires were mailed to these superintendents and sixty-nine were returned, a return of 87.3 percent.

In 1971 there were 274 Class C and D schools in Nebraska. It was determined to use one-third of the schools for the study. Excluding the non-public schools, in which the negotiation law was not applicable, there was a total of 237 public schools. By the use of a set of random sample tables, one-third or seventy-nine schools were selected for inclusion in the study. These seventy-nine superintendents were sent a questionnaire and requested to respond.

To determine whether the items in the questionnaire were stated clearly as well as how the items would be interpreted, a pilot study was conducted by sending the questionnaire to ten superintendents not included in the seventy-nine selected to participate

in the study. No suggestions for changes or clarification in the questionnaire were received from these ten superintendents.

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to find out how many superintendents participated in the negotiation process between their boards of education and the teachers.

As can be seen in the data in Table 1 forty-eight superintendents, or 69.6 percent of the respondents, stated that their school boards negotiated with certified employees as provided by law in Legislative Bill 485. Six of the sixty-nine respondents or 8.7 percent indicated they negotiated informally or in some manner other than the procedure outlined in the statute.

Almost three-fourths, or 73.9 percent of the superintendents who participated in the study were members of the local teachers' association in their school, and three or 4.3 percent of them were officers in their local associations. Also shown in Table I fifty superintendents or 72.5 percent of those who replied to the questionnaire were participants in the negotiation process between the local school board and teacher association representatives.

TABLE I

THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF REPLIES ON THE QUESTION
CONCERNING THE SUPERINTENDENTS' PARTICIPATION
IN NEGOTIATION AND MEMBERSHIP IN LOCAL
TEACHER ASSOCIATION

Item	Number of Yes Replies	Percent	Number of No Replies	Percent
Does your school's board of education or its representatives negotiate with the certified employees of the school on matters of employee relations as outlined in Legislative Bill 485?	48	69.6	21	30.4
Are you a member of the local teachers' association in your school?	51	73.9	18	26.1
If the answer to the above question is yes, do you hold an office in the association?	3	4.3	48	69.6
Do you as superintendent of schools participate in the negotiations between the teacher association and board representatives?	50	72.5	19	27.5
Number of schools which negotiate in some manner other than as outlined in Legislative Bill 485	6	8.7	63	91.3
Number reporting	69	-	-	-

Since the negotiations process was a relatively new one for superintendents and boards of education it was important to determine how the superintendent viewed his role in this process.

As can be seen in Table II some superintendents saw their role as representing the teachers while others saw themselves as representing the board of education in the negotiation process. Five superintendents stated they were spokesman for teachers while eleven stated they were spokesman for the board of education. Forty-three superintendents stated they participated in negotiations in some way representing the teachers and sixty-four stated they had this same role for the board of education. As can be seen in Table II the superintendents who replied to the questionnaire had not agreed on which side of the bargaining table their position placed them.

TABLE II

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF ROLES ENGAGED IN BY SUPERINTENDENTS
AS EITHER "TEACHER NEGOTIATOR" OR "BOARD NEGOTIATOR"

Role	Teacher Negotiator		Board Negotiator	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Spokesman	5	7.2	11	15.9
Recorder	2	2.9	7	10.1
Researcher	8	11.6	27	39.1
Advisor	29	42.0	48	69.6
Interested Observer	18	26.1	11	15.9
No Answer	26	37.7	5	7.2
Number of Replies	43	62.3	64	92.8
Total	69	-	69	-

Boards of education employ a chief administrative officer who carries out the policy decisions made by the board. This chief administrative officer, the superintendent, engages in a variety of activities related to the policies and it was considered important to this study to determine what those activities were and to what extent superintendents in small schools in Nebraska engaged in these activities.

Table III shows the variety of activities in which superintendents engaged during negotiations between teachers and boards of education. As can be seen superintendents were actively involved in the planning for negotiations. This was shown by the fact that 88.4 percent of the superintendents normally attended planning sessions held by the board. Fifty-six of the sixty-nine who answered this question or 81.2 percent attended joint meetings held with boards from other districts. Twenty-two superintendents or almost one-third served on the boards negotiating team.

The superintendents were in close contact with each other during negotiations as shown by the fact that fifty-nine or 85.5 percent communicated with neighboring superintendents regarding negotiations.

To show further the high interest which superintendents had concerning negotiations forty-six or two-thirds of the respondents attended schools or workshops about negotiations.

