72-4818

AUKEE, Waino Eric, 1931-
A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND THE PROFESSIONAL WELFARE OF ADMINISTRATORS.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1971
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND THE PROFESSIONAL WELFARE OF ADMINISTRATORS

by
Waino Eric Aukee

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirments for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1971

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Frederick W. Bertolaet, Chairman
Assistant Professor Gerald G. Mansergh
Assistant Professor George Mills
Assistant Professor J. Bonner Ritchie

PLEASE NOTE:

Some Pages have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is appreciative of all the individuals who in various ways assisted in the preparation of the study. The many individuals are too numerous to name here, however several deserve particular recognition.

To his adviser, Dr. Frederick W. Bertolaet, the constant support and guiding hand in this study, a special debt of thanks is owed for his many suggestions, encouragement and time. A special note of thanks to Dr. Lester Anderson who had over the years had an influence in my pursuit of graduate education.

To the committee members, Dr. Gerald Mansergh, Dr. George Mills and Dr. J. Bonner Ritchie goes my sincere appreciation for their valuable suggestions and concerns.

A special thanks is offered to the Executive Board of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., for sponsoring this research and encouraging Bureau member administrators to provide the data. Acknowledgments are also extended to the administrators of the Bureau service area who participated in interviews and completed questionnaires.

To Mrs. Arlene Phillips, the author is grateful for the expert typing of this manuscript.

Finally, the author is forever grateful to his wife, Sylvia, for her support, patience and love during the completion of the doctoral program.

Waino Eric Aukee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii

CHAPTER		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background of the Study	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Significance of the Study	2
	Relationship to Other Studies	8
	Setting of the Study	12
	Data Gathering Procedures	12
	Scope and Limitations of the Study	16
	Questions to be Considered in the Study	18
	Definition of Terms	19
	Summary	20
	Organization of the Study	21
II	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	22
	Introduction	22
	The Management Team Concept in School Administration	23
	The Management Team Concept in the Industrial Commercial Context	26
	Current Issues in the Area of Administrator Welfare	31
	Summary	39
III	FINDINGS -- SALARY AND WELFARE STUDIES	41
	Introduction	41
	Administrator Salaries 1964-65 and 1969-70	42
	Welfare and Fringe Benefits Reported for 1969-70	49
	Summary of Findings Regarding Fringe Benefits Granted to Superintendents and Other Supervisory Personnel	86
	Conclusions of Findings of the Annual Survey of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc.	90

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER		Page
IV	FINDINGS -- INTERVIEWS	91
	Introduction	91
	Administrative Postings	109
	Summary of Positive and Negative Elements of Management Team	109
	Summary of the Findings by Interview	113
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	116
	The Study	116
	Sources of the Data	117
	Scope and Limitations of the Study	118
	Related Literature	119
	Conclusions	121
	Conclusion I	121
	Conclusion II	125
	Implications	127
	Concluding Statement	129
APPENDICES		132
BIBLIOGRAPHY		193

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Classification of School Districts According to the Management Team Patterns of School Organizational Structure and District Size . .	11
2.	Vacation Provisions for Administration and Supervisory Personnel on Twelve-Month Contracts, 1969-70	48
3.	Transportation Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70	50
4.	Sick Leave Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1970	55
5.	Term Life Insurance Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70	59
6.	Hospitalization (Medical-Surgical Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel 1969-70	62
7.	Long Term Disability Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70	64
8.	Personal Liability Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70	68
9.	Tax Sheltered Annuity Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70 . . .	71
10.	Sabbatical Leave Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70	74
11.	Conference Attendance Allowance Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel 1969-70	77
12.	Membership in Professional Organization Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70	82
13.	Number of Districts Providing Fringe Benefits to Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. .	87

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
14.	Interview Summary - Size District	93
15.	Interview Summary - Administrative Positions	94
16.	Interview Summary - Membership in Various Teams within the Administrative Structure	95
17.	Interview Summary - Administrator's Number of Years in the District	96
18.	Interview Summary - Administrator's Number of Years in the District	97
19.	Interview Summary - Administrator's Number of Years in the Profession	99
20.	Interview Summary - Highest Degree Held by Administrator	100
21.	Interview Summary - Formulas for Setting Administrator's Salary	101
22.	Interview Summary - Responsibility of Setting Administratory Salary	102
23.	Interview Summary - Status of a Recognized Bargaining Unit of Administrators as of July 1, 1970	103
24.	Interview Summary - Responses of Administrators Concerning the Recognition of a Bargaining Unit for Administrators	104
25.	Interview Summary - Criteria for Assignment of Secretarial Assistance to the Administrator	106
26.	Interview Summary Criteria for Assignment of Administrative Assistants to Administrators	106
27.	Interview Summary - Administrator's Weeks of Work Differential	108
28.	Interview Summary - Administrator's Weeks of Work Differential Predication	108

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX		Page
A	Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc. - Member Organizations on August 1, 1969	133
	Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure	135
	Questionnaire - Follow-up Letter	139
	An Analysis of the Questionnaire, Patterns of School Organizational Structure	141
	Model Team Management Agreement	152
B	Author's Letter to the Executive Secretary Michigan Congress of School Administrators.	163
	Letter of Introduction - Executive Secretary Michigan Congress of School Administrators.	164
	Cover Letter - Annual Study of Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel .	165
	Survey Form - Salary Policies Relating to Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70	166
C	Management Team Welfare Questionnaire	178
	Summary Sheet for Management Team Welfare Questionnaire	180
	Schedule of Weeks Worked by Position of Various Building Administrators in Single, Dual, Multiple, and Divisional Structures of Team Management	183
	Key to IBM Cards	191

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The management team concept of school administration is being adopted by school districts throughout the state of Michigan as the logical design for effective school management. Considerable attention is being placed on the concept by various state associations and administrator groups. Especially active in this movement are the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations, The Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals and the Michigan Association of Secondary Principals. The Michigan Association of School Boards is also interested in the movement towards adoption of the concept in local board actions.

The activity among the above mentioned groups seems to stem from the fact that in Michigan as a direct result of the passage of Public Act 379 in 1965, the legislation that permits collective bargaining by public employees, educators at and above the level of assistant principal were consistently excluded from bargaining units. The collective efforts of these stated groups now seems to center around local and association adoption of resolutions in

support of management teams. The team most often includes all principals, coordinators and central administration. In some instances also included in the team is the board of education.

Encouragement for study in the area of management team came from three significant groups. First the department of administration at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor was influential in counseling doctoral students to investigate this area. The executive secretaries of all three administrator associations in the state offered assistance in gathering data and resources for study purposes. The Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., initiated the first inquiry into areas needing study and did by executive board action endorse this particular study.

Statement of the Problem

This is a study to determine the effect of management team patterns of school organizational structure on the administrator's welfare. Special consideration will be given the elements of welfare including salary, fringe benefits, clerical assistance, administrative assistance and management bargaining units.

Significance of the Study

Mr. Robert Walker, Lansing, Michigan Public Schools, has described management team as the latest innovation in educational administration in Michigan Schools. In his unpublished article he indicates that there is no established

blueprint for the Management team but that participation and involvement in the decision-making process is the essential ingredient. He further states:

"Recognizing that each district is somewhat unique in its organization and structure even from those of comparable size and complexity and perhaps more important, in the composition of its staff and of staff attitudes, we could not expect to satisfy fully everyone's impression of or expectation for this concept. Reduced to its most basic element, however, the management team concept simply means the team approach to management rather than management by decree."[1]

Dr. Lester Anderson of the University of Michigan in a recent article in the Michigan Journal of Secondary Education deals with the issues present in management team concept. Anderson's article points out the four viewpoints included in concept are the principal's, the board of education's, the superintendent's and the legal. On the whole, management team revolves around two main questions: 1) do all parties want a working relationship based on participation in policy formulation? and 2) is the formulation of organizational structure designed to keep communication open in the decision making process.[2]

The professional journals of the various Michigan school administrator organizations for the past two years

---

[1]Robert Walker, "The Management Team Concept." An unpublished paper. Lansing Public Schools, Lansing, Michigan, 1970.

[2]Lester W. Anderson, "Management Team Concept", Michigan Journal of Secondary Education, X (Spring, 1969), 24-33.

have reflected this growing concern of the public school leader in the areas of structure and decision making. Heselton, Pinis, Walker and Hammel,[1] writing in the Michigan School Board Journal in January 1969, presented various observations on the management team. Other writings include a position paper developed by David C. Smith reflecting the position of the elementary principals in the management team. In addition, the management team concept was the main topic of discussion at the July 23, 1969 First Annual Orientation Meeting for New School Board Members. The conference held at Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan was jointly planned by the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations and the Michigan School Board Association.

"Improving the Management Team" was the theme for the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies fall conference called "School Administrators' Management Lab" held in October of 1969 at Waldenwoods in Hartland, Michigan. The Bureau has an abiding interest in this area as it is supporting this and two other studies regarding management team.

Perhaps the most important quasi-legal decision having significance to this study was the recent Michigan

---

[1]Frank Heselton, "Management Team Concept from Board Member's Viewpoint," Michigan School Board Journal, XV (January, 1969), 6, 23: Fritz Pinis, "The Management Team Concept Myth or Reality". Michigan School Board Journal, XV (January, 1969), 7: Robert Walker, The Management Team Concept," Michigan School Board Journal XV (January 1969), 8-9; Robert Walker and Eugene C. Hammel, Management by Design-Using the Team Approach," Michigan School Board Journal, XVI (February, 1969), 12-14.

Labor Relations Board's "Hillsdale Case". The board ruled that all the administrators of the Hillsdale Public Schools except the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent and Business Manager may enter into collective negotiations with the Hillsdale Board of Education.[1] Detroit, Michigan administrators and organized groups in several suburban Detroit districts have petitioned for recognition to bargain.

The movement is not limited to Michigan for the The Michigan Elementary Principal reports from the Government Employees Relations Report the following two significant items:

> "Philadelphia school principals voted for Teamsters affiliation. The Association President, Daniel McGinley, said the action under consideration for several months was precipitated by the school board president, who was vague and not specific in his reply to the association's request for bargaining rights. Affiliation with the Teamsters was chosen to open lines of communication with the administration."
>
> "Vermont Professional Negotiations Law provides the same organizational rights for supervisory personnel as for teachers provided supervisory personnel form separate units from those of the teachers."[2]

---

[1]Hillsdale, Michigan, "Ruling Gives Administrators Rights to Bargain," Educators Negotiating Service-Complete Texts, (January 15, 1969), 1-5.

[2]Summary of Labor Relations Actions Affecting School Administrators" The Michigan Elementary Principal Volume 34 (January-February), 1970. 27.

This study of management team structure would appear to be timely if not overdue in that so much has taken place in the state of Michigan and nationally in the direction of bargaining by administrative groups. At this writing little has been done in the area of research regarding the structure of administration in districts practicing management team. Charles E. Bidwell states:

> .....There are apparently no published studies of relationships between superintendent and principal .... despite the central importance of middle-level administrative echelons in the functioning of school systems. In addition, there are, it seems no inquiries into the articulation of school units and system-level administrative structures, despite the questions raised by the structural looseness of school systems.[1]

The topic of welfare when applied to management seems also to be overlooked in the public sector.

This research is important for it approaches administrative structure from the "gut" issues of welfare. The professional welfare of the administrator is a necessary area of study for the recent ruling by the Michigan Labor Mediation Board that would interpret Michigan law to permit middle management to bargain for wages, hours and working conditions. The principals of Hillsdale, Michigan, Public Schools petitioned the Labor Mediation Board for a ruling in order that a local election by administrators could be conducted to establish a bargaining unit of administrators. The ruling permitting the principals to

---

[1]Charles E. Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization" in Handbook of Organizations, ed. by James G. March (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1965), pp. 10001-02.

hold such an election was precedent setting in that from that one decision as of November 1970 as reported in publications of the Michigan Elementary Principals Association recognized unions of administrators have now appeared in over twenty districts in Michigan. In almost every case the main thrust for a bargaining unit stems from a desire by the group to address the board of education in the local district in matters of welfare, that is: issues of salary, fringe benefits, length of contract and working conditions.

Historically in the literature of industrial unions the appearance of protest has come when economy was on the up-swing. The writing of the war years, 1942-45 indicates that at Ford Motor and Packard organizations of foremen were created over the same fundamental issues.

F. J. Roethlisberger wrote in the Harvard Business Review in 1945:

> Some of the reasons cited in the current situation for the increasing receptiveness of foremen to unionization in mass production industries are:
>
> 1. The weekly take home of many foremen is less than that of men working under them: this condition has been aggravated under war conditions in those factories where foremen do not receive extra compensation for working overtime.
> 2. The influx of inexperienced workers, under war demands, has made the foremen's jobs more difficult.
> 3. The rise of industrial unions has stripped the foremen of most of their authority.
> 4. Many union-minded workers have been upgraded to supervisory positions.
> 5. Many production workers promoted to the rank of foremen during the war expansion face the possibility of demotion after the war and

> sacrifice of senority credits in the unions from which they came for the period spent as foremen.[1]

These same fundamental concerns prompt the principal of 1970 to feel his weekly take home is less than the teachers, that greater demands are being made upon him in the era of bargaining by teacher unions, and the teacher unions have by contracts stripped him of authority in his administrative role. Many former leaders of the teacher organizations are administrators now and continue their "union" leadership as administrators.

Relationship to Other Studies

This study was one of three related dissertations by University of Michigan Ph.D. students focusing on the management team concept in the public schools. The first study was conducted by John Adams Beckwith and entitled "An Analysis of Management Team Patterns of School Organizational Structure and the Leader Behavior of Superintendents". He analyzed the management team patterns of school organizational structure as it affects the professional welfare of administrators.

In consultation with the chairman of the three doc-

---

[1]Readings in Personnel Administration, Editors: Paul Pigors, Charles A. Myers and F. T. Malm, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York; 1959 Article The Foreman: Master and Victim of Double Talk, F. J. Roethlisberger, page 222.

toral committees, an initial instrument was designed to obtain descriptions of the current management team patterns of school organizational structure. The Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure focused on the extent of the various types of administrative teams or groups that meet with the superintendent in each school district to consider system wide problems.[1] In addition, the questionnaire extracted the positions in the school district on each team or group and the frequency and average length of their meetings.

The forty-nine local school districts involved in this research were members of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., on August 1, 1969.[2] On August 12, 1969, a cover letter explaining the interest in the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies and the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations, and the Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure were mailed to the forty-nine Bureau superintendents. On August 28, 1969, a similar cover letter and another questionnaire were mailed to the member Bureau school districts who had failed to return the first mailing of the questionnaire.[3]

---

[1]The Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure is in Appendix A.

[2]A list of member organizations on August 1, 1969, is in Appendix A.

[3]The cover letters are in Appendix A.

After the return of the questionnaires to the Bureau, the data were analyzed by the three researchers to identify school districts with common management team patterns of school organizational structure. All forty-six of the responding districts indicated the existence of some kind of administrative team of groups that meet with the superintendent periodically in the consideration of system wide problems. The data revealed that four basic management team patterns of school organizational structure existed:

1. School districts where the superintendent meets with just one group that includes all the management team members or their representatives were classified as employing "single" management team patterns of school organizational structure;

2. School districts where the superintendent meets with a group that includes all the management team members or their representatives as well as a group that includes just central administrators were classified as employing "dual" management team patterns of school organizational structure;

3. School districts where the superintendent meets with a group that includes all the management team members or their representatives and one or more other groups that include different segments of the management team members were classified as employing "multiple" management team patterns of school organizational structure; and

4. School districts where the superintendent does not meet with a group that includes all the management team members or their representatives, but meets with one or more groups that include different segments of the management team members were classified as employing "divisional" management team patterns of school organizational structure.[1]

---

[1]A detailed analysis of the forty-six school districts according to the management team patterns of school organizational structure, district size, members on each team or group and the frequency and average length of their meetings appears in Appendix A.

A breakdown of the forty-six responding Bureau school districts, according to the four common management team patterns of school organizational structure, and their relationship to middle and large size school districts resulted in the Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING TO THE MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND DISTRICT SIZE

Management Team Pattern of School Structure	Number of Middle size School Districts (Less than 6,000 Students)	Number of Large Size School Districts (6,000 Students or more)	Total
1. Single	14	3	17
2. Dual	2	11	13
3. Multiple	3	8	11
4. Divisional	1	4	5
Total	20	26	46

As Table 1 indicates, fourteen middle size and three large size school districts (a total of seventeen) operated with the single management team pattern of school organizational structure; two middle size and eleven large size school districts (a total of thirteen) operated with dual management team patterns of school organizational structure; three middle size and eight large size school districts (a total of eleven) operated with multiple management team patterns of school organizational structure; and one middle size and four large size school districts (a total of five) operated with divisional management team patterns of school

organizational structure.[1]

Setting of the Study

The foundation for the study comes from the four structures described in the relationship to other studies. The service area of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies including school systems in Macomb, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw and Wayne counties was extensively surveyed and administrators personally interviewed.

The field testing of the interview questionnaire was done in non-member school districts, three of which were in Washtenaw county and one in Wayne county.

The support to all matters related to data gathering came from the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc.. The Bureau is a non-profit school study council dedicated to cooperative development, research and service. Also supporting this study with interest was the Executive Secretary of the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations.[2]

Data Gathering Procedures

Two instruments were used to secure current data and opinion on the status of welfare for management team members in the Bureau service area.