Thirty-two or almost half the superintendents stated they wrote the negotiated agreement.

TABLE III

NEGOTIATION ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY SUPERINTENDENTS
AS EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE BOARD

Activity	Number	Percent
Normally attend all planning sessions held by the board	61	88.4
Attend joint meetings of your board and boards of other districts	56	81.2
Serve on the board's negotiating team	22	31.9
Handle correspondence relative to negotiations	54	78.3
Issue press releases regarding negotiations	30	43.5
Develop proposals and counter proposals	34	49.3
Do cost studies on various proposals	51	73.9
Communicate with neighboring superintendents regarding negotiations	59	85.5
Attend negotiation schools and workshops	46	66.7
Write the negotiated agreement	32	46.4
Number replying	61	88.4
No answer	8	11.6
Total	69	

As a result of the experience which the superintendents had with the negotiation process, it was considered that their opinions would be important in developing their role further. These opinions are shown in Table IV.

The data in Table IV shows that twenty superintendents or almost thirty percent were of the opinion that more emphasis should

be placed on attending planning sessions held by the board. Only one superintendent stated that he thought less emphasis should be placed on this activity.

Boards of education often held joint planning and discussion meetings with other boards regarding professional negotiations. The superintendent was not always involved in such sessions. Table IV shows that twenty-three or 33.3 percent of the respondents stated more emphasis should be placed on having the superintendent attend such meetings. There were no superintendents who stated they thought less emphasis should be placed on this activity.

As shown in the data in Table IV only eight of sixty-nine or 11.6 percent of the superintendents reporting thought more emphasis should be placed on his serving on the board's negotiating team.

Table IV indicates that more than half or 56.5 percent of the superintendents stated that the handling of correspondence relative to negotiation should be held at about the same degree of participation as at the present time.

Twenty-eight or 40.6 percent of the administrators stated they thought they should not participate in the development of proposals and counter proposals.

A total of 29.0 percent of the superintendents expressed the opinion that they should participate to a greater degree in doing cost studies on various proposals as shown by the data in Table IV. A total of ten or 14.5 percent of the superintendents expressed the opinion that they should not participate in this activity.

Superintendents regarded communications with each other as an important activity regarding negotiations. This is shown by the

data in Table IV that reveals that 33.3 percent of the respondents thought more emphasis should be placed on communicating with neighboring superintendents on negotiations.

Table IV also shows that 42.0 percent or twenty-nine respondents to the item stated they should participate more in negotiation schools and workshops. Twenty of the superintendents were of the opinion they should continue at about the same degree of participation in negotiation schools.

Table IV shows that 23.2 percent of the superintendents replying stated they should not participate in the writing of the agreement negotiated between the board and teacher groups.

TABLE IV
 OPINIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS CONCERNING DEGREE OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON VARIOUS
 ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN DURING THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS

Activities Participated in by Superintendents	Degree and Percent of Opinions Held by Superintendents										Number Replies	No Answer	Total
	MORE		LESS		ABOUT SAME		NONE		No.	Percent			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent					
Attend Planning Sessions Held by Board of Education	20	29.0	1	1.4	41	59.4	0	0.0			62	7	69
Joint Meetings of Own and Other Boards of Education	23	33.3	0	0.0	31	44.9	0	0.0			54	15	69
Serving on the Board's Negotiating Team	8	11.6	5	7.2	10	14.5	38	55.1			61	8	69
Handling Correspondence Relative to Negotiations	11	15.9	3	4.3	39	56.5	8	11.6			61	8	69
Issuing Press Releases on Negotiations	6	8.7	3	4.3	23	33.3	29	42.0			61	8	69
Developing proposals and Counter Proposals	9	13.0	3	4.3	21	30.4	28	40.6			61	8	69
Do Cost Studies of Various Proposals	20	29.0	1	1.4	30	43.5	10	14.5			61	8	69
Communicating with Neigh- boring Superintendents	23	33.3	2	2.9	34	49.3	2	2.9			61	8	69
Attending Negotiation Workshops and Schools	29	42.0	1	1.4	20	29.0	4	5.8			54	15	69
Write Negotiated Agreement	8	11.6	3	4.3	21	30.4	16	23.2			48	21	69

The superintendents were divided in their opinions regarding their role in future negotiations. This fact is shown by the data in Table V which shows that 29.0 percent of the superintendents were of the opinion their role would decrease in future negotiations. However, 23.2 percent of the superintendents did not share this opinion. They stated their role would increase. Slightly less than half or 47.8 percent thought the future role would remain about the same.