---

[1]Due to the common nature of the three separate yet related dissertations, the above four paragraphs of this section were written by John A. Beckwith, Karl O. Buttenmiller and Waino E. Aukee.

[2]A letter to this effect is in Appendix A.

The first instrument was a part of the annual study conducted by the Metropolitan Bureau of School Studies and is entitled the annual study of Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel.[1] The first four pages of the form included the author's many questions regarding welfare elements other than salary and the balance of the form was a comprehensive study of current salary by position. These forms were mailed to the forty some members of the Bureau. A cover letter by Executive Director Gerald Mansergh advised the members of the need for more complete information on the fringe benefit area and encouraged the support of the member superintendents in returning the completed forms.[2] Thirty-seven districts that replied to the form were also a part of the sample from which the Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure had been received. These thirty-seven districts therefore form the sample and the population for consideration of salary data and welfare benefits.

The second data gathering was obtained by personal interview. In order to insure a satisfactory response to

---

[1]The form mailed to the Bureau school districts on January 5, 1970, is found in Appendix B., entitled annual study of Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel.

[2]The cover letter written over Dr. Gerald Mansergh's signature can be found in Appendix B.

the type of questions, be they routine or subjective, a field test of the interview instrument Management Team Welfare Questionnaire[1] was conducted in three Washtenaw county and one Wayne county school system. By random selection, the districts, a central office administrator and a building administrator were chosen. The form of management team structure was not known beforehand but was determined during the course of the interview. All districts in the field test responded that they had a management team structure and the size of the districts in Washtenaw county somewhat dictated that they were of the single management team structure. The conclusions of this field test were in favor of continuing the same format. The interviewer, after proper introductions, would hand the administrator being interviewed a copy of the questions. The interviewer, would retain a summary sheet with the questions and some of the probable answers available for a simple check off during the interview. No questions were added or deleted from the field test instrument and the summary form[2] was readily coded for punch cards and analysis of frequency and percentages.

The actual schedule of interviews and data gathering did not take place until after most public schools had closed for the summer recess in June, 1970. The central office administrators and building administrators had not left for the summer and interview appointments were easily made and

---

[1]The interview instrument Management Team Welfare Questionnaire is found in Appendix C.

[2]The Summary Sheet for Management Team Welfare Questionnaire is found in Appendix C.

usually kept. The school districts were chosen so as to give the widest geographic and county wide distribution. All five districts with Divisional structure were chosen for interview. In the other three categories of Single, Dual, and Multiple, the five representative districts were chosen randomly. Within each of the chosen districts administrators were chosen randomly[1] and represented both central office and building level administrators in all but two districts where only central office people could be contacted. In total, twenty districts were interviewed and thirty-eight separate interviews conducted by the author.

A comparison was made of basic salaries paid to administrators in the school year 1969-70 and salaries paid in the same Bureau schools in the pre-collective bargaining year of 1964-65. All of these data were then compared with national means for maximum salary paid to central office and building administrators.

---

[1]The random selection was accomplished by obtaining the 1969-70 district directories of each of the selected school districts. The names and school addresses of all central administrators and building principals and assistants were identified for each district. In consultation with a set of random digits in "Table XII 10,000 Random Digits," Solomon Diamond Information and Error An Introduction to Statistical Analysis (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1959), p. 286, the sample for each district was chosen.

The study follows a pattern of development that in Chapter II gives support to the acceptance of the management team into the vocabulary of school administration. The term appears to be much misunderstood in the school setting. Therefore in reviewing the literature an emphasis is in the area of current and relevant writings. The review pertaining to the management team also indicated the inter-relatedness of this concept in school administration to items of welfare. The data gathering, although reported in two chapters, is in reality validating the concept that management team in school administration infers participation in decision making and also increased salary and fringe benefit over the provisions for the instructional and non-instructional staff.

The two findings' chapters proceed in considering first basic salary and second other welfare benefits.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study is regional in that data gathered was from Southeastern Michigan School districts. There are many state wide inferences that will be reflected in the summaries but the nature of the Bureau service area (Detroit and its suburban area) will restrict salary and benefits analysis to metropolitan areas. National implications to some of the conclusions will appear in the final chapter.

The limitations to the study are four major considerations and two minor considerations. A major consideration

is that only member school districts of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., on August 1, 1969 were included. The data was somewhat restricted by the information secured in the Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organiazational Structure and the annual study of Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. The second limitation was that historical data from pre-collective bargaining years could not be compared for the lack of knowledge of the administrative structure during that year. The third, a most important limitation, is that all data gathered regarding fringe benefits lacked a commonality that would lend itself to statistical analysis. The wide variety and costs of the various benefits could not be equated with any common factor other than perhaps were they provided or not provided. The fourth limitation was in that the number of administrative interviews conducted did not permit complete analysis of variance for the small sample.

The minor limitations to the study stem from the fact that little research has been conducted in the area of management team administration of public schools and secondly that a review of the issues of salary become a study of "what was" because the data on salary paid changes annually.

The emerging time of bargaining by public administrators has arrived in Michigan and elsewhere. A study at this time of change should have long range implications for the public boards of education and the many professional

administrators seeking a clearer definition of "management team".

Questions to be Considered in the Study

The questions are:

Major Question 1. Will there be a difference in the administrators' welfare of members of a management team of various levels in school districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional management team patterns of school organizational structure?

Related Question 1. Will there be a difference in how basic salary is set for members of a management team of various levels in school districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional management team patterns of school organizational structure?

Related Question 2. Will there be a difference in the length of the work year when members of management teams of various levels in school districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional patterns of school organizational structure are compared?

Related Question 3. Will there be a difference in the fringe benefits granted to members of the management team of various levels in school districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional patterns of school organizational structure?

Related Question 4. Will there be a difference in the amount of secretarial assistance provided administrators of various levels in school districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional patterns of school organizational structure?

Related Question 5. Will there be a difference in the posting of professional openings for members of management team of various levels in school districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional patterns of school organization?

Major Question 2. Will there be a difference in the attitude of administrators as to the establishment in their districts of a bargaining unit for portions of the manage-

ment team of various levels in school districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional patterns of school organization?

Definition of Terms

The terms defined below are for the purpose of clarity in the study of administrator welfare.

Central Administration -- All administrators, supervisors, directors, including assistant superintendent and superintendent who operate out of central office and have system wide responsibilities.

Elementary Schools -- Include all schools where most of the students are less than twelve years of age.

Fringe Benefits -- Include such items as insurance of various kinds, transportation allowance, conference expense account and leave of various kinds.

Index -- Indicates the ratio relationship of the salary to a prescribed schedule of established salaries.

Large School Districts -- School districts with a student membership of six thousand or more on September 27, 1968.

Management Team Members -- Include the superintendent, central administrators, school principals, and assistants.

Management Team Patterns of Organizational Structure. -- The administrative team or group in a school district that meet with the superintendent periodically in consideration of system wide problems.

M.A. Maximum Salary -- The last step on a salary schedule for experienced teachers with a Master's degree

and a valid teaching certificate.

Middle Size School District -- Those school districts with a student membership of less than six thousand students on September 27, 1968.

Professional Welfare -- Includes all the economic as well as the position and title benefits granted administrators. It includes such things as salary, fringe benefits, secretarial help, administrative assistants, length of contract and length of work year.

Secondary Schools -- Those schools where most of the students are more than twelve years of age. This includes junior high school and some middle schools.

Summary

The design of the study presented in this chapter included its relationship to two other studies namely, John Beckwith's Analysis of Management Team Patterns of School Organizational Structure and the Leader Behavior of Superintendents and Karl Buttenmiller's current research on the decision making process.

The three instruments pertinent to this study;

1. Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure
2. Annual Study - Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
3. Management Team Welfare Questionnaire

have been reviewed and their purposes outlined. The regional nature of the study is one of its limitations. The problems of a small sample have been presented. The data lends itself only to a study by frequency tables and

percentages and therefore lacks some statistical sophistication.

The development of the study follows a design that should lead to understanding of the management team concept as perceived by the public school administrator. All the data reported in Chapter III is in the form and vocabulary of the practicing administrator. The tables are inclusive of most all the areas of welfare considered practice in southeastern Michigan.

Chapter IV is the reported findings from interviews of line administrators. Some of the findings in Chapter IV are available in Chapter III but are personalized by the input from each person interviewed. Additional questions raised in the interviews add to the definition of the management team as understood by the administrator.

Organization of the Study

In Chapter I the background of the study, the statement of the problem, statement of the major questions and related questions, definition of terms and organization of the study are presented.

Chapter II includes the review of related literature as regards to the management team concept in school administration, the management team concept in the industrial-commerical context and writings in the area of administrator welfare.

The findings of the three data gathering procedures will be reported in Chapter III and IV. The summary, conclusions and the implications will be reported in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The "management team" concept is a recent addition to educational literature of today. In preparing a review of this literature three things become very evident:

1. Many books have been written on this topic reporting the research of business and industrial relations.
2. The writings in educational journals are all quite recent in date of publication. Most of the writings coming after 1965.
3. The elements of administrator welfare to be studied can best be found in research studies of various professional associations and bureaus. Much of which is not in the formally published book category.

The exploration of the literature will include definitive articles about the management team concept, interpretations of the concept as it relates to educational administration and a variety of dissertations and studies of salaries, bargaining, and professional welfare in general.

The related literature included in this chapter

proceeds from the known writings in basic texts on school administration to the description of ideal management and finally, to the concerns of administrator groups in Michigan. Elementary school principals and school board members consider the implementation of the management team concept their appropriate concern at this time.

Educators have only recently entered the area of collective bargaining and, therefore, a time of redefining of roles and relationships is going on. This chapter only touches briefly the wide ranging acceptance of newly changed behavior on the part of school board, superintendent and line administrator. The review of the literature provides the foundation for the investigation of participatory management as practiced in the public sector. Included are the ideal management team models of Likert and McGregor. Management prerogatives in salary and welfare determination, as suggested in these models, add to the basis for the study of school administrator participation in matters of welfare.

Management Team Concept in School Administration

A review of the basic texts in school administration indicated that organization principles apply in industry as well as in the public sector. Although few of the basic texts speak of management team as such, they reflect on the underlying precepts from which the concept has evolved. Morphet, Johns and Reller indicate this fundamental relationship:

> The effectiveness of an organization is enhanced when every person in the organization knows to whom and for what he is responsible.
>
> The effectiveness of an organization is enhanced when superordinates delegate authority to subordinates.
>
> The effectiveness of an organization is enhanced by the development of standardized procedures for routine administrative operation.

> The effectiveness of an organization is enhanced by assigning to each administrator no greater a number of persons than he can directly supervise.
>
> The effectiveness of an organization is enhanced by continuing policies and programs until results can be evaluated.
>
> The effectiveness of an organization is enhanced when it makes provision for innovation and change.
>
> The effectiveness of an organization is enhanced when the organization provides security for its members.[1]

Don Tatroe speaking to the Michigan Association of Elementary Principals in October, 1969, made the following remarks regarding the state of the "management team" concept.

> What is this "will-of-the-wisp" management team concept we're talking of anyway? How would we know if we had it in our districts? The answers to this question have yet to be effectively written and I suspect a continuous refinement process will be underway for years. But to me it includes a genuine delegation of managerial responsibility, authority and accountability to the administrative office most appropriate to carry on the management activity. And it involves an administrative and communicative system which produces effective understanding and at least representative involvement in the overall decision-making apparatus.[2]

This reference to the decision making process and the clarification of the definition of team management is the partial purpose of this and several studies underway in the area of management team in Michigan. Perhaps this is the

---

[1]Edgar L. Morphet, Roe R. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967, pp. 94-97.

[2]Don O. Tatroe, "Management Team Leadership," The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXXIV (January-February, 1970), p. 9.

refinement process that the late Dr. Tatroe was speaking to. He continued in his address as recorded in the The Michigan Elementary Principal to identify those roles in management he felt most appropriate to the concept. He included the principals role in district wide affairs such as negotiating, contract administration, budget making, participation in councils for policy making, goal setting. He also sensed the need for principal involvement in the determination of conditions of employment for administrators and a free opportunity to express one's views on salary and contract matters.[1]

In another article recorded in the Michigan Elementary Principal in the spring of 1969 a simple but accurate definition of the management team appears. Francis Reynolds, an elementary principal in Alpena, Michigan, states:

> The Management Team Concept in simply the recognition that a person has a certain job responsibility and then being allowed to do that job. The individual's responsibility is then integrated into an overall scheme of operations which allows for a blending of individual responsibilities with others in the school administration.[2]

It therefore appears that the definition for management team as presently regarded by school administrators in the Michigan area at least includes the elements of working

---

[1] Ibid., p. 9.

[2] Francis Reynolds, "A Model for the Management Team Concept", The Michigan Elementary Principal, (March-April, 1969), 10.

together, shared participation in decision making, recognition of various roles contributing to the overall good and the uniqueness of public school administration over other elements of the public sector. It is also apparent that we must look to the writings of commerce and industry if we wish to more clearly define a concept of industry when used in the public sector.

The Management Team Concept in the Industrial-Commercial Context

The single most helpful reference in defining of the management team concept is Douglas McGregor's The Professional Manager.[1] This text follows an earlier work entitled The Human Side of Enterprise which presented exceptionally well his ideas on values of people in organization. McGregor's theory "X" and theory "Y" have formed the basis for much of the academic and industrial writings on the management theory of today.[2]

An effective managerial team included the following elements:[3]

---

[1]Douglas McGregor, The Professional Manager (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p. 162.

[2]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960)

[3]Op. Cit. pp. 162-167.

1. Understand, mutual agreement, and identification with respect to the primary task.
2. Open communications.
3. Mutual trust.
4. Mutual support.
5. Management of human differences.
6. Selective use of the team.
7. Appropriate member skills.
8. Leadership.

McGregor in this outline of his effective managerial team is very close to the guide to administration in Morphet, Johns, and Reller. The first seven elements of McGregor's outline are all interdependent much as the elements as described in Educational Organization and Administration are dependent one upon the other. The eighth however, is worthy of separate consideration. The "manager" of the team has as leader a significant effect on the behavior and success of the other seven elements. The leader alone cannot by his own power effect all the variables. He along with the members of the team interacting with each other can when all attitudes are taken into consideration become effective in the communications area so basic to the team effort. Built into our culture is a strong emphasis on the individual worth of each team member. This, in team development, must (because of the complexity of our goal structure) include some form of teamwork and team building. McGregor completes his discussion of team development by describing four conclusions:[1]

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 181-182.

1. As in other processes of development, time and historical continuity are important. There is no reason to expect that a new committee or task force will function efficiently at its inception.

2. Groups and teams, like other organisms, require internal communication and leader functions and, in addition to time, the development of a common language and culture.

3. Teams have to interact and cope successfully with an environment and, like other open systems, to process and store large amounts of information necessary for survival.

4. Finally, teams have to succeed in mastering their tasks and achieving competence.

Complimentary to the elements of management team found in McGregor's Professional Manager, Likert, in The Human Organization, developes a system 4 which incompasses many of the same elements of team management in a table of organizational variables. The table in part is quoted below:[1]

Table 2-1

Table of Organizational and Performance Characteristics of Different Management Systems.[2]

Organizational Variable	System 4
1. Leadership	Complete confidence and trust in all matters. Subordinates feel completely free to discuss things about the job with their superior. Always gets ideas and opinions and always tries to make constructive use of them.

[1]Rensis Likert, The Human Organization (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1967), pp. 4-11.

[2]Ibid. pp. 4-7.

2.	Character of motivational forces	Economic rewards based on compensation system developed through participation; group participation an involvement in setting goals, improving methods, appraising progress toward goals. Personnel at all levels feel real responsibility for organization's goals and behave in ways to implement them.
3.	Character of communication process	Much (interaction and communication) with both individuals and groups.
	Direction of informational flow	Down, up and with peers.
	Extent to which downward communications are accepted by subordinates	Generally accepted but, if not, openly and candidly questioned.
	Accuracy of upward communication via line	Accurate.
	Psychological closeness	Knows and understands problems of subordinates very well.
4.	Character of interaction influence process. Amount and character of interaction	Extensive, friendly interaction with high degree of confidence and trust.
	Amount of cooperative teamwork	Very substantial amount throughout the organization.
5.	Character of decision making process At what level in organization are decisions formally made?	Decision making widely done throughout organization, although well intergrated through linking process provided by overlapping groups.
	To what extent are decision makers aware of problems, particularly those at lower levels in the organization?	Generally quite well aware of problems.

6.	Character of goal setting or ordering Manner in which usually done	Except in emergencies goals are usually established by means of group participation.
	Are there forces to accept, resist, or reject	Goals are fully accepted both overtly and covertly.
7.	Character of control processes Extent to which the review and control functions are concentrated	Quite widespread responsibility for review and control, with lower units at times imposing more rigorous reviews and tighter controls than do management.
	Extent to which there is an informal organization present and supporting or opposing goals of formal organization	Informal and formal organization are one and the same; hence all social forces support efforts to achieve organization's goals.
	Extent to which control data are used for self guidance or group problem solving by managers and nonsupervisory employees; or used by superiors in a punitive, policing manner	Used for self-guidance and for coordinated problem solving and guidance; not used punitively.[1]

Likert in his various research studies used the format of a table with the four systems in a continuum. The various organizations evaluated tended to rate themselves below the near ideal system 4 for actual practice. When asked to rate the structures for where they would like the organization to be, ranking in system 4 was chosen by all levels of the management structure.

In comparing the writings of Likert and McGregor, the models used, the ideals set and the testing conducted would lead the author to conclude that management teams as de-

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 9-10.

scribed are heavily dependent on the human resources of the leader and the various team members. It is also obvious that at the industrial-commercial research level, ideals of management team are still sought after goals. Heavy emphasis on the leader behavior in all of the readings gives support of other research in the area of leader behavior[1] and decision-making. Because of known research in these areas the author will consider writings in the area of salary studies and welfare research.

Current Issues in the Area of Administrator Welfare

The most complete resource for data regarding the salaries paid and the benefits provided administrators come from the national research offices of our major teacher and professional associations. The most comprehensive reports are published annually by the Research Division of the National Education Association. Their data gathering is national in scope and well documented. The various professional journals of the administrator organizations also quote the authority of this research division of N.E.A.

Other sources of data are the various state associations be they associations of school boards, teachers, or the several administrator groups. By far the most authoritative of these are the various bulletins of the American Association of School Administrators and its many state

---

[1]John Adams Beckwith, "An Analysis of Management Team Patterns of School Organizational Structure and the Leader Behavior of Superintendents" Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.

groups. In addition to the above are various regional bureaus such as the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., (a voluntary association of school systems, colleges and county boards of education) dedicated to the collection and distribution of financial and salary data of regional and state significance. In addition to the above are the various management periodicals such as School Management.

The review of published reports by the Research Division National Education Association for the years 1964-65[1] and 1969-70[2] indicate as regards to salaries of school administrators several consistencies in reporting and process.

1. The salaries paid can be classified by size of district.

2. When using the maximum salary paid for position such as principal a ratio relationship to the teacher salary at the M.A. maximum can easily be established. This has over the years become the yardstick for most of their reporting.

3. Salaries paid are reported as scheduled or un-scheduled.

4. The mean maximum appears to be the measure most often used for district comparison.

---

[1] Research Report 1965-R2, "Salary Schedules for Administrative Personnel," 1964-65, Washington: Research Division-National Education Association, 1965.

[2] Research Report 1970-R2, "Maximum Salaries Scheduled for School Administrators," 1969-70, Washington: Research Division-N tional Education Association, 1970.

5. As is true for classroom teachers, the regional differences in maximum salaries scheduled for principals are still very marked. For example, the average maximum scheduled salary for senior high-school principals in the Mideast in 1969-70 is $20,954 compared with an average of $14,890 in the Southeast, and with $15,112 in the Southeast. For the Far West, the average is $20,423. These averages are based on information from reporting systems with enrollments of 6,000 or more.

6. For central-office administrators-supervisors, directors, assistant superintendents, and superintendents--marked differences are apparent in relation to size of school system. The average maximum salaries are higher in the larger systems.[1]

7. Increases in the salaries of administrators can be studied in the light of what has happened to the salaries of teachers.

8. It appears from the most recent data that salaries of administrators in school districts of more than 25,000 enrollment having an increasing proportion of non index of "independent" schedules from the more traditionally practiced teacher ratio or index.[2]

9. The greatest difference in salaries paid is in the range of superintendent salaries when compared to size of district.

10. Because of the many variables from schedule to schedule to schedule, including various combinations of school sizes, preparation levels, relationships to teacher's salary schedules and alike, it is difficult to find a common ground for comparison of minimum salaries for various administrative positions.

The annual and biennial reports when considered together from the National Education Association Research Division provide a substantial base for local and state analysis of the salary being paid.

In Michigan the elementary principals have separated

---

[1] Ibid. p. 5.

[2] Op. Cit. p. 8.

from the state Michigan Education Association and formed their own state group (Michigan Association of Elementary Principals). Two items in the report of the state convention[1] of the association held in Grand Rapids in October 1969, are of importance to this study and are included.

The first item is the complete text of the position paper on the Management Team adopted by the Association in 1968. In brief this statement from the position paper is significant and is quoted below in full:

> The position of the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals with respect to collective negotiations and the management team concept are clear. We velieve that elementary principals should have an inherent right to have a voice in the determination of their professional destiny. As one means, but certainly not the only one, toward this end elementary principals must have the right to take part in the determination of their wages and conditions of employment. Since Public Act 379 (Michigan Law providing for collective bargaining by public employees) stipulates the conditions and mutual responsibilities of the affected parties under the law, it would appear that elementary principals are entitled to the protection and benefits which other public employees enjoy.[2]

The position of Michigan elementary principals is clearly one of caution in approaching the bargaining table as a recognized group. The position paper links the status of bargaining with the emerging management team concept.

---

[1]Report of the Forty-Fourth Annual Conference, "Leadership-Dimensions Awareness Dynamics" Lansing: Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals, 1969.

[2]Ibid. p. 122.

Included in the position statement is the following paragraph under the heading of Implications:

> Second, within the management team concept, the MAESP recommends the use of formal bargaining procedures with restraint, and only to the degree necessary for elementary principals to achieve and maintain a significant role in matters vitally important to them. As a result, within the concept of the management team, militancy is not encouraged--but then, neither is blind obedience.[1]

The implications go on to link even further the many decision making obligations inherent in management team structures.

In another part of that convention report a study conducted by the MAESP Professional Standards Commission indicates some of the difficulty in gathering data on matters of administrator welfare. Many of the questionnaires were not adequately filled out or answers were incomplete. For example incomplete returns made it impossible to determine if term life insurance, an important fringe benefit, was or was not provided. Items identified as fringe benefits but not completely reported were:

1. Hospitalization insurance
2. Life insurance
3. Liability insurance
4. Sick leave
5. Emergency leave
6. Sabbatical leave
7. Professional dues
8. Retirement pay
9. Disability pay
10. Travel expenses

---

[1]Ibid. p. 124.

[2]Ibid. pp. 108-109.

11. Conference expenses
12. Mileage
13. Graduate credit courses (paid by the board)

Paul Horn, chairman of the committee reported:

> In conclusion, some other kind of reporting must be devised if we are to get useful information. When talking with their boards, principals need better information than is offered here. We must double our efforts to procure complete information for our members.[1]

Worthy of noting in the summation of salaries reported was a table with three catagories for the method used to determine the salary. The three identified were (1) Individual agreement (2) Determined by the board (3) Agreement by involvement of administrative group. Another table of note was interesting for the variable was the weeks worked.

The Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals have also been active in developing guide lines to implement the management team concept. In a Model Team Management Agreement (Total copy in Appendix A) the secondary principals suggest a format for written agreement of board of education with the management team. In his cover letter to the model agreement, Theodore Southerland, Executive Secretary, affects the similar restraint of the MAESP position paper when he states:

> "We also would underscore the fact that this (Ed. Management) Concept is new to all involved parties and should therefore be approached carefully with tact and understanding. There are two involved parties, namely the Board, whose responsibility is policy-making, and the Management Team

---

[1] Ibid. p. 109.

> (Administrators - Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Principals, Assistant Principals, etcs.), whose major responsibility is carrying out established policies. It is clear that a very close harmonious working relationship to these two parties is vital to the successful operation of a good educational program for the boys and girls in your school district. The Management Team should be encouraged by the Board to lend its professional knowledge to the Board in assisting in the development of Board policy. Further, the Management Team is not only expected to loyally support the final board policies and act as its representative in the buildings, but is also expected to implement the negotiated contracts with other employee groups in the school district as the Board representative."[1]

The model itself is indeed a notable document in the evolving of the team management concept and only the listing of the articles will be included at this point.

The Preamble (which includes as the fifth WHEREAS, both the Board and the Management Team agree to cooperate and work in good faith to develop salaries commensurate with the Management Concept as applied in the business and industrial world:)

Article I Recognition (including this paragraph; The term "Management Team" when used hereinafter in this Agreement shall refer to those persons employed by and authorized by the board to recommend for hiring, firing, and/or supervising professional staff members and other personnel.)

---

[1] Model Team Management Agreement, Appendix A

Article II - Management Team Rights (Local administrator organization rights)

Article III - Professional Compensation (Attendance of Team members at conferences)

Article IV - Working Conditions

Article V - Leave of Absence

Article VI - Termination of Services

Article VIII - Insurance Protection

Article VIII - Evaluation of Administrators

Article IX - Vacancies, Promotions and Transfers

Article X - Creation of New Positions

Article XI - Protection of Administrators

Article XII - Grievance Procedure

Article XIII - Miscellaneous Provisions

Article XIV - Duration of Agreement

It should be readily discernible to the reader that this outline closely parallels the master agreements of the various teacher association contracts and that as such it brings to the front the close tie in of the management team concept and bargaining by administrators.

The Detroit Metropolitan Bureau of School Studies, Inc., has for a number of years provided regional salary data and pupil cost analysis for the member school districts of the Metropolitan Detroit area. A review of their past reports indicates the need for an increased amount of data gathering in the area of welfare benefits paid various members of the administration of the bureau schools. This past year the Bureau school systems were asked considerably

more questions than the routine vacation and travel allowance recorded in the earlier reports. These questions and the answers reported will appear later in this study for they reflect the complete range of welfare elements.

Frank Pichel[1] in his dissertation regarding the question of the financial affects of teacher strikes has completed and summarized the impact on selected Michigan school districts. Pichel found little related research on the topic of the effects of striking on professional welfare. Even less can be found on the impact of management team or bargaining by administrators for that matter. Comparative data as regards the various fringe benefit areas was the most difficult to assemble and analyzed.

Several dissertation studies are currently investigating various aspects of management team. Studies dealing with the welfare of administrators in a management team structure are not available.

Summary of the Review of the Related Literature

The relationship of the management team concept and the impact on the administrators' welfare was the intent of the review of related literature.

The ideals of the management team and the parallels of industrial and educational administration writings was

---

[1]Frank Marcel Pichel, "The Financial Effects of Teachers' Strikes in Selected Michigan School Districts", Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969.

for the necessary purpose of defining the term "management team." The almost total absence of university research in the topic lends additional significance to this study and others in process.

The activity of Michigan school administrators must be looked upon as a possible example and model for other states to consider. Michigan has been first in many of the innovations as regards the arena of collective bargaining by teachers and this continued militancy in these matters of professional welfare may well be an outgrowth of the success granted the teachers.

The limitations on this review of literature stem from the lack of published work in the area of professional welfare and management structure.

The review of the literature presented in this chapter ranges from the theoretical ideals of democratic and participatory management to the model management team contract. The linking of theory to practice in the literature is necessary to consideration of welfare that follows in the findings of Chapters III and IV.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS -- SALARY AND WELFARE STUDIES

Introduction

The findings to the study will be in three distinct forms of reporting. The first will be the reporting of findings from the historical review of salaries paid administrators in the school districts that are members of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc.. The second portion of the findings will be the complete tables of reported welfare benefits paid administrators in the Bureau schools for the 1969-70 contract year. These data will be reported according to the various management team structures of organization be they Single, Dual, Multiple, or Divisional. The third will be the frequency and percentage tables of the data gathered by personal interview and will be found in Chapter IV.

Many school administrators equate welfare with salary. This chapter reviews Southeastern Michigan salaries before and after collective bargaining. Salaries are changed annually and therefore specific salaries are not so relevant as a comparison of means and mean maximums.

The tables of the many benefits are in an arbitrary priority that is orginial with the author. The insurance benefits are grouped in a sequence of tables. All the other benefits are more individual in character and amount. The wide range of benefit within some of the areas and the total absence of benefit in some districts can be seen by close study of the tables.

The constant in the reporting of this data is that it was responded to directly by the superintendent or his designate. In most instances the data was reviewed and submitted over the superintendent's signature.

The four structures, having been established four months before the salary data was gathered, re-emphasizes what was stated in Chapters I and II in that the definition of management team is evolving. These findings support the fact that all districts reported practicing management team but by responses to questions on benefits paid have inequities in amount and form of benefit provided members of the team.

Administrator Salaries 1964-65 and 1969-70

The salaries paid administrators in the southeastern Michigan region served by the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of Schools has for a number of years been well documented in the annual reports of the Bureau. The almost one hundred percent responses of the members to the requested data had made the report particularly dependable and the format has not changed drastically over the years.

In like manner to the Bureau the Research Division

of the National Education Association has not changed their basic reporting style over the past few years. It is, therefore, possible to compare the salary of selected administrative positions in Bureau schools with national figures. The NEA findings for mean maximum are from districts of twenty-five thousand students or more.

The impact of bargaining on increased teachers' salaries is apparent in the research of the NEA. A comparison of administrator salaries before and after bargaining by teachers in Michigan is included in this study of welfare. Collective bargaining by administrators is a reality in Michigan and the relationship to increased salaries experienced by the teachers is helpful to understanding this movement.

The ratio relationship of elementary principals' salary to classroom teachers' salary has remained quite constant over the five year period 1964-1969. Given the teacher mean maximum of 100.0, the elementary principals' salary ratio was 136.2 in 1964-65 and 135.7 in the year 1969-70. The median salary for elementary principals in Bureau member school districts reporting in 1964-65 was $11,114. The new median for 1969-70 was $18,018 for a total of 620 elementary principals. The percentage of increase reflected was 62.1 per cent and over $6,000 in that five year period.

The ratio relationship to the classroom teacher during this period has remained relatively constant for junior high and senior high principals. Given the teacher mean maximum ratio of 100.00 the junior high principals were 142.9 in 1964-65 and 142.7 in 1969-70. Senior high principals were 153.7 in the 1964-65 year and 152.6 in the 1969-70 contract year. The median salary for junior high principals in Bureau schools reporting in 1964-65 was $12,922. The new median for 161 junior high principals is $19,483. Senior high salaries climbed from $13,409 to a new median of $20,583. The junior high increase was, therefore, a 50.6 per cent increase. The senior high increase in percentages came to 53.5. These increases reflect almost twice the increase of the five years preceding 1964-65.

Given the classroom teacher mean maximum ratio of 100.0, the superintendents in the NEA report were 273.3 in 1964-65 and 247.7 in 1969-70. Central office directors on the same index were 164.7 in 1964-65 and 159.8 in 1969-70.

The per cent of salary increase for superintendents was 45.9. Central office administrators with responsibility for administrators salaries. The average salary paid superintendents of schools with total student population of 6,000 or more was $25,134 for the year 1969-70. The range was from a low of $13,000 to the high of $51,450. The national average paid in 1964-65 was $22,914 for school districts with an enrollments of over 25,000 while in 1969-70 this had reached an average of $30,398.[1]

The same March report indicated that in 1964-65 reporting districts with enrollments of 6,000 or more 27.9 had independent salary schedules while 57.1 had a ratio or index relationship to the teachers schedule for administrators. In 1969-70 with over 800 school districts reporting 24.9 had independent schedules while 62.4 per cent were in ratio or index relationship to the teacher salary schedule.[2]

The close similarity of findings in the report of the Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel

---

[1]NEA Research Bulletin Volume 48, Number 1, Washington: National Education Association, Research Division, 1970), p. 19.

[2]Ibid. p. 7.

in Metropolitan Detroit Schools and the NEA Research report Maximum Salaries Scheduled for School Administrators adds support to the significance of the consideration of welfare of members of Management team members in the districts that are members of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies.

Welfare and Fringe Benefits Reported for 1969-70

This portion of the findings incorporates the most complete range of administrator benefits all organized so as to indicate the four management team organizational structures to which the local districts of the Bureau attest. The tables include: vacations, transportation, sick leave, term life insurance, hospitalization (Medical-Surgical), long term disability insurance, personal liability, tax sheltered annuities, sabbatical leave, conference attendance and membership in professional organizations.

The tables were prepared by the author from replies to the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau annual study questionnaire Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. The questions were directed to the various superintendents and their responses were first for the office of the superintendent and then for other administrative and supervisory personnel.

In all the Tables regarding benefits provided the members of the management team at the various levels the data and responses to the questions was so set up as to reflect the initial question of the superintendent, the

benefit and then the difference for other administrative and supervisory personnel. In most of the superintendent's responses the differences for other administrators was nil, however, if the superintendent did not respond the table did not presume but left the column blank. Where the superintendent responded that the benefits were the same the indication "Same" was placed in the column for specified differences. A complete table of weeks worked by building administrators is included for reference in the Appendix C.

In Table 2 the column entitled superintendent indicates the responses to the question "Does the superintendent have a specified vacation benefit?" Only two districts responded that this was not specified in the contract. The mean and the median for each structure would indicate four weeks of vacation. Sometimes spelled out as twenty days the amount of time can not be determinded from this evidence to be different in the various teams.