TABLE V

OPINIONS OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS ON THE ROLE THEY
WILL HAVE IN FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS

Role in future Negotiations	Number Replying	Percent
Will increase	16	23.2
Will stay about the same	33	47.8
Will decrease	20	29.0
Number Replying	69	100.0

Table VI yields data regarding the impact that participation in negotiation has had on the effectiveness of the superintendent as an educational leader. Table VI shows that slightly more than one-half or 58.0 percent of the superintendents stated it had not changed their effectiveness. Table VI also shows that 13.0 percent or nine of the superintendents thought that participation in negotiations had increased their effectiveness. It was also noted in this data that 14.5 percent stated that participation in the negotiations process had been detrimental to the point of making them ineffective as an educational leader. Three respondents wrote on their questionnaire that it had been detrimental but not to the point of total ineffectiveness.

TABLE VI

OPINIONS REGARDING THE EFFECT THAT PARTICIPATION IN
NEGOTIATIONS HAS HAD ON THE SUPERINTENDENT AS
AN EDUCATIONAL LEADER

Changes in effectiveness	Number replying	Percent
None	40	58.0
Greatly increased	9	13.0
Detrimental to the point of making Superintendent ineffective as an educational leader	10	14.5
Number replying	59	
No answer	10	14.5
Total	69	100.0

Analysis of Data

A wide range of activities regarding negotiations were found to be engaged in by the sixty-nine superintendents that responded to the questionnaire. More specifically fifty of the sixty-nine superintendents stated they participated in some way in the negotiation process between teacher groups and boards of education.

The three activities most actively participated in by the superintendents regarding negotiations were; attendance at planning sessions held by the board of education, communications with superintendents in other schools regarding negotiations, and attendance at joint meeting with the local board and boards from other districts.

In another section of the questionnaire the respondent superintendents were asked to give their opinions on the importance they thought should be placed on their participation in several activities concerning negotiations. These data show that 33.3 percent of the administrators stated they thought more emphasis should be placed on the attendance at joint meetings with other boards of education.

It was evident that most of the superintendents were of the opinion they should not participate as a member of the board's negotiating team. This was shown by the fact that only 11.6 percent of the superintendents thought more emphasis should be placed on his serving on the negotiating team.

Increased in-service training and professional growth in the field of professional negotiations may be needed by the superintendents. In support of this statement the data shows that 42 percent of the administrators thought more emphasis should be placed on attendance

at negotiation schools and workshops.

There were only eight superintendents or 11.6 percent that stated more emphasis should be placed on writing the negotiated agreement as a role for the administrator. This fact may indicate more need for an attorney to perform this activity in negotiations.

Twenty, or slightly more than one-fourth of the superintendents were of the opinion their future role in negotiations would decrease.

Ten superintendents indicated that participation in negotiations had been detrimental to their role as the educational leader in the local school.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study of the superintendent's role and activities engaged in during professional negotiations between teacher groups and boards of education in the smaller schools in Nebraska was undertaken with the following purposes in mind: (1) To identify those activities relative to negotiations engaged in by the superintendents of Class C and D schools in Nebraska; (2) To determine the role the superintendents held regarding negotiations; (3) To determine the impact that negotiations have had on the superintendency as a position of educational leadership; (4) To evaluate the role of the superintendent in the negotiation process.

It was important to understand the character of the group of schools with which this study was made. At the time of the study the Nebraska School Activities Association classified Nebraska high schools from largest to smallest according to male enrollment in the top four grades. The thirty-two largest schools made up Class A schools which had an enrollment range from 348 to 1,661 male students. The next smaller sixty-four schools made up Class B with a range from 129 to 332 male students. The next one hundred and twenty-eight schools were identified as Class C and had an enrollment range from 57 to 128 male students. The remaining schools in Nebraska comprised the Class D

group. Class D ranges were from 6 to an enrollment of 57 male students.

This study was limited to schools in the C and D group because they were smaller and had available to them less professional outside help than larger schools which were in a better position to call upon outside resources. The small school superintendent also has few or no administrative assistants upon whom he can call for help in carrying out his executive duties.

A wide and varying range of activities regarding professional negotiations were found to be engaged in by the superintendents. Sixty-nine out of a total of seventy-nine superintendents included in the study responded to a questionnaire. Analysis of the questionnaires received showed that administrators in Nebraska were actively involved in negotiations in their respective school districts. More specifically 72.5 percent or fifty of the superintendents stated they participated in some way in the negotiations process.