Table 3 is a complete table of the amounts provided for the expense of transportation of the various members of the administrative team. In three districts no allowance was provided. In all twenty two districts provided and maintained an auto for the superintendent's use. All the districts in the one category of districts with multiple team management provided the superintendent an auto. The table would indicate that in the other administrative positions the allowance varied considerably from no allowance

TABLE 2

Vacation Provisions for Administration and Supervisory Personnel on Twelve-Month Contracts 1969-70

School System	Superintendent	Weeks	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
	SINGLE MANAGEMENT		
1	No	4	
2	Yes	4	Asst. Supt. 5 weeks
3	Yes	5	4 weeks
4	Yes	4	Benefits vary from 12-20 working days
5	Yes	4 or 20	
6	Yes	4	
7	Yes	3	
8	Yes	4	
9	Yes	4	
10	Yes		(1)
11	Yes	3	
12	Yes	4	(2)
13	Yes	4	
	DUAL MANAGEMENT		
14	Yes	20	
15	Yes	2 or 10	
16	Yes	4	
17	Yes	4 or 20	No difference
18	Yes	4 or 20	Other central office 3 weeks or 15 days
19	Yes	One Month	4 weeks
20	Yes	3	
21	Yes	4 or 20	
22	Yes	4	
23	Yes	4	
24	Yes	4 or 20	

[1]10: Years of Service — Number of Vacation Days

Years of Service	Number of Vacation Days
Less than 1 year	10/12 of 1 day for each month
1-9	2 weeks
10-14	3 weeks
15 and over	4 weeks

TABLE 2 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Weeks	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
	MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT		
25	Yes	4	
26	Yes	15	
27	Yes	6	
28	Yes	5 or 25	Same
29	Yes	4	
30	Yes	6	8 weeks
31	Yes	4 or 20	
32	Yes	3 or 15	Assistant to Superintendent (1 paid week) others 3
33	Yes	4	All others 3 weeks
	DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT		
34	No		12 months admin - 25 working days[1]
35	Yes	4 or 20	5 Superintendent people/benefits the same as superintendent
36	Yes	3	
37	Yes	4 or 20	Same-4 weeks after 10 years for 52 weeks administrators
38	Yes	21	

[1]34: 12 month administrators, 25 working days earned at rate or .85 days for each two weeks of service plus 3 days as an adjustment in work year in relationship to 30 week administrators

TABLE 3

Transportation Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70

School System	Supt. Trans. Allow.	Auto Provided & Maintained	Mile-age Allow.	Amount Per Year	Cents Per Mile	Specified Differences for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
			SINGLE MANAGEMENT			
1	No					
2	Yes	Yes	No			Assistant Superintendent, car provided; 5¢ mile for business meeting only
3	No					
4	Yes	Yes				Assistant Sup. auto provided. Other mileage
5	Yes	Yes	No		10¢ per mile plus expenses	
6	Yes	No	Yes		10¢	
7	Yes	No	Yes	$1,500 over routine	12¢	Asst. Supt's $500 per year; all others 12¢ per outside dist.
8	Yes			$1,200		10¢ per mile
9	Yes	Yes	No			10¢ per mile
10	Yes	No	Yes		8¢	Outside Wayne County
11	Yes	No	No		10¢	
12	Yes	Yes				Two Asst's. auto provided; others 10¢ per mile
13	Yes	Yes				

TABLE 3 - Continued

School System	Supt. Trans. Allow.	Auto Provided & Maintained	Mile-age Allow.	Amount Per Year	Cents Per Mile	Specified Differences for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
			DUAL MANAGEMENT			
14	Yes	Yes	No			Dir/Asst. Supt. $30/mo; Super. Coord. $20/mo; Principal $100/yr; Supervisor 10¢ per mile
15	Yes		Yes		10¢	
16	Yes	Yes				Car provided Asst. Supt's. for Personnel, Instruction, and Dir. of Admin. Services. Others 10¢ per mile
17	Yes	No	Yes		10¢	Same
18	Yes	Yes	Yes		10%	10¢ per mile or air fare
19	Yes	Yes				10% per mile
20	Yes	No	Yes	$1,000		Asst. Supt's. $800, $750, $650 per year; others $40 per month
21	Yes	No	Yes	$1,200		Asst. Supt. $75 per month
22	Yes	Yes				
23	Yes	Yes				
24	Yes	Yes				Cabinet members $75 per month; others 10¢ per mile up to 800 miles on a reporting bases (5¢ over 800)

TABLE 3 - Continued

School System	Supt. Trans. Allow.	Auto Provided & Maintained	Mile-age Allow.	Amount Per Year	Cents Per Mile	Specified Differences for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
			MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT			
25	Yes	Yes				10¢ per mile
26	Yes	Yes				10¢ per mile
27	Yes	Yes				Five cars for school business
28	Yes	Yes				
29	Yes	Yes	Yes	$3,000		Asst. Supt's. car plus $1000/ year; Bus. Mgr. car plus $360; others 10¢ mile in city. 8¢ mile outside
30	Yes	Yes				Three Asst. Supt's. $50 per month; others 9¢ per mile
31	Yes		Yes			Leased car subsidized by Board not to exceed $1,200.
32			Yes		10¢	
33	Yes		Yes		10¢ per mile	

TABLE 3 - Continued

School System	Supt. Trans. Allow.	Auto Provided & Maintained	Mile-age Allow.	Amount Per Year	Cents Per Mile	Specified Differences for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
			DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT			
34	Yes	Yes		Board cars available or mileage and subsistance		
35	Yes	No		$2,000		Plus credit card--Supt. only Mileage 12¢ per mile
36	Yes	Yes	No			
37	No	(included in	salary)			
38	Yes		Yes	$200		Asst. Supt. $150 per yr.; Principal $80 per year; all others 10¢ per mile

to fully maintained auto for assistant superintendents. In districts where a flat transportation figure was included the amount varied from as low as amount in these several instances may reflect money set in the budget for travel expense other than basic transportation.

Table 4 summarizes the answers to the following questions.

Does the superintendent have a specified sick leave benefit in his contract?

What is the number of days allowed per year?

May the days accumulate over the length of the contract?

If yes, what is the maximum benefit?

If other administrative and supervisory employees do not recieve the same benefit, please specify the differences:

Six districts in the single management team structure responded that they had no provision for sick leave in the contract, however each did list a number of days allowed and in all but one district did allow days to accumulate. It would appear that when it was not clearly indicated the provision of the existing teacher contract was applied to administrators as contractual to all certified personnel.

The range of accumulated benefit was from none to unlimited. Only the divisional could be clearly ahead of the others in that of five districts three indicated some degree of unlimited accumulation.

Additional benefits as regard to long term illness

TABLE 4

Sick Leave Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70

School System	Superintendent	No. of Days	Accumulate over Contract	Maximum Benefit in Days	Specified Differences for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		SINGLE MANAGEMENT			
1	No	10	Yes	unlimited	
2	Yes	13	Yes	unlimited	
3	Yes	16	Yes	48	All received 16 days per contract year
4	Yes	16	Yes	145	Varies 13-16 days per year
5	Yes	10	Yes	unlimited	Does not apply
6	No	14	Yes	120	
7	No	12	Yes	none set	
8	Yes				
9	Yes	15	Yes	125	
10	No	12	No	All certified governed by teacher contract sick leave policy	
11	Yes	12	Yes	200	Sick leave accum. at one day per mo.
12	No	As needed			
13	No				Same as teachers - 13 days

TABLE 4 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	No. of Days	Accumulate over Contract	Maximum Benefit in Days	Specified Differences for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		DUAL MANAGEMENT			
14	Yes	1-	Yes	180	
15	Yes	12	Yes	100	
16	Yes	Same as other personnel		unlimited	Same
17	Yes	13	Yes	120	Same
18	Yes	12	Yes	unlimited	Same except based on length of contract (10 1/2-11-12 days)
19	Yes			1 calendar year	Same
20	Yes	18	Yes	216	
21	Yes	15	Yes	150	
22	Yes	18	Yes	175	
23	Yes	14	Yes	158	
24	Yes	12	Yes	144	Same

TABLE 4 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	No. of Days	Accumulate over Contract	Maximum Benefit in Days	Specified Differences for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT			
25	Yes	15	Yes	129	Same
26	Yes	18	Yes	135	
27	No				
28	Yes		No	100/year	
29	Yes	12	Yes	unlimited	
30	Yes	11	Yes	120	
31	Yes	13	Yes	213	
32	No	Unlimited			
33	Yes			All administrative unlimited up to six months then a long term disability of 50% salary less government benefit	
		DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT			
34	No				
35	No	18	Yes	unlimited	Same
36	Yes	15	Yes	150	
37	No	Unlimited	No		Same
38	Yes	10	Yes	unlimited	

will appear in Table 7 where the questions regarding long term disability are answered.

Term life insurance is the topic of Table 5 and is one in which the numbers indicate readily the variety of and range of benefit granted to various management team members. In each structure except divisional a few districts did not grant this benefit to the superintendent or other administrators.

In the single management team structure the nine districts provided the median amount of $10,000 and a range of from $5,000 to $25,000. In dual management the range was $6,000 to $44,850 with a median amount of $15,000. In the multiple management team the range was from $2,000 to two times the annual salary. The median however was only $4,000. In the divisional management team the median amount was the highest at $20,000 and the range was from $1,000 to $35,000.

A provision for double indemnity for accidental death was included in eighteen of the responses from thirty one districts which provided the insurance.

Specified differences were not always indicated, but insurance to an amount to the nearest $1,000 or salary was the most interesting variable.

Hospitalization and medical surgical benefits are reported in Table 6. These data were unique in that with but one exception they were granted and paid in full for the administrative staff. In many instance the benefit was for the administrator and his family fully paid for.

TABLE 5

Term Life Insurance Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70

School System	Superintendent	Amount of Death Benefit	Double Indemnity Provided	Specified Differences for Other Administrative Personnel
		SINGLE MANAGEMENT		
1	No			
2	No			
3	Yes	25,000	Yes	Others $12,500 - $20,000
4	Yes	20,000	No	
5	Yes	5,000	No	
6	No			
7	Yes	10,000	Yes	
8	No			
9	Yes	10,000	Yes	
10	Yes	5,000	No	
11	Yes	25,000	No	
12	Yes	20,000	Yes	
13	Yes	5,000	No	Principals $1,000

TABLE 5 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Amount of Death Benefit	Double Indemnity Provided	Specified Differences for Other Administrative Personnel
		DUAL MANAGEMENT		
14	Yes	16,000	Yes	To nearest $1000 of salary to age 49; a age 50-59 (75¢) age 60; (50%)
15	No			
16	Yes	7,000	No	
17	Yes	10,000	Yes	
18	Yes	43,500	Yes	$29,000 with double indemnity Amount equal to 1969-70 salary
19	Yes	44,850	No	
20	Yes	9,000	Yes	
21	Yes	6,000	No	
22	Yes	23,000	No	
23	Yes	15,000	No	
24	Yes	15,000	Yes	Cabinet 15,000, other 12,500

TABLE 5 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Amount of Death	Double Indemnity Provided	Specified Differences for Other Administrative Personnel
		MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT		
25	Yes	4,000	Yes	
26	No			
27	Yes	2 Times annual Salary	Yes	
28	Yes	2,000	Yes	
29	Yes	20,000	Yes	
30	No			
31	Yes	4,000		
32	Yes	25,000	Yes	
33	Yes	3,000	No	
		DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT		
34	Yes	1,000	No	
35	Yes	20,000	Yes	
36	Yes	5,000	Yes	
37	Yes	35,000	Yes	Same as salary to nearest $1,000
38	Yes	30,000	Yes	

TABLE 6

Hospitalization (Medical-Surgical) Provisions For Administrative and Supervisory Personnel 1969-70

School System	Supt.	Fully Paid	Other Benefit	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		SINGLE MANAGEMENT		
1	Yes	Yes		
2	Yes	Yes		
3	Yes	Yes		
4	Yes	Yes		Same
5	Yes	Yes		Does not apply
6	Yes	Yes		
7	Yes	Yes	$275 Stipend for own carrier	
8	Yes	Yes		
9	Yes	Yes	Option to buy additional $5,000 group plan	
10	Yes	Yes		
11	Yes	Yes		
12	Yes	Yes		
13	Yes	Yes		
		DUAL MANAGEMENT		
14	Yes		Paid for employee; 1/2 for dependents	
15	Yes	Yes		
16	Yes	Yes		
17	Yes	Yes		Same
18	Yes	Yes		Same
19	Yes	Yes		
20	Yes	Yes		
21	Yes	Yes		
22	Yes	No	Less than half paid	
23	Yes	Yes		
24	Yes	Yes	Full Family	

TABLE 6 - Continued

School System	Supt.	Fully Paid	Other Benefit	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
	MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT			
25	Yes	Yes		
26	Yes	Yes		
27	Yes	Yes		Same
28	Yes		Single Subscriber, semi-private - Blue Cross-Blue Shield	
29	Yes	Yes	Full Family	
30	Yes	Yes		
31	Yes	Yes		
32	Yes	Yes		
33	Yes	Yes		
	DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT			
34	Yes	Yes	Paid for employee; 1/2 for dependents	
35	Yes	Yes		Same
36	Yes	Yes		
37	Yes	Yes		Same
38	Yes	Yes		Same

TABLE 7

Long Term Disability Insurance Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel 1969-70

School System	Supt.	Length and Conditions	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		SINGLE MANAGEMENT	
1	No		
2	Yes	up to 1/2 a year's salary - illness; fully paid	
3	No		
4	Yes	After 90 days, 50% of salary - Fully paid	Same
5	No		
6	No		
7	No		
8	No		
9	No		
10	No		
11	Yes	90 day waiting period - 75% Subsidy	Maximum $1000 per month
12	Yes	Full pay first 6 months; half pay 50 65	Fully paid
13	No		
		DUAL MANAGEMENT	
14	No		
15	No		
16	Yes	60% of income to 65 for total disability	Half paid
17	Yes	Full Paid	
18	No		Guaranteed
19	No		one year salary
20	No		
21	Yes	A 60%-40% Board Subsidy - Fully Paid	Payroll insurance available
22	No		
23	No		
24	Yes	60% gross salary Fully paid - Not over $1000 per month	Cabinet members only

TABLE 7 - Continued

School System	Supt.	Length and Conditions	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT	
25	Yes	39 weeks at salary Fully paid 70% of base (after sick leave)	Same
26	No		
27	Yes	60% of current salary to age 65	
28	No		Same
29	No		
30	Yes	$12,000 per year - Full paid after 180 days	
31	No		
32	No		
33	Yes	After six months 1/2 salary to age 65 - Fully paid	Less other government benefits
		DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT	
34	No		
35	No		
36	Yes	$50 for 1-13 weeks; $90 next 39 weeks; $25 next 52 weeks	
37	Yes	60% to age 65 Fully Paid	Not to exceed $1500 per month benefit
38	Yes	Fully Paid	

The provision for paid long term disability for administrators is relatively new in the area of public schools. In only fifteen districts of this part of the study did the question of subsidized long term disability insurance receive a positive response. The amount paid by the board of education varied from half of the cost to fully paid. The benefit ranged from one half year salary fully paid to sixty percent of salary paid until age sixty five. Various plans had waiting periods of from ninety days to a calendar year.

Divisional management structure had three of the five districts reporting with this benefit provided for the superintendent. The wide range of possible options for the board of education in this one category of benefit is a factor in making the value of this benefit hard to assess. The district with an excellent sick leave policy may not necessarily be improved with the addition of this benefit. New administrators without a bank of sick days may find such a benefit an important welfare item.

It would appear that this item is one in which the boards of education having approached it in various ways may find an experience factor to lead them to explore price advantages for the increasing size of the insured group.

Table 8 records the response of the questions regarding personal liability. Twenty of the thirty eight districts responded that this item was provided for the superintendent and members of the management team. The amount of coverage ranged from a low of $100,000 to a high of $2,500,000. The administrators in the dual management team structure with one exception had this provision. The median maximum benefit in the dual structure was three hundred thousand, however, there were four districts in which the maximum amount was one million dollars or more. In only one instance was an amount of deductible portion indicated.

This particular coverage, which slightly more than fifty percent of the superintendents and management team members receive seems to be one which the profession of school administration will be looking at closely. Many associations of administrators presently provide amounts of protection as a part of the membership to the organization.

TABLE 8

Personal Liability Provisions for
Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
1969-70

School System	Supt.	Maximum Benefit	Deductible Portion & Amount	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
	SINGLE MANAGEMENT			
1	No			
2	Yes	300,000	No	
3	Yes	200,000	No	
4	No			
5	No			Covered under district P.I.P. policy
6	No			
7	No			
8	No			
9	No			
10	No			
11	Yes	1,000,000	No	
12	Yes	1,300,000	No	
13	Yes	1,000,000	No	
	DUAL MANAGEMENT			
14	Yes	1,000,000	No	
15	Yes	100,000	No	
16	Yes	1,000,000	No	
17	Yes	100,000	No	Same
18	Yes	2,500,000		Same
19	No		All covered under regular liability for district	
20	Yes	100,000		
21	Yes	300,000	No	
22	No			
23	Yes	1,000,000	No	
24	Yes	100,000	Yes	($15,000) Same

TABLE 8 - Continued

School System	Supt.	Maximum Benefit	Deductible Portion & Amount	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
	MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT			
25	No			
26	No			
27	No			
28				
29	Yes	1,000,000	No	
30	Yes		No	
31	No			
32	Yes	1,300,000	No	
33	Yes	500,000	No	All the same
	DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT			
34	No			
35	No			
36	No			
37	Yes	1,000,000	No	
38	Yes		No	Principals do not have coverage

Table 9 shows that in all but two of the thirty eight districts included in this study tax sheltered annuities are provided as an administrator's welfare item. The optional number of carriers ranges from one to seven. In most instances the maximum deduction is the amount allowable under Internal Revenue Service regulation.

The benefit was granted to all multiple and divisional management team districts. Although the amount of cost to the board of education is not easily discerned, the benefit is worth much to the administrator who would like to postpone earnings for later years to gain certain tax advantage. The fact being that the amount of the benefit depends so much on the individual program of deductions established by the school administrator the net value of this benefit can not be easily measured. Board of education costs are in reality the amount of bookkeeping required for the contract provision. The more numerous the possible carriers the more costly the board's portion.

TABLE 9

Tax Sheltered Annuity Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70

School System	Supt.	Maximum or Minimum Amount	Number of Choice of Carriers	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		SINGLE MANAGEMENT		
1	Yes			
2	Yes	Max. 12% of salary	1	
3	Yes	Not specified		
4	Yes	I.R.S. Regulation	1	Same
5	Yes		1	Does not apply
6	Yes	1/6 of annual salary maximum	2	
7	Yes	None	2	
8	Yes	I.R.S. Regulation	7	
9	No			
10	Yes	No policy	1	
11	Yes		1	
12	Yes		1	
13	Yes		4	Same
		DUAL MANAGEMENT		
14	Yes	Set by	1	
15	No	Carrier		
16	Yes		3	
17	Yes	None	2	
18	Yes	5% of contract minimum	4	Available to all staff. Supt. annuity in addition to salary
19	Yes	None		
20	Yes	Legal Limit	16	
21	Yes	By law	Unlimited	
22	Yes	By law	3	
23	Yes		1	
24	Yes		4	Same

TABLE 9 - Continued

School System	Supt.	Maximum or Minimum Amount	Number of Choice of Carriers	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT		
25	Yes	$10 per day min; no maximum	3	Same
26	Yes			
27	Yes		5	Same
28	Yes	No Policy		
29	Yes		1	
30	Yes			Only same as all other employees with board contribution being $100 in lieu of Blue Cross-Blue Shield
31	Yes	I.R.S. Regulation	3	
32	Yes	None	3	
33	Yes	Legal Limit	2	Same
		DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT		
34	Yes	None	1	
35	Yes	None	2	Available
36	Yes		3	
37	Yes	None	3	Same
38	Yes	Limit by Carrier	1	

Provision for sabbatical leave for administrative and supervisory personnel is the information provided in Table 10. Only eleven districts reported that this welfare item was provided for superintendents and other member of the management team. In that only about one fourth of the districts reported positively to this item, it is notable that all did require the seven years of continuous service as prerequisite for the leave provision. Half pay is the standard salary to be paid to the administrator on leave. The number of years of service upon return from sabbatical was a range of one to three years. The median being two years for the eleven districts. Multiple and dual management team each had four districts in which the benefit was provided.

Table 11 summarizes the amounts of money and districts that provide conference attendance to the members of the management team members. With four exceptions the districts all provide conference allowance and expenses. The provisions are difficult to compare for some districts provide the benefit as a general conference budget amount while others merely pay all expenses for the conferences approved by the board of education. Some respondents indicated the per day allowance and others provided the amount for the entire administrative team. Each district's response is so individual as to require scrutiny of each to determine the total benefit provided.

TABLE 10

Sabbatical Leave Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70

School System	Supt.	No Years Continuous Service	Salary Option	Years Return Required	Written Reports	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
			SINGLE MANAGEMENT			
1	Yes	7	1 yr. no pay	2		
2	Yes	7	half pay	2	Yes	
3	No					All outside of central office 1/2 pay after 7 years
4	No					
5	No					Does not apply
6	No					
7	No					
8	No					2% of the professional staff; 1/2 pay after 7 years
9	No					
10	No					
11	No					
12	Yes	7	1/2 pay	3	2	1/2 pay after 7 years
13	No					

TABLE 10 - Continued

School System	Supt.	No Years Continuous Service	Salary Option	Years Return Required	Written Reports	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
			DUAL MANAGEMENT			
14	Yes	7	Half pay	3		
15	No					
16	No					
17	Yes	7	Half pay	2	Yes	Same
18	No					
19	No					(2)
20	No					1/2 pay after 7 years service
21	Yes	7	Half pay	2	Yes	
22	No					
23	No					
24	Yes	7	1/2 pay	3	Yes	Same

[2]19: Such an option is not specified in his contract or in the contracts of assistant superintendents and directors. However, it is assumed that the board would give consideration to such a request.

TABLE 10 - Continued

School System	Supt.	No Years Continuous Service	Salary Option	Years Return Required	Written Reports	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
			MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT			
25	Yes	7	Half pay	1		Same
26	Yes	7	Half pay	2	Yes-2	
27	No					Same
28	No					
29	No					
30	No					
31	No					
32	Possible	7	1/2 pay	1	Yes	provided one leave administrative so far
33	Yes	7	1/2 yr. full pay	2		Same
			DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT			
34	No					(1)
35	No					
36	No					
37	No					
38	Yes	7	1/2 pay	2	Yes	

[1]34: Half pay; return for one year; interim and final written reports; seven years of continuous service or 10 years non-continuous, with last three years continuous service.

TABLE 11

Conference Attendance Allowance Provisions for Administrative And Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70

School System	Superintendent	Total Allowance For Travel and Expenses	Limits to Number	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		SINGLE MANAGEMENT		
1	No		No	
2	Yes	$2,000	No	
3	Yes	Not stated	Yes	
4	Yes	All expenses	Yes	Asst. Supt. Bus. Affairs - $900; Asst. Supt. -$675; Supt. Elem. Ed-$720; High School Prin. -$630
5	No			
6	No		No	
7	Yes	No definite amount	No	Asst. Supt. Budget limit; Principal
8	Yes	Budget limits	No	Central Office no set limit; Prin. $400;
9	Yes	No ceiling	No	Asst. Prin. $250
10	Yes	$1,500	No	Principal, Directors $1,000
11	Yes	Full	No	
12	Yes	Expenses	No	
13	No		No	

TABLE 11 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Total Allowance For Travel and Expenses	Limits to Number	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		DUAL MANAGEMENT		
14	Yes	$2,000	Budget set	
15	Yes	Open	Yes	
16	Yes	$1,575	No	
17	Yes	As incurred	Yes	Same
18	Yes	As needed; approved by Board		Same
19	Yes	Not specified	No	
20	Yes	Open	Yes	
21	No	As requested per expenses	No	
22	Yes	Cost	No	
23	No		No	
24	Yes	$9,700 Adminis. budget	No	Try to send all to major conference each year

TABLE 11 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Total Allowance For Travel and Expenses	Limits to Number	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT		
25	Yes	$20 per day lodging $20 per day for food	No	Same includes air costs
26	No	No regular allowance; all expenses paid	No	
27	Yes	As needed	No	Same
28	Yes	Budget limits	No	
29	Yes	Expenses incurred	No	
30	Yes	Not limited		
31	Yes	No specified		
32	Yes	$25 per day plus air fare	No	
33	Yes	Cost	No	All the same

TABLE 11 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Total Allowance For Travel and Expenses	Limits to Number	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT		
34	Yes	Unlimited	No	
35	Yes	$1,500	Supt. Discretion	
36	Yes		No	
37	Yes	Actual expenses	No	None allowed due to budget limitations
38	Yes	$5,000	No	Principal to state annually; to national biennially

The payment of membership for members of the management team in various professional associations is indicated in Table 12. In twenty-six of the thirty-eight districts the board of education assumes the responsibility for some memberships for superintendents and certain central office administrators. The most prevalent organization in all structures of the study for which the dues were paid was the Association of School Administrators and it various state and county affiliates. Although no dollar limit was reported it can be assumed from the list of organizations reported that the benefit to team members could easily exceed one hundred dollars per year for the many organizations listed.

From the differences indicated in that column the various levels of the management team are definitely allowed membership depending upon their specific board office role.

TABLE 12

Membership in Professional Organization Provisions for Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, 1969-70

School System	Superintendent	Names of Organizations	Dollar Limit on Dues Paid by the Board	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		SINGLE MANAGEMENT		
1	No		No	
2	Yes	Local, state & National	No	Central office only
3	No			
4	Yes	MASA-AASA,ASBO & County	No	Would vary according to approved memberships
5	Yes		No	Does not apply
6	Yes	MASA-AASA,MASCD & ASCD	No	
7	No			None paid
8	No			
9	Yes	MASA-AASA & Wayne County ASA	No	None paid except Business Manager and Curriculum Coordinator
10	Yes	MASA-AASA & ASCD	No	None paid by the Board
11	Yes	MASA-AASA	No	
12	Yes		No	Principals belong to national associations
13	Yes	MASA-AASA	No	

TABLE 12 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Names of Organizations	Dollar Limit on Dues Paid by the Board	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		DUAL MANAGEMENT		
14	Yes	MASA-AASA & OCCAS	No	
15	No			
16	Yes	MASA		
17	Yes	MASA-AASA,MCASA MASB & NAPSAE	No	Others national, state and county dues, but not the same as supt.
18	Yes	MASA,ASBO,OCASS & OCSBO		Some are paid for example, MASSP, NASSP
19	Yes	Under consideration		Supt. and Assts. will re-receive if approved; others pay own
20	Yes	MASA-AASA	No	
21	No		No	
22	Yes	All but primary professional group-AASA	No	
23	Yes	MASA-AASA	No	
24	Yes	Some, organizations directly related to position	No	Supt. pays his own MASA-AASA

TABLE 12 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Names of Organizations	Dollar Limit on Dues Paid by the Board	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT		
25	Yes	MASA-AASA	No	Same
26	No			
27	Yes	MASA-AASA	No	Same
28	Yes	MASA-AASA, Chamber of Commerce	No	
29	No			
30	No	No		
31	No			
32	No			
33	Yes	Not specified	No	All same

TABLE 12 - Continued

School System	Superintendent	Names of Organizations	Dollar Limit on Dues Paid by the Board	Specified Differences for Other Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
		DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT		
34	Yes			
35	Yes	MASA-AASA & ASCD	No	(1)
36	Yes	AASA,WCASB	No	
37	No	MASB,NASB		
38	Yes	MASA-AASA ASCD	No	Same for their respective association

[1]34: Assistant Superintendent MASA; Assistant Superintendent, business local, state and national business officials; Superintendent Elementary Education, ASCD; high school Principal, MASSP and NASSP.

Summary of Findings Regarding Fringe Benefits Granted to Superintendents and Other Supervisory Personnel

Table 13 includes the review of the contractual provisions for superintendents and other supervisory personnel. There were thirteen districts reporting in the single management structure, eleven in the dual management, nine in the multiple management, and five in the divisional management.

In these totals are reflected the percentage out of the possible number of districts granting the benefit. The dual management team structure has a slight percentage lead over divisional in this overall summary of benefits. Multiple is third with 74.7 per cent and single is fourth with 60.8 per cent.

The eleven items including everything from vacation time to board of education paid professional dues, encompasses the more easily identified elements of administrator welfare. This list of items as indicated in Chapter II reflects the bargainable areas of welfare. Few districts included in Table 16 have arrived at these benefits by the bargaining process and negotiating. In the future, a comparison of this table and the benefits provided as a result of administrator bargaining would be of some relevance.

Many of the benefits granted are merely the extension of the current fringe benefits granted teachers by contract. An exception would be professional dues. In some instances,

TABLE 13

Number of Districts Providing Fringe Benefits to Administrative and Supervisory Personnel[1]

Management Team Structure	Personnel Benefit, 1969-70														
	Total Number of Districts	Vacation	Transportation	Sick Leave	Term Life Insurance	Hospital Insurance	Disability Insurance	Personal Liability	Tax Sheltered Annuity	Sabbatical Leave	Conference Allowance	Professional Dues	Totals	Percentages of Possible Benefit	Total Possible
Single	13	12	11	7	9	10	4	5	12	3	9	9	87	60.8	143
Dual	11	11	11	11	10	11	4	9	10	4	9	9	99	80.9	121
Multiple	9	9	9	7	7	9	4	5	9	4	8	4	75	74.7	99
Divi - sional	5	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	5	1	5	4	44	80.0	55

[1]Table 13 identifies in summary the benefits provided by district. It is the data gathered from the questions asked on the form, Salary Policies, Relating to Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. It is, therefore, an overview of the benefits provided. The percentage of possible benefit indicates what percentage of the maximum possible benefit was provided in the school districts surveyed.

as term insurance the benefit far exceeds the teacher contract.

The tables included in this chapter of fringe benefits forms a major portion of the reporting of school districts that are members of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc.. They have been published in a report entitled Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel In Metropolitan Detroit Schools, April, 1970. The forms for gathering the data and the tables as published were the work of the author. The report is used widely by boards of education, superintendents, teacher unions and administrative groups in evaluating their position as regards to salary and fringe benefits. The tables were developed in a priority from high to low as perceived by the author as a practicing administrator.

Without the actual cost analysis being done and a measure of the ability of a district to grant benefits, the tables become a tally by management team structure of what is present practice. The comparison of benefit by administrative management team structure refines the reporting to indicate some difference that may be attributed to structure.

Although it is difficult to compare fringe benefits as to costs of value received, the tables included in this chapter of findings does reveal some differences among the four management team structures that can be evaluated.

When comparing the data from Table 2 as regards to weeks of vacation for superintendents the median for all

four structures was four weeks. The difference are not all so designated in the superintendent's contract. Table 3 reveals the number of districts which provide and maintain an auto for the superintendent. A tally of the number of districts in each of the management team structures would indicate that single team structure is more rewarding until we examine the number of other key administrators who are also granted the same benefit. Therefore an erroneous supposition that single team structure is more rewarding in this area is not truly accurate.

Table 4 reviews the number of sick days granted to the administrators of the various management team structures. The median days allowed range from twelve days in single structure to fifteen days in divisional. This can not be taken as completely valid for a number have unlimited sick leave and a median of fifteen does not indicate how many actually are granted the benefit.

Conclusions of Findings of The Annual Survey of The Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies

The author has concluded that the summary of the data gathered in the Tables 2 - 12 have importance for they reveal accurately the wide range of welfare benefits granted to the various members of the management team in the thirty eight reporting districts. A statistical analysis of the data was not possible for the one constant that might be applied to the four variables of structure is not available. That is, of course, the cost to the board for each benefit. The size of the management team would strongly influence the board of education cost for each benefit. Many options available in term insurance make the equating of benefit near impossible.

Table 13, which is a tally of benefits granted by contract, indicated that the differences that exist among the four management team structures would favor dual and divisional management team members in benefits reported and granted.

The findings in this chapter need to be considered in the light of responses to personal interview with a random sample of administrators as reported in Chapter IV. The granting of benefits as reported here take on new consideration when the interviewed administrator reflects on management team as practiced or perceived in his local district.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS--INTERVIEWS

Introduction

The findings reported in this chapter will be the summary in table form of data gathered by personal interview conducted in twenty Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies member districts. The interviewed administrators had been randomly selected from randomly chosen school districts. Included are various levels of central office administration and in all but two districts a building administrator.

The data was converted to punch card form, and the computer program Contingency Table Analysis BMD2S has been applied. The computer program was written by Health Sciences Computing Facility, UCLA as revised and adapted by the Statistical Research Laboratory of the University of Michigan. The version used was dated July 1, 1968. This particular form was used in that the sample was small but the reliability was high due to the random selection within the Bureau membership and the availability of back up data from earlier salary and fringe benefit studies.

The first seven tables describe more fully the

sample for they include such facts as: Table 14, the Management Team pattern of organization and size of district. Table 15, the Management Team pattern of Organization and the individual position of the administrator interviewed. Table 16 indicates the number of various teams the administrator is a member of in the specific pattern of organization in the district. Tables 17, 18, 19, and 20 cover the number of years in the position, in the district, in the profession and the highest degree held. Table 21 and 22 summarize the formulas for setting salaries and the responsibility for setting salary. Tables 23 and 24 are important for they summarize the status of a bargaining unit for administrators and the possibility of such in the near future. Tables 25 and 26 discuss the assignment of secretarial help and administrative assistants. The work year in weeks, justification for the differential and the actual weeks worked are included in Tables 27-28. Interview reaction to the question of job posting and informal advancement are in narrative summary. Included in Appendix C is a complete table on the actual weeks worked and specified vacation by position of building administrator in all the member districts of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau.

All of the data gathered by interview is reported and included in the table and narrative for the purpose of giving a full description of the interview sample. Tables 17-20 assist in this description as do tables 14-16.

The reporting proceeds as the interviews did from

basic factual data to open-ended questions about management team. The findings thereby follow the author's concern that the randomly chosen administrators, as experienced in the field test of the instrument, move more readily from known materials such as years in the profession, and role, to the more personal inquiry about the status of bargaining and management team.

TABLE 14

Interview Summary
Size of District

Management Team Structure	Middle Size		Large Size		Totals	
	Dist.	Admin.	Dist.	Admin.	Dist.	Admin.
Single	4	8	1	2	5	10
Dual	1	2	4	8	5	10
Multiple	1	2	4	7	5	9
Divisional	1	2	4	7	5	9
Total	7	14	13	24	20	38

The random selection of districts resulted in the above described table of interviewed districts according to their size of student population. A middle size district is defined for study purposes as one that has a student membership of less than 6,000 students on September 27, 1968. Large districts would be those with a larger than 6,000 membership on the same date. It is readily discerned that single management team and small districts are reasonable expectation and that divisional is a mark in most instances of the large more complex organizational structure.

For this study districts of larger than six thousand students were interviewed in percentage ratio of 63.1 percent to 36.9 percent of the middle size school districts.