According to the study, a number of superintendents continued to maintain membership in the local teachers' association, and a very small number held office in the state or national association.

Often the superintendent served both the local board and the teachers in the capacity of advisor. In a few cases he served as the spokesman for the teachers or for the board in negotiations.

Three activities in the order of actual participation were first, the attendance at planning sessions held by the board with 88.4 percent of the superintendents participating, which indicated they were deeply involved in negotiations.

The second activity in which the superintendent participated

was communications with superintendents in other schools regarding negotiation. This seemed to indicate that schools, through their chief administrator, maintained close contact on the matter of negotiations. Many superintendents commented on the importance of this activity.

Third, as indicated by the superintendents, attendance at joint meetings with the local board and boards from other districts was an important activity. Again, this item seemed to indicate that superintendents and boards of education regarded planning as an activity of importance in the negotiation proceedings.

Another part of the questionnaire was the section in which the superintendents were asked to give their opinions on the importance they thought should be placed on their participation in selected activities regarding the negotiation process. This was considered to be an important part of the study because it was felt that some superintendents might be fulfilling certain roles which they thought were inappropriate. One of the most interesting points gathered from the opinions was the fact that 33.3 percent of the respondent superintendents stated they thought more emphasis should be placed on their attendance at joint board meetings with other school districts, and 42.0 percent placed more emphasis on negotiation schools and workshops. This seemed to indicate the need for more professional growth and in-service training in the field of professional negotiations. This would enable the administrator to increase his knowledge of professional negotiations.

Slightly more than one-fourth or 29.0 percent of the superintendents were of the opinion that their future participation in negotiations

would decrease.

Ten superintendents stated that they thought that their participation in negotiations had been very detrimental to their role as the educational leader in the local school system.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings in this study, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. There was little general agreement among the superintendents surveyed and thus among superintendents of small school districts in Nebraska concerning the role of the superintendent in the negotiation process. They appeared to be confused and in the relatively short period of time since the legislation was enacted had not developed a pattern for resolving their problems.
2. More than half of the superintendents in the survey or 73.9 percent belonged to the local professional teacher organization as well as being the chief executive officer of the school system.
3. Most superintendents participated in the negotiations process in some way in the local district.
4. A few schools did not follow the established pattern in the negotiation process as outlined in the enabling legislation.
5. More than half of the superintendents surveyed handled the correspondence concerned with negotiations.

6. Most of the superintendents consulted with other superintendents concerning negotiations. The superintendents also indicated a desire to attend negotiation workshops and indicated a need for more information and help in solving their problems relative to negotiations.
7. With some few exceptions the weight of opinion among the superintendents was that they thought they were placing about the right amount of emphasis on the activities in which they were engaged regarding negotiations.

Recommendations

As a result of this study and the conclusions which have been reached the following recommendations are made:

1. It is recommended that the State Department of Education or Nebraska State School Boards Association or some other official agency set up guidelines under which Boards of Education and superintendents representing these boards can operate in all the negotiations process in a consistent manner.
2. It is recommended that superintendents recognize their inability to represent both the teachers and their board of education at the same time and that their major responsibility in this regard is to the board of education.
3. It is recommended that the superintendent of schools not serve as a negotiator in the negotiation proceedings in order to maintain his allegiance to the board and his

integrity with the teachers.

4. It is recommended that the superintendent of schools furnish data concerning costs of operation and other financial considerations which are and should be open to public scrutiny as needed by the negotiating participants.
5. It is recommended that local boards of education make use of an attorney in writing the agreement that is negotiated with the teachers' association with the superintendent providing information and assistance as needed.
6. It is recommended that the superintendent maintain a position as an observer of the proceedings and report to the board of education the result of these observations.

These recommendations are based on the findings of this study and are written to apply to the superintendents in Class C and D schools in Nebraska.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administrators. Critical Incidents in Negotiation (Washington, D. C. 1971), p. 2.
- Dempsey, Richard A. and Lloyd C. Hartman. Collective Bargaining in Public Education: A Manual for School Administrators and Boards of Education. Swarthmore, Pa: A. C. Croft, Inc., 1970, p. 36.
- Educational Policies Commission. The Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1965, p. 12.
- Head, James E. and Samuel A. Moore. The Teacher and Administrative Relationships in School Systems. New York: Macmillan Co. 1968, p. 259.
- Hill, Frederick W. and James W. Colmey. School Business Administration in the Smaller Community. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison Co. 1964, p. 309.
- Nolte, Chester. Guide to School Law. West Nyack: Parker Publishing Co. 1969. p. 16.
- Woodworth, Robert and Richard Peterson. Collective Negotiation for Public and Professional Employees. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co. 1969, p. 346.