TABLE 15

Interview Summary
Administrative Position

Management Team Structure	Central Office		Building Administrators				
	Supt.	Other C.O.	Sec. Prin.	Ass't. Prin.	Elem. Prin.	Ass't. Prin.	Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Single	3	2	0	1	4	0	10
Dual	2	3	0	0	4	1	10
Multiple	0	5	2	0	2	0	9
Divisional	1	4	1	0	3	0	9
Total	6	14	3	1	13	1	38

Column one of the above table indicates the number of superintendents interviewed, column two the number of other central office administrators, column three secondary principals, column four the number of assistant secondary principals, column five the elementary principals and column six the number of assistant principals. Elementary principals were the largest number of building administrators interviewed for they constitute the largest single group of administrators in the area of the study. A total of twenty central offices and eighteen building administrators were interviewed.

In the random selection superintendents were not chosen for interview in the category of the multiple

management team structure. Of the many interviews conducted the superintendents appeared to be most interested in the topic and interested in the final outcome of a study of the management team.

Interviews were conducted in all twenty districts of the study area, however, building administrators were not available in one multiple management team district and in one divisional district.

TABLE 16

Interview Summary
Membership in Various Teams Within
The Administrative Structure

Management Team Structure	Number of various teams within the Structure						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Single	5	3	1	0	1	0	10
Dual	5	3	0	1	0	0	9
Multiple	2	5	2	1	0	1	9
Divisional	0	5	2	1	0	1	9
Total	12	16	4	3	1	1	37

In total thirty seven administrators responded to this portion of the interview confirming their participation in the management team process by serving on various teams within the structure. Thirty-two and four tenths percent were members of only one team, forty-two and two tenths percent were active in two teams and balance were active in three or more. The highest number of teams participated in was reported in one district each of the

divisional and multiple structure of team mangement as being six. These various groups were entitled by locally definitive names such as administrative cabinet, administrative council, advisory council, curriculum council, central administrative staff, superintendent's advisory committee, bargaining team, secondary principals association, and elementary principals association. The most common term, however, was simply administrative staff.

TABLE 17

Interview Summary
Administrator's Number of Years in Present Position

Management Team Structure	Number of years in present position								Total
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15-16	
Single	4	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	10
Dual	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	10
Multiple	3	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	9
Divisional	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	9
Totals	21	14	4	2	1	1	0	3	38

Interview Table 17 is significant in identifying the length of time each of the interviewed administrators has been in the present position. Probably the most significant part of these responses is the fact that twenty six of the thirty eight administrators has been in the role less than five years. Almost seventy percent have been in their titled positions less than five years. Only three had been in their assignment for fifteen or sixteen years.

TABLE 18

Interview Summary
Administrator's Number of Years in the District

Management Team Structure	Number of Years in the District																	Total
	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	
Single	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	10
Dual	0	2	1	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10
Multiple	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Divisional	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9
Totals	2	6	1	3	2	5	4	5	3	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	1	38

The Table 18 gives a profile of the years of service to the local district by the thirty-eight administrators in the twenty districts. Most of the representatives of administrative teams had been in the present district sixteen years or less. When this data is compared with Table 17 the interviewed administrators years in position and Table 19 it is easy to see that many have been in the same district their entire career and that many have been in their administrative position only a short time.

The percentage evaluation of the data in Table 19 reveal that 65.8 percent of the administrators interviewed had eighteen years or less in the profession and that only six individuals had over thirty years of service.

TABLE 19

Interview Summary
Administrator's Number of Years in the Profession

Management Team Structure	Number of Years in the Profession																	
	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	Total
Single	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	10
Dual	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
Multiple	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Divisional	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9
Totals	1	2	3	3	11	5	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	38

TABLE 20

Interview Summary
Highest Degree Held by Administrator

Management Team Structure	Highest Degree Held by Administrator							
	M.A.	%	Spec. Ed.	%	Ph.D.	%	Other	
Single	6	21.4	4	66.7				
Dual	9	32.1			1	33.3		
Multiple	7	25.0	2	33.3				
Divisional	6	21.4			2	66.7	1	100.
Totals	28	100	6	100	3	100	1	100

The educational level of the administrators interviewed revealed the doctorate to be the exception and the masters to be the norm in the various management team structures.

The first seven tables of this part of the chapter of the findings were in the form of data gathering for the purpose of establishing the competence in terms of years of service,degrees held, role in the various teams of the district. They also serve as an aid to establishing rapport with the administrator before asking the more discerning questions regarding the status of bargaining and the formula for salary setting. Some of the more nearly subjective type responses to questions regarding the possibility of a bargaining unit, criteria for the appointment of secretaries and assistants, the posting of positions and the informal advancement procedures were the ones that stimulated the most discussion.

The eight tables that follow take up these issues in detail.

TABLE 21

Interview Summary Formulas for Setting Administrators' Salaries

Management Team Structure	Formula for Setting Salary - Column Percents									
	Index	%	Merit	%	Schedule	%	Formula	%	Total	%
Single	4	40.0	2	15.4	2	33.3	2	26.3	10	26.3
Dual	4	40.0	4	30.8	2	33.3	0	0	10	26.3
Multiple	2	0	1	7.7	1	16.7	7	77.8	9	23.7
Divisional	2	20.0	6	46.2	1	16.7	0	0	9	23.7
Total	10		13		6		9		38	

Table 21 indicates that within the group of administrators interviewed, the variety of responses is somewhat significant. Index was defined as the fixed ratio to teachers maximum M.A. salary. Merit indicated subjective merit evaluation. Schedule indicated a previously agreed to range of salary. Formula indicated a computation including index, size of school and other factors. The large number of merit responses - thirteen, can be understood for twenty of this number of thirty-eight held central office positions.

The variety described above also is indicative of the practice in the randomly selected twenty districts. No one pattern is discernible with the exception of the response by seven administrators in the multiple structure reflect-

ing 77.8 percent of the total respondents in the "formula" category.

TABLE 22

Interview Summary
Responsibility of Setting Administrator Salary

Management Team Structure	Responsible Group or Position						
	Superintendent	Superintendent and Board	Board Alone	Management Team Committee	Negotiations	Other	Total
Single	0	0	4	3	0	0	10
Dual	2	3	2	2	0	1	10
Multiple	1	4	0	4	0	0	9
Divisional	1	4	1	1	1	1	9
Total	4	14	7	10	1	2	38

In twenty-five of the thirty-eight interviews the response indicated that the salary was set by the superintendent, superintendent and board, or board alone. In that both central office and building administrators are included in this data it appears that at the time of the interviews as they reflect on the salaries paid for the school year 1969-70 the board and superintendent hold the major responsibility for the final decision. A total of eleven reported the salary to have been set by management team committee or by formal negotiations. This is notable in that as many as eleven would involve a committee and a few bargain for their salaries.

TABLE 23

Interview Summary
Status of a Recognized Bargaining Unit July 1, 1970

Management Team Structure	Status of Recognized Unit and Percent						
	Yes	Per-cent	No	Per-cent	Other	Per-cent	Totals
Single	0	0	10	100.0	0	0	10
Dual	4	40.0	4	40.0	2	20.0	10
Multiple	1	11.1	7	77.8	1	11.1	9
Divisional	6	66.7	3	33.3	0	0	9
Total	11		24		3		38

This question when asked of both building administrators and central office personnel indicated that in six districts formal bargaining had begun. However, in one instance, the administrators of the same district disagreed that a position of recognition existed at the time of the interview.

In districts that reported no recognized unit existed, a further question was asked as to the possibility of such a unit. The results of this are reported in Table 24.

TABLE 24

Responses of Administrators Concerning the Recognition of a Bargaining Unit for Administrators

Management Team Structure	Possibility of Recognizing Administrator Bargaining Unit		No Possibility of Recognizing Administrator Bargaining Unit			
	Number	%	Number	%	Total	%
Single	4	57.1	4	23.5	8	33.3
Dual	2	28.6	3	17.6	5	20.8
Multiple	1	14.3	7	41.2	8	33.3
Divisional	0	0	3	17.6	3	12.5
Total	7		17		24	

To this question only twenty-four administrators replied. The others eigher already had established units or felt some other middle position was under study or in the future. It could be determined by the responses received that the number of districts from those interviewed which may possibly be bargaining in the near future may increase at least by three if not more. A few of these interviewed went beyond the question to state that in their opinion, administrators in their respective districts would "never" bargain collectively with the board of education.

This question elicited the most subjective responses and touches the real heart of the study. Consistently, the building administrators, whether in the field test of the instrument or in the actual study sample, wished to discuss this item beyond the content of the interview question. It is evident from the responses in Table 24 that of those in-

terviewed a high percentage indicated no possible unit. However, other conditional statements by the administrators would lead the author to believe otherwise. Assuming the status quo of salaries and fringe benefits as they related to teacher maximums need for bargaining for administrators welfare would possibly not exist.

The definition of management team and the question raised about possible bargaining by administrators are in contradiction. Management team carries, by its present definition by field administrators, attitudes of loyalty, team work and shared decision making. To ask the question is there a possibility of a unit appeared to cause some discomfort in the administrator being interviewed. Many in response to the question regarding positive and negative elements of management team reflected negatively on the rapport between central office and building administrators.

Certain central office administrators indicated some status anxiety in discussing commitment to management team. Building administrators were on the other hand more militant in expressing feelings positively toward bargaining.

In the number of districts interviewed of the six that have established units only three had bargained for the benefits reported in Chapter III of this study. It is not, therefore, possible at this time to accurately assess the relationship between welfare benefits obtained by bargaining and those not bargained for.

It is possible to conclude that in the area of sick

leave, hospitalization insurance and other leave benefits the existing contractual agreements with the instructional staff are in general extended to the various management team members. Structure of these teams does not appear to be the major factor in these welfare decisions.

TABLE 25

Interview Summary
Criteria for Assignment of Secretarial Assistance to the Administrators

Management Team Structure	Criteria				
	Size of School	Level of School or Board Office Role	Supt's. Recom.	Other	Total
Single	4	1	4	1	10
Dual	4	0	2	4	10
Multiple	1	3	4	1	9
Divisional	3	0	3	3	9
Total	12	4	13	9	38

TABLE 26

Interview Summary
Criteria for Assignment of Administrative Assistance to Administrators

Management Team Structure	Criteria				
	Size of School	Level of School or Board Office Role	Supt's. Recom.	Other	Total
Single	3	1	1	4	9
Dual	1	0	1	6	8
Multiple	1	2	1	5	9
Divisional	2	1	0	4	7
Total	7	4	3	19	33

Table 25 and Table 26 have been grouped together for closer study. These two areas, secretarial and administrative assistance were answered by the administrators interviewed as low priority items. Few of the administrators considered these areas as major problems. The basic assignment of one secretary for each elementary school and two or more for secondary schools seems to have general acceptance as the norm. Central office administrators reflected more frequently that the question had budget implications and often the answer "I defend the need of an assistant to the superintendent and he carries my request to the board in budget preparation". No one in a building capacity indicated a numerical figure of students as criteria for additional secretaries, but several mentioned the number of students dictated the assignment of additional building assistant principals.

The number of actual weeks of work seems to be a true indicator of the status and role enjoyed by members of the management team at different levels. The question directed to the various team members was "Is there a differential in the number of actual work weeks for the various members of the management team?" The Table 27 shows the responses of the administrators to that question. Table 28 that follows is a review of the answers to the question "On what is the differential of weeks worked predicated upon?"

TABLE 27

Interview Summary
Administrators Weeks of Work Differential

Management Team Structure	Indication of Differential and Percent				
	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	Totals
Single	8	80.0	2	20.0	10
Dual	7	70.0	3	30.0	10
Multiple	9	100.0	0	0	9
Divisional	9	100.0	0	0	9
Total	33		5		38

TABLE 28

Interview Summary
Administrators Weeks of Work
Differential Predication

Management Team Structure	Basis for Differential					
	Size of School	Level of School	Board Office Role	Title	Other	Total
Single	0	4	3	0	3	10
Dual	0	4	2	1	0	7
Multiple	0	4	5	0	0	9
Divisional	0	4	4	1	0	9
Total	0	16	14	2	3	35

ADMINISTRATIVE POSTINGS

Two additional questions raised in the interview:

> How are administrative openings posted? What, if any, is the informal advancement procedure from building level to central office?

In answering these two somewhat related questions all thirty eight administrators replied that positions were posted by notification of the teacher bargaining unit and communication from the superintendent's office to the present administrative staff. The question of an informal advancement procedure to central office from the buildings was answered in the negative with one exception where the answer indicated that every other appointment made came from outside the district. In related discussion with the persons being interviewed the position of most was that only major administrative positions such as assistant superintendent and alike were widely advertised in the university placement centers. Additional comments revealed a dependence upon locally oriented intern programs and promotion from within as the general guideline.

Summary of Positive and Negative Elements of Management Team

At the close of the interview two general questions were asked. The first question, "What are positive elements of management team?" resulted in the following summary of comments.

The comments on the positive aspects of management

team fall into four general areas, the first is communication, the second decision making, the third make up of the team or definition of the team, and fourth the general or descriptive terms as expressed by the various management team members.

In this first category the comments included such statements as "communication is better", "more heads better than one", and "total communication when all are involved." The second series of comments followed the line such as this "In management team recommendations are seriously considered," and "involvement results in positive decision." A summary of the second type comment might be the one that stated simply that in management team more alternatives are brought to light.

The third area of answers to this question resulted in the most interesting review of the team concept. Although they responded to this as positive comment the various administrators were often contradictory in the statement of their team structure responses. Some said the board must be a part of the team others said only people who must implement should be on the team. Team meant bargaining with teachers as management and others said being on a team strengthened their position when dealing with the board. Consistently the positives identified involvement in decisions as criteria for membership in the management team. A very insightful comment reflected on the fact that what was really needed was several teams in the district to accomplish the tasks of administration.

The fourth area of positive commentary includes the more general nature. The adjectives used include: worthwhile, needed, unifying, stabilizing, very good, supportive of trust and loyalty.

In summary, the positive comments most frequently reflected the involvement of various members of management in the making of decisions. The responses indicate a lack of clear definition in the team concept and who should be included in the team. Most all administrators had some positive reflections on management team as they perceived it.

Negative comments can also be categorized into several general areas. The areas are: the role of the superintendent, decision making, involvement, board of education role, and the large number who responded that there were no negative aspects to the management team concept.

Three responses indicated concern for the superintendent realistically surrendering legal or position authority. Concern was expressed for the difficulty the superintendent would have as team member where often the strength of the team depends on the leadership of the superintendent. One saw the team as an erosion of the role of the superintendent and another saw the central office unable to or willing to share all decisions with the team.

Criticism of the decision making process followed the lines of these comments; communications must improve, some will not support the decisions of the team, cumbersome for decision making, and major decisions will still

be handed out.

In regards to involvement the negative responses are typified by such blunt statements as, "size lets things bog down", "cabinet level team too narrow", "time consuming and inefficient", others expressed concern over willingness of building administrators to be involved with district concerns, the expense and time involved, and the problem of changed behavior necessary in management team. One single comment summarizes the comments regarding the area of involvement by indicating the difficulty in maintaining the definition of the management team.

Harsh criticism of the board of education could best describe this fourth kind of a response. The board should not be included for turnover would prevent normal progress, and the board does not accept the management team role assignment. The one response that sums up the attitude expressed in this area was simply "the board is not to be involved in the management team".

A total of six interviewed stated that they had none when asked to suggest negative aspects of management team. Again as in the positive response a few indicated that what was really needed was a definition.

Although a number of the administrators interviewed did respond to this question the single most consistant answer given was "None". The negative responses seem to cover much of the same ground covered by others in positive comments. In reviewing the answers of superintendents and

central office compared to building administrators the negative responses and positive are about equal in number and conviction. Each element of the various team structures seem to have similar concerns and positive reactions. No pattern prevails when all are compared.

Summary of the Findings by Interview

The summary tables of the data gathered by personal interview would indicate a few patterns of difference that can be summarized. Team as interpreted by the various administrators interviewed varied in definition from the total management structure to bargaining by administrative groups. The first Tables 14-20 served to identify the administrator being interviewed and revealed some differences from structure to structure as to experiential and preparation background of the sample. Table 16 would indicate that the median number of teams within the structure was two, but that some administrators served on as many as six and twelve of thirty-seven served on only one.

Table 22 indicated that out of thirty-eight administrators interviewed twenty-five had their salary set by the superintendent, superintendent and board or board alone and only thirteen had salary set by management team committee, negotiations or other means. When compared to the responses on Table 22 where only six districts have bargaining units it would appear that in this sample some modification of salary negotiations is in existence by committee. It is also of note that many of the central office people interviewed would not be a part of a bar-

gaining unit for they are superintendents or assistant superintendents.

Table 24 indicates that the replies in the single management structure are evenly divided as to the possibility of a bargaining unit in their respective district. Dual management team administrators split with two responding yes and three saying none possible. The multiple group was margin of seven to one none possible. Divisional reported only three and they stated none possible. The totals of seven "possible" and seventeen "none possible" are an evidence of the feelings of this group that the bargaining by administrators is not about to take a hold in this sample area.

Tables 25 and 26 when studied revealed that the assignment of secretaries and assistants split almost evenly between the responses of building administrators and central office. The criteria being size of school for principals and the superintendent's recommendation for central office personnel.

Tables 27 and 28 summarize the conclusion that in the districts interviewed there is a differential in the number of weeks worked by various members of the management team and that it is predicated on level of school or central office role.