Periodicals

- Evans, Seymour. "Superintendent's Dilemma," American School Board Journal, November 1967, p. 10.
- Garber, Lee O. "How to Free Superintendents from Negotiation Hazards," Nation's Schools, March 1966. p. 139.

APPENDIX "A"

Sam Townsend, Supt.
Clay Center Schools
Box 125
Clay Center, Nebr. 68933

Dear Superintendent:

I am in the process of completing the requirements for my specialist degree in educational administration at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

The final requirement is the field study for which I have selected a study concerning the superintendent's role in professional negotiations in class "C" and "D" schools in Nebraska. In order to test the questionnaire before mailing it to a random sampling of schools, I am mailing it to ten superintendents and requesting their assistance by completing it and returning it to me in the enclosed envelope. The purpose of this procedure is to correct the questionnaire on items where it is not clearly understood. Please write any comments you may have on any of the items at the bottom of page 3 after question 9.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated and I will gladly make results of the study available to you should you desire them after its completion.

Respectfully,

Sam Townsend

Sam Townsend, Supt.
Clay Center Schools
Box 125
Clay Center, Nebr. 68933

Dear Superintendent:

I am in the process of completing the requirements for the specialist degree in educational administration at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. My field study for the degree concerns the role of the superintendent in negotiations in class C and D school districts in Nebraska.

I am taking this means to request your help on the study by completing the enclosed questionnaire which should require only a small amount of time. A stamp self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire.

All information on the questionnaire will be reported in summary form and not be identified with a particular school.

I wish to thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

Respectfully,

Sam Townsend

APPENDIX "B"

Questionnaire

1. Name of School _____
2. Does your school's board of education or its representatives negotiate with the certificated employees of the school on matters of employee relations as outlined in Legislative Bill 485?

Yes ___ No ___

3. Are you a member of the local teacher's association in your school?

Yes ___ No ___

4. If the answer to question number 3 is yes do you hold an office in the association?

Yes ___ No ___

5. Do you as superintendent of schools participate in the negotiations between the teacher association and the board representatives?

Yes ___ No ___

6. Included below are several roles listed under teacher negotiator and board negotiator, please check the role that you feel best describes your role in the negotiation process.

Teacher Negotiator

___ Spokesman

___ Recorder

___ Researcher

___ Advisor

___ Interested Observer

Board Negotiator

___ Spokesman

___ Recorder

___ Researcher

___ Advisor

___ Interested Observer

Note: Please complete the remaining questions only if you feel your role in the negotiation process is one that represents the board of education.

7. In fulfilling your responsibilities as superintendent and executive officer of the board of education please check below at the left the activities in which you participate regarding the negotiation process.

Instructions for the Check List

In the check list the writer is attempting to determine the activities in which you participate and at the right the degree to which you feel the superintendent should participate. The terms More, Less and About Same mean in comparison to the level at which you are now participating. The term None for example would mean you feel the superintendent should not participate in that particular activity.

Place a check in the appropriate column
More Less About Same None

- A. Normally attend all planning sessions held by the board.....
- B. Attend joint meetings of your board and boards of other districts
- C. Serve on the board's negotiating team.....
- D. Handle correspondence relative to negotiations.....
- E. Issue press releases regarding negotiations.....
- F. Develop proposals and counter proposals.....
- G. Do cost studies on various proposals.....
- H. Communicate with neighboring superintendents regarding negotiations
- I. Attend negotiation schools and workshops.....
- J. Write the negotiated agreement.....

8. Please indicate below the extent to which you feel the role the superintendent will have in the future in negotiations.

___ will increase.

___ will stay about the same.

___ will decrease.

9. The professional negotiations act became law in Nebraska in 1967. Since that time negotiations are an annual occurrence in most schools in the state. The Superintendents have had varying roles from school to school in the negotiation process. Please indicate below the effect you feel this role in negotiation has had on the superintendent as the educational leader in the school.

___ No effect.

___ Greatly increased his effectiveness.

___ Has been detrimental to the point of making the superintendency totally ineffective.