Data gathered about posting for advancement in the interview area is very much the same and with one exception there is no informal advancement procedure.

Summary statements about the management team concept

would reveal a fairly even distribution of positive and negative comments by both central office and building administrators. The concerns both positive and negative seem to revolve around concerns for communications, decision making, and role of the superintendent and board. The most consistent answer was that they had nothing negative to say as regards to the management team concept.

The findings in this chapter must be compared with the basic information reported in Chapter III. The interviews were conducted to gain an accurate sensing as to whether or not the administrator was a spectator or a participant in the management team and to determine if he was consulted in establishing the welfare benefits in his district. The number of administrators interviewed is too small a sample to be evaluated on a test for statistical significance. The reporting, however, clearly indicates differences.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the effect of management team patterns of school organization on the administrators' welfare. The term professional welfare was defined for study purposes as all the economic as well as position and title benefits granted administrators such as salary, fringe benefits, secretarial help, administrative assistance, length of contract and length of work year.

The data for the above was gathered from research bulletins, an extensive survey of the member school districts of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Services, INC., and personal interviews with central office administrators and building principals. Initially, in cooperation with two other doctoral students, criteria for describing four structures of management team evolved from a survey of Bureau member school districts in southeastern Michigan. The four structures derived were: Single management team - where the superintendent meets with just one group that includes all the management team members or their representatives; Dual - management team where the superintendent meets with a group that includes all the management team members or their representatives as well as a group that includes just central administrators; Multiple - where the superintendent meets with a group that includes all the

management team members or their representatives and two or more other groups that include different segments of the management team; Divisional - where the superintendent does not meet with a group that includes all the management team members or their representatives, but meets with one or more groups that include different segments of the management team.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of the study was regional in that the data gathering was restricted to the member school districts of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau located in southeastern Michigan. State and national trends are possible inferences but the data is limited by the regional nature of the Bureau's service area.

Limitations on the study included first the fact that only Bureau school districts were included and data comes mostly from three instruments: the Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure, the Annual Study of Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, and Management Team Welfare Questionnaire.

A second limitation was that the historical data from pre-collective bargaining years could not be compared for lack of knowledge of the administrative structure during that year.

A third limitation to the study was the fact that the data gathered regarding fringe benefits lacked a commonality that would lend itself to statistical analysis.

A fourth limitation was that the number of administrative interviews conducted did not permit complete analysis of variance for the small sample. The minor limitations to the study stem from the fact that little research had been conducted in the area of management team administration of public schools, and secondly that a review of the issues of salary become a study of "what was" because the data on salary paid changes annually.

Sources of Data

The data were accumulated from three instruments. The first was the Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure, the second was the Annual Study of Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. The third instrument was the summary sheet which included the responses of thirty-eight administrators to an interview format.

I. Questionnaire - Patterns of School Organizational Structure

This instrument, developed jointly by John Beckwith, Karl Buttenmiller, and Waino E. Aukee, was sent to the superintendent of each of the member school districts of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., in August of 1969. From the responses to this questionnaire came the four basic structures of Single, Dual, Miltiple and Divisional management team organization. From this early sample the second two data gathering instruments had a basic form over which their input was then evaluated. This instrument determined which school districts would form the basis for further study and interview.

II. Annual Study of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel

This study conducted annually by the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., among its member school districts in southeastern Michigan provides the basic salary and fringe benefit data for administrators in the Detroit Metropolitan area. The various items of fringe benefit were the specific form and design the author developed for study purposes.

III. Summary Sheet for Management Team Welfare Questionnaire

This item is the tally sheet or form on which the author accumulated the responses to the thirty-eight interviews conducted with central office and building administrators. The data gathered on these forms were converted to punch card data and submitted to the University of Michigan Terminal System (Model PR220) for analysis. The program applied was the BMD 2S-Contingency Table Analysis - Version of July 1, 1968 written by Health Services Computing Facility, UCLA as revised and adapted by the Statistical Research Laboratory, University of Michigan. The analysis was limited to frequency tables as well as row and column percentages for the various responses.

Related Literature

Chapter II contains references to related literature in a variety of source material. The inclusion of material regarding the foundations of the management team concept is necessary for a clearer understanding of the structures developed as part of the study design. The four management

team structures are the author's approach to describing an operational structure as reported in practice by Southeastern Michigan school districts.

Support for administrator participation is found in Likert's system four where he states this as a character of motivation - "Economic rewards based on a compensation system developed through participation."[1] The identification with the manager's role in leadership of a team is present in both the writings of Likert[2] and McGregor.[3]

The absence of research in education to identify the welfare concerns of management was reported. This need will be supplied as additional research regarding management team includes this facet.

Other related literature from the administrator association journals points out the urgency of the study of welfare as it relates to structure. The concerns of school administrators focus on welfare as critical to the evolving of the management team in the local districts. The reference to association convention reports and the lists of identified fringe benefits support the development of the study around similar welfare concerns.

---

[1] Rensis Likert, The Human Organization, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967, p. 5.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Douglas McGregor, The Professional Manager, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

The final inclusion in the related literature of the Model Team Management Agreement bridges the theoretical writings with the practical politics of school administration, 1971.

Conclusions

Two principal conclusions are drawn from the data of this study. Concomitant conclusions are placed in a subordinate position as they amplify support, limit, or are corollary to the principal conclusions discussed. The pertinent findings follow the conclusions.

Conclusion I - There is little substantive difference in administrators' welfare of members of a management team of various levels in school districts with dual, single, multiple or divisional management team patterns of school organizational structure.

The comparison of salaries and fringe benefits paid to the various members of the four structures indicate that administrators of the same structure were granted no special salary or advantage.

In Table 13 of Chapter III the percentage of all welfare benefits provided superintendents and other administrative personnel in the two structures of Dual, 80.9 per cent, and Divisional, 80.0 per cent, are appreciably higher than the 60.8 per cent for Single and 74.7 per cent for Multiple.

The difficulty of making more than an observation of this percentage difference stems from the fact that equating benefits must be normed on some criteria.

The most reasonable criteria seems to be cost to the board of education. When attempting the analogy however, the task is most difficult. The cost per individual or cost per administrative group is not a separate budget item for each of the elements of welfare defined in this study. The individual administrator's net salary is easily retrieved for study. But the cost to the board per individual administrator is not easily obtained in dollars and cents for the optional pay roll deduction for tax sheltered annuities. When costs for term life insurance may be obtained for the district or individual, the amount and method of analysis when comparing districts of different size and administrators of varying age, as indicated in the interview summary tables, the task is near impossible.

The salary paid to various members of the management team in school districts with single, dual, multiple, or divisional management patterns of school organizational structure is different in the various structures. The findings of the salary survey would indicate that perhaps the salary paid the highest paid teacher may be more significant for many salaries of administrators are predicated on this element of salary structure.

The districts in the various management team structures differ in size, number of administrators, and taxable wealth behind each child but still maintain a constant ratio or relationship as to salary structure for the levels of the management team. Major salary increases have occurred over the past five years. The research of the NEA and the member districts of the

Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies report such increases. The increases in the Bureau service area closely parallel the national figures for large (25,000 students or more) districts. The data of the Bureau, although a small sample, is accurately reported and presents a respectable sample for a model of Michigan and midwest salaries.

When the length of work year of members of management teams of various levels in school districts with single, dual, multiple or dividional patterns of school organizational structure are compared, there is little difference. The median and average for elementary principals was forty-four weeks for all four structures, the median and average for secondary school administrators was forty-eight weeks. The forty-eight actual weeks was also true of central office administration. Most high school principals and central office administrators indicated a fifty-two week contract, but in reality work forty-eight weeks with twenty to twenty-five days of vacation or holiday. The one rather notable exception is school district thirty-four in the divisional structure where the elementary principals have a thirty-nine week contract. This district is the largest in the state and in numbers employs more elementary principals than any other.

The data gathered by interview indicate that the assignment of secretarial assistance was not a great concern of the administrators studied. The survey of elementary school administrators reported that the formula of one secretary at each school was the norm.

Secondary administrators agreed that two secretaries plus some assistance for the counseling office was the norm for the secondary school. The difference in responses to this question could be best summarized as the central office viewing it as a low priority item and one based almost entirely on budget consideration. Building level administrators considered it to be a higher priority item but felt that the selection and option for additional secretarial services was a welfare consideration. Some indicated it would be a negotiable item in their district.

Opportunity for professional advancement from the building level indicated a completely legalistic posting practice. The language of the teacher's master contract agreement often outlines procedures for job posting. Both Central Office and building administrators who were interviewed indicated, with but one exception, that the appointment opportunity was without pre-agreed guideline. The intern route was no longer the major source of appointments.

As indicated in Chapter II in the related literature the concern of administrators for consideration in the filling of vacancies and proper notification of posted positions is a part of the model team management agreement. In the writings of the several professional journals the evidence is clear. The building administrators wish very much to participate in the evaluation and selection process as it relates to their position and those at central office. The late Dr. Tatroe records the need of principals to have genuine involvement as a part of his

management team construct.[1]

Conclusion II - There is little substantive difference in the attitude of administrators interviewed as to the need for the establishment of a bargaining unit for portions of the management team when members of various levels of management team in school districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional patterns of school organization are compared.

The data gathered in the interviews indicates that in the districts where bargaining had begun, the reasons expressed and the results hoped for were not in disagreement when the responses of building administrators and central office administrators were studied. The one exception being in one district where the administrators disagreed as to whether the bargaining unit had indeed achieved legal recognition.

As indicated in the analysis of this item in Chapter IV regarding the possibility of bargaining units in the various districts with single, dual, multiple or divisional management team structures, the structure is not the pulse of the administrators' position. The lack of an acceptable definition of the role of the building administrator and the board of education in a viable management team may be the source of misunderstanding between the two elements of public school administration. The policy making role in contrast with the

---

[1]Don O. Tatroe, "Management Team Leadership," The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXXIV (January-February, 1970), p. 9.

implementation and management roles are at the root of the definition problem. If administrators are told they have a management team but in actuality the decision making excludes them they feel left out of the process. They can easily become cordial to the more formal bargaining relationship of administrator unions.

A general attitude seems to be present in the positive and negative comments about management team. Effective, vertically inclusive, enlightened management teams would be summarized as an alternative to bargaining by administrative groups. The two unknowns that need further exploration are the role of the superintendent and the role of the board of education members.

The study has provided a report on the status of benefits granted that is inclusive and complete. The wide range of benefits in table form in Chapter III assist in defining the elements of administrator welfare. The interviews reported in Chapter IV are complementary to the basic data gathered in Chapter III. The findings of the interviews go further toward defining welfare for they include the assignment of secretarial and administrative assistance.

The responses to the questions regarding the status of bargaining touches the real pulse of public school administration in southeastern Michigan. While researchers seek the definition of management team as applied to public schools, arbitration rulings, court injunctions, and petitions for bargaining are creating the new definition in the school districts of Michigan.

Implications

The conclusions of the study of welfare elements that are provided administrators in the service area of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., lead to this summary of the implications for further study. When districts with the various management team patterns of organization are compared there are little differences between single, dual, multiple or divisional patterns. The Bureau schools, when compared to NEA studies, parallel closely benefits paid nationally to districts of size 25,000 or more. The first implication therefore is that the Southeastern Michigan districts are significant for sampling purposes.

The variety of welfare benefits provided members of the various administrative staffs of the Bureau area schools indicate a growing awareness on the part of both boards of education and the profession of school administration that these benefits are the desire of and appropriate goals of central office and building administrators. The second implication is the awareness of the welfare needs of the public school administrator. This is a significant area of study and one for which little data is available at this time.

Although the initial part of this study clearly indicated four discernable patterns of administrative structure when the districts were compared for various elements of status and anticipation of bargaining units of administrators the various patterns revealed no clues as to the emerging of new bargaining units. The implication from this conclusion would

have to be that it is too early to tell what the future portends for administrator bargaining. The area of bargaining demands on-going evaluation and study as a new facet to the overall picture of public education especially in the state of Michigan. The study revealed only six districts bargaining out of a sample of twenty randomly chosen. A close study of districts who have by election or designation chosen bargaining as a way to achieve administrative recognition for concerns of wages, hours and working conditions could be very significant. In October of 1970 twenty-two school districts in Michigan have recognized bargaining units of administrators. The follow up of this movement would certainly have implications for the state and the nation.

The concept of management team still needs further clarification for the study does reveal wide differences of opinion when the positive and negative aspects were elicited. Apparently the term "management team" means different things to different people. Some would include the board of education, some would not. Many would restrict it to administrators only, while others would include teaching department heads. Considerable study could be undertaken to more accurately define the concept of management team.

This study approached the study of management team from the concept that team included those groups that met with the superintendent on some kind of a regular basis. The indication is present in the data that other criteria could well serve to establish the common base for management teams. One

district reported that the bargaining unit of administrators included department heads from the secondary schools. This implies the need to study other teams of educators within the school district and within buildings. The study of how a building administrator manages his instructional staff as a team could be significant to the understanding of management teams.

Another area of possible research would be the analysis of the contrasting behavior of central office teams as compared with line administrators in the various buildings. The response to questions about the management team concept as described in the narrative summary of comments by the various administrators infer the possibilities of a further study of job satisfaction. The response varied greatly but the number that responded that had nothing negative gives a clue to the need for additional study for job satisfaction. The reluctance on the part of certain administrators to criticize the management team in their respective district is a clear indication of anxiety about role.

Concluding Statements

Very little was written about management team in education before bargaining by teacher groups began in 1965 in Michigan. The term "management team" as practiced in the public sector is being defined and refined by research such as this study. The study serves to point out the apparent relationship of welfare to the management team concept.

The relationship is suggested in the professional literature of administrator groups. It is present in the example of the model management team contract. The encouragement for this research and an experimental program in three Michigan school districts at this time indicates the commonality of the concern for the concept at all levels of public school administration.

The alternative to management team would appear again from the literature and the responses to the interview questions of this study to be collective bargaining for matters of administrator welfare. Present Michigan laws permit such election and thereby provide a vehicle for movement in this direction. The ruling on the Hillsdale, Michigan, school administrators' request for the right to bargain assures all local groups of administrators that this alternative is one solution to concern for matters of welfare. The wide variety of welfare benefits provided the members of management teams of various structures, single, dual, multiple and divisional, could be costed out on some normative factor. The value could be measured as to cost to the board of education. Another approach may be to study the dollar benefit to the individual administrator. When either of these cost factors has been analyzed in the light of the four structures as practiced in the various school districts, the resultant data may be more relevant and may be statistically significant. The specific study suggested would include many

more variables than structure of the team. Elements of ability to provide local revenue, the numbers of administrators, the numbers of students and a more complete indication of the amount of actual participation in decision making could add to this research.

APPENDIX A

METROPOLITAN DETROIT BUREAU OF SCHOOL STUDIES, INC.
Member Organizations on August 1, 1969

Local School Districts

___ Algonac
___ Allen Park
___ Birmingham
___ Cherry Hill
___ Clarenceville
___ Clintondale
___ Crestwood
___ Detroit
___ East China
___ Ecorse
___ Farmington
___ Fitzgerald
___ Garden City
___ Grosse Pointe
___ Hamtramck
___ Harper Woods
___ Heintzen
___ Highland Park
___ Inkster
___ Lakeview
___ Lamphere
___ Livonia
___ Lincoln Park
___ Marysville
___ Melvindale
___ Mount Clemens
___ N. Dearborn Heights
___ Northville
___ Oak Park
___ Plymouth
___ Pontiac
___ Port Huron
___ Redford Union
___ River Rouge
___ Riverview
___ Rochester
___ Romeo
___ Royal Oak
___ Southfield
___ So. Redford
___ Taylor
___ Trenton
___ Utica
___ Van Born
___ Warren
___ Warren Woods
___ Waterford
___ Wayne
___ W. Bloomfield

Intermediate Districts

___ Macomb County
___ Oakland County
___ Washtenaw County
___ Wayne County

Universities

___ Eastern Michigan Univ.
___ Univ. of Michigan
___ Wayne State Univ.

METROPOLITAN DETROIT BUREAU OF SCHOOL STUDIES, INC.
FAIRMONT BUILDING - 680 MERRICK STREET
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
TEmple 1-0613 DETROIT, MICH. 48202 TEmple 1-0965

AUGUST 12, 1969

Dear Bureau Superintendents,

As you know, over the past several years considerable interest in the development and improvement of the school management team has been expressed by many school administrators and such organizations as the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies and The Michigan Congress of School Administrators.

In October the Bureau's Committee for the Improvement of Professional Management is sponsoring a School Administrators' Management Lab and we are also interested in a series of research projects which hopefully will contribute significant data and information relative to this crucial issue.

Enclosed you will find an initial questionnaire designed to obtain descriptions of current patterns of school organizational structures. To help us in our endeavors, we respectfully request your support and cooperation in completing this enclosed questionnaire.

The tabulated data from this questionnaire will be made available to you and an interim report will be made at the Bureau's Management Lab entitled "Improving the Management Team".

Please take a few moments of your time to complete the questionnaire and mail it to the Bureau in the enclosed envelope by Wednesday, August 27th so that the information can be compiled in time for our October 7-8 Waldenwoods Management Lab. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gerald G. Mansergh
Executive Director

QUESTIONNAIRE - PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT_____

_____ _____

Person completing this questionnaire Position

1. Is there any kind of "administrative team" or groups (council, committee, etc.) in operation in your school district which meet <u>with you</u> (the superintendent) periodically to help you in the consideration of system-wide problems? Yes____ No____

2. What name do you give to your administrative team or groups? (Check one or more below if appropriate; otherwise please give name or names.)

____Administrative Cabinet
____Administrative Council
____Advisory Council
____Advisory Staff
____Curriculum Council
____Central Administrative Staff
____Superintendent's Advisory Committee
____Bargaining Team
____Secondary Principals
____Elementary Principals

Other _____

_____

_____

3. For each administrative team or group you listed above in Question 2, indicate the positions represented; the total number of persons in the position in the school district; the number of persons from the position meeting with you; the frequency of the meetings; and the average length of the meetings. (AFTER COMPLETING THIS SECTION, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTION 4 ON THE LAST PAGE.)

<u>EXAMPLE</u>

<u>Administrative Cabinet</u>
NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBERSHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members	_____	_____	<u>Once every</u>	<u>Two</u>
<u>x</u> Superintendent	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>two weeks</u>	<u>hours</u>
<u>x</u> Assistant Superintendents	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	_____	_____
<u>x</u> Other Central Office Staff	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>		
<u>x</u> Secondary Principals	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>		
____Assistant Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Department Chairman	_____	_____		
____Teachers	_____	_____		
____Pupils	_____	_____		
____Other (specify) _____	_____	_____		
_____	_____	_____		

_____

NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Assistant Superintendents	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Other Central Office Staff	_____	_____		
____Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Department Chairman	_____	_____		
____Teachers	_____	_____		
____Pupils	_____	_____		
____Other (specify) _____	_____	_____		
_____	_____	_____		

_____

NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Assistant Superintendents	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Other Central Office Staff	_____	_____		
____Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Department Chairman	_____	_____		
____Teachers	_____	_____		
____Pupils	_____	_____		
____Other (specify) _____	_____	_____		
_____	_____	_____		

_____

NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Assistant Superintendents	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Other Central Office Staff	_____	_____		
____Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Department Chairman	_____	_____		
____Teachers	_____	_____		
____Pupils	_____	_____		
____Other (specify) _____	_____	_____		
_____	_____	_____		

NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Assistant Superintendents	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Other Central Office Staff	_____	_____		
____Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Department Chairman	_____	_____		
____Teachers	_____	_____		
____Pupils	_____	_____		
____Other (specify) _____	_____	_____		
_____	_____	_____		

NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Assistant Superintendents	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Other Central Office Staff	_____	_____		
____Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Department Chairman	_____	_____		
____Teachers	_____	_____		
____Pupils	_____	_____		
____Other (specify) _____	_____	_____		
_____	_____	_____		

NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Assistant Superintendents	_____	_____	_____	_____
____Other Central Office Staff	_____	_____		
____Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Secondary Principals	_____	_____		
____Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Assistant Elementary Principals	_____	_____		
____Department Chairman	_____	_____		
____Teachers	_____	_____		
____Pupils	_____	_____		
____Other (specify) _____	_____	_____		
_____	_____	_____		

_____
NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members				
____Superintendent				
____Assistant Superintendents				
____Other Central Office Staff				
____Secondary Principals				
____Assistant Secondary Principals				
____Elementary Principals				
____Assistant Elementary Principals				
____Department Chairman				
____Teachers				
____Pupils				
____Other (specify) _____				
_____				

_____
NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members				
____Superintendent				
____Assistant Superintendents				
____Other Central Office Staff				
____Secondary Principals				
____Assistant Secondary Principals				
____Elementary Principals				
____Assistant Elementary Principals				
____Department Chairman				
____Teachers				
____Pupils				
____Other (specify) _____				
_____				

_____
NAME OF GROUP

POSITION	TOTAL MEMBER-SHIP	NUMBER IN TEAM/GROUP	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	AVERAGE LENGTH
____Board Members				
____Superintendent				
____Assistant Superintendents				
____Other Central Office Staff				
____Secondary Principals				
____Assistant Secondary Principals				
____Elementary Principals				
____Assistant Elementary Principals				
____Department Chairman				
____Teachers				
____Pupils				
____Other (specify) _____				
_____				

4. If readily available, please enclose an organizational chart for your school district and descriptions of each team or group mentioned above.

METROPOLITAN DETROIT BUREAU OF SCHOOL STUDIES, INC.
FAIRMONT BUILDING - 680 MERRICK STREET
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
TEmple 1-0613 DETROIT, MICH. 48202 TEmple 1-0965

August 28, 1969

Dear Bureau Superintendents,

During the second week of August, you received the questionnaire, "Patterns of School Organizational Structure." Our records indicate the one mailed to you has not been returned. The success of the Bureau's Management Lab in October and a series of research projects on improving the school management team depends greatly upon your support and cooperation. To date twenty-two of the Bureau Superintendents have already returned the initial questionnaire.

Enclosed you will find an additional questionnaire to complete and mail to the Bureau in the enclosed envelope. Please do this today so that the information can be compiled in time for the Bureau's October 7-8 School Administrators' Management Lab entitled "Improving the Management Team."

Thank you for your continued interest and cooperation in Bureau activities.

Sincerely,

Gerald G. Mansergh
Executive Director

AN ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

METROPOLITAN DETROIT BUREAU OF SCHOOL STUDIES, INC.
FAIRMONT BUILDING - 680 MERRICK STREET
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
DETROIT, MICH. 48202

OCTOBER, 1969

(Not to be used or reproduced without permission from the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc.)

AN ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Lester W. Anderson's recent article in the Michigan Journal of Secondary Education deals with the relevant issues inherent in the management team concept.[1] The management team revolves around two main questions: 1) Do all parties really want a working relationship based on participation in policy formulation? and 2) Is the formulation of organizational structure designed to keep communication open in the decision making process?

In an effort to answer part of Anderson's latter question for the members of this Management Lab, the Bureau developed the questionnaire, Patterns of School Organizational Structure.[2] The questionnaire focused on the extent of the various types of administrative teams or groups that meet with the superintendent in each school district to consider system-wide problems. In addition, the questionnaire extracted the positions in the school district on each team or group and the frequency and average length of their meetings. In August of this year a questionnaire was mailed to each Bureau superintendent.

After the return of the questionnaires by mail to the Bureau office, the data was analyzed to identify school districts with common management team patterns of school organizational structure.[3] All forty-four of the responding districts indicated the existence of some kind of administrative team or groups that meet with the superintendent periodically in the consideration of system-wide problems. The data revealed that four basic management team patterns of school organizational structure exist:

---

[1] A copy of Anderson's article is in the "Management Lab Registration Folder."

[2] The questionnaire, Patterns of School Organizational Structure, is stapled to the back of this analysis.

[3] For the purpose of this questionnaire, management team patterns of school organizational structure are the administrative team or groups in a school district that meet with the superintendent periodically in consideration of system-wide problems.

1. School districts where the superintendent meets with just one group that includes all the management team members[4] or their representatives were classified as employing "single" management team patterns of school organizational structure;

2. School districts where the superintendent meets with a group that includes all the management team members or their representatives as well as a group that includes just central administrators[5] were classified as employing "dual" management team patterns of school organizational structure;

3. School districts where the superintendent meets with a group that includes all the management team members or their representatives and one or more other groups that include different segments of the management team members were classified as employing "multiple" management team patterns of school organizational structure; and

4. School districts where the superintendent does not meet with a group that includes all the management team members or their representatives, but meets with one or more groups that include different segments of the management team members were classified as employing "divisional" management team patterns of school organizational structure.

The remainder of this analysis lists the responding Bureau school districts according to the four common management team patterns of school organizational structure, single, dual, multiple and divisional, and in relationship to district size. The charts below outline the members on each team or group within a district and the frequency and average length of their meetings.

---

[4] For the purpose of this questionnaire, management team members include the superintendent, central administrators, secondary school principals, assistant secondary school principals, elementary school principals and assistant elementary school principals.

[5] For the purpose of this questionnaire, central administrators consists of all administrators, supervisors or directors who operate out of the central office and have system-wide responsibilities.

I SINGLE MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

LESS THAN 6,000 STUDENTS	Board Members	Superintendent	Asst. Supt.	Central Office	Secondary Prin.	Asst. Sec. Prin.	Elem. Prin.	Asst. Elem. Prin.	Dept. Chairman	Teachers	Pupils	Others	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Other	Time by Hours
1. Algonac																	
Adm. Staff		1	1		2	1	2						x				2
2. Clarenceville																	
Adm. Council		1	1	3	2		4							x			3
Bargaining Team	2	1	1	1			1						As need arises				
3. Clintondale																	
Adm. Council		1	2	1	2	2	5					1-Communications		x			2-3
4. Crestwood																	
Adm. Council		1	2	2	1	2	5						x				2
Curr. Council		1		2	2		2		2	8		1-Spec. Services			x		2
5. Hamtramck																	
Adm. Council		1		1	1		4					3-Program Directors	x				2
6. Harper Woods																	
Adm. Council		1	1		2		2						x				2
7. Heintzen																	
Adm. Council		1	1	2	2		4							x			2
8. Marysville																	
Adm. Council		1	1		1		2							x			2
Prof. Study Council	1	1			1		1			3		1-President of Teachers Association					
9. Melvindale																	
Adm. Council		1	2	1	2	2	7									x	2
10. Northville																	
Executive Council	1			2	2	2	3							x			2½
11. River Rouge																	
Adm. Staff		1	1	2	1		4							x			2
Bargaining Team	1	1	1		1		1						Once a week when negotiating				1

I SINGLE MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

	Board Members	Superintendent	Asst. Supt.	Central Office	Secondary Prin.	Asst. Sec. Prin.	Elem. Prin.	Asst. Elem. Prin.	Dept. Chairman	Teachers	Pupils	Others	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Other	Time by Hours
LESS THAN 6,000 STUDENTS																	
12. Romeo																	
Adm. Council		1		2	2	2	4							X			2
13. W. Bloomfield																	
Adm. Council		1	2	1	2		5							X			3
MORE THAN 6,000 STUDENTS																	
1. Farmington																	
Adm. Council		1	2	7	6	6	18							X			2
2. Mount Clemens																	
Adm. Council		1	2		1		11					2-Directors 3-Coordinators		X			3
3. Utica																	
Cabinet		1	2		1		1					1-Dir. Elem. Ed. 2-Adm. Assistant 1-Dir. Sec. Ed.	X				3

II DUAL MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

	Board Members	Superintendent	Asst. Supt.	Central Office	Secondary Prin.	Asst. Sec. Prin.	Elem. Prin.	Asst. Elem. Prin.	Dept. Chairman	Teachers	Pupils	Others	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Other	Time by Hours
LESS THAN 6,000 STUDENTS																	
1. Cherry Hill																	
Adm. Council		1	2	1	2	2	5							x			1½
Central Adm. Council		1	2	1									x				1
2. Lamphere																	
Adm. Council		1		4	2		7							x			3-4
Central Adm. Staff		1		4									x				2-3
Supt. Ad. Comm.		1		1	1		1		Varies	Varies		1-representative at least from the secretaries, cafeteria, transportation & custodians				x	1-2
MORE THAN 6,000 STUDENTS																	
1. Birmingham																	
Adm. Council		1	1	9	7		18					1-Deputy Supt. 10-Coordinators		x			2½
Central Staff		1	1	9										x			2
Teachers' Assoc. Exec. Bd.		1	1							10					x		1
Sec. School Editors & Student Council Pres.		1									25				x		1
Teachers		1								35		Any teacher may come		Every other month			1½
2. Grosse Pointe																	
Adm. Council		1	2	6	5	15	10	1				1-Personnel 3-Instructional Dept. Assts.			x		2
Central Adm. Staff (Cabinet)		1	2	6									x				3
3. Lakeview																	
Adm. Staff		1	2	5	3	4	9					1-Title III Dir.		x			2½
Central Adm. Staff		1	2	5										x			2
4. Lincoln Park																	
Adm. Council		1	2	1	1	7	15					4-Directors			x		2
Adm. Cabinet		1	2	1									x				2
Board Meetings	7	1	3	1										x			3

II DUAL MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

MORE THAN 6,000 STUDENTS	Board Members	Superintendent	Asst. Supt.	Central Office	Secondary Prin.	Asst. Sec. Prin.	Elem. Prin.	Asst. Elem. Prin.	Dept. Chairman	Teachers	Pupils	Others	Weekly	Bi-Weekly	Monthly	Other	Time by Hours
5. Livonia																	
Adm. Staff		1	2	3	2	1	2	1							x		2
Adm. Cabinet		1	2	5									x				2
Prof. Study Comm.	3	1	1		1		1			6				x			1½
6. Oak Park																	
Adm. Council		1	3	2	3	2	7	1						x			3
Central Adm. Staff		1	3	1										x			2
Curr. Council		1	2	1	1		2		2	4					x		3-5
Bargaining Team	2	1	2		1		1						As needed				
7. Plymouth																	
Adm. Staff		1	3	2	4		9										
Central Adm. Staff		1	3														
8. Port Huron																	
Adm. Council		1	2	15	2		14								x		3
Executive Comm.		1	2									2-Executive Dir.	Twice a week				3
Operational Adm. Council		1	1									3-Bus Drivers 3-Cooks 3-Custodians 3-Secretaries			x		1½
Teacher Adm. Council		1	1							36					x		1½
9. Rochester																	
Adm. Council		1	1	5	4		8						x				2½
Supts. Cabinet		1	1	3									2				3
10. Trenton																	
Adm. Council		1	1	3	1	2	5						x				2-3
Supt. Adm. Council		1	1	3									x				1-2
11. Wayne																	
Adm. Council		1	2	8	7		25		2					x			4
Adm. Cabinet		1	2	3										x			2

XII MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

LESS THAN 6,000 STUDENTS	Board Members	Superintendent	Asst. Supt.	Central Office	Secondary Prin.	Asst. Sec. Prin.	Elem. Prin.	Asst. Elem. Prin.	Dept. Chairman	Teachers	Pupils	Others	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Other	Time by Hours
1. East China																	
Adm. Council		1	2		4		4					1-Secretary		x			2½
Central Adm.		1	2										x				2
Bargaining Team		1	1		1		1						As needed				2½-3
2. Ecorse																	
Adm. Council		1	1	1	1	2	5							x			3
Advisory Staff		1	1	1								1-Coord. Spec. Services					
												1-Dir. School Comm. Affairs		x			1
Central Adm. Staff		1	1	1									Daily				½
Bargaining Team		1	1	1	1		1						As needed				
MORE THAN 6,000 STUDENTS																	
1. Allen Park												Some secondary,					
Adm. Cabinet		1	1	4								Asst. Sec. and Elem. Principals		x			4
Elem. Principal		1	1				6							x			2
Sec. Principal		1	1		3	4								x			2
Central Adm.		1	1	4									x				2
2. Garden City																	
Adm. Council		1	1	3	6	2	9					2-Curr. Dir.		x			2½
Central Office Staff		1	1	3	1		1					1-Elem. Curr. Dir.					
												1-Curr. Dir.	x				2½
Sec. Principal		1			6	2						1-Dir. Curr.	x				3
Elem. Principal		1					9					1-Elem. Curr. Dir.	x				3
3. Highland Park																	
Adm. Council		1	4	5	4		5					1-Dir. of Cont. & Voc. Ed.			x		1
Central Adm. Staff		1	4												On call		
Sec. Principal		1	4		4										x		1
Elem. Principal		1	1				5								x		1
College Adm.		1	1									1-Dean, Jr. College			x		1
												4-College Adm.					
Supt. Ad. Comm.		1	4									20-Citizens from each school area			x		1

III MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

MORE THAN 6,000 STUDENTS	Board Members	Superintendent	Asst. Supt.	Central Office	Secondary Prin.	Asst. Sec. Prin.	Elem. Prin.	Asst. Elem. Prin.	Dept. Chairman	Teachers	Pupils	Others	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Other	Time by Hours
4. Pontiac																	
Supt's Coordinating Council		1	2	12	8		28					8-Heads, Central Office Dept.		x			2
Executive Council		1	2									1-Bus. Mgr. 1-Dir. Human Relations 1-Personnel Dir.	x				3
Negotiating Team		1	1	1	1		1										
5. Royal Oak																	
Adm. Council		1	3	11	6		18							4½ hrs/mo			
Curr. Council		1	2	9	6		18							7½ hrs/mo			
Executive Council		1	3										x				3
6. Southfield													Every day of negotiations				
Bargaining Team		1	2	2	1		1										3
Central Adm. Staff		1	2	11										x			2
Sec. Principal		1	2	2	6		3							x			2
Elem. Principal		1	2	4			18							x			2
7. South Redford																	
Gen. Adm. Staff		1	1	3	3	4	9							x			2-3
Bargaining Team-Prof.		1		1		1	2										
Bargaining Team-Non-Teaching		1		1			2										
Central Adm. Staff		1	1	3													
Sec. Principal		1			3	4									x		2
Elem. Principal		1					9								x		2
Curr. Council		1	1		2		4		27	44	14	Sub-Committee within the Curr. Council	(77 meetings in 68-69)				1½
8. Waterford																	
Adm. Council		1	2	8	6	12	28							x			3
Adm. Steering Comm.		1	2	8	1	1	2							x			3

IV DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT TEAM PATTERNS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

	Board Members	Superintendent	Asst. Supt.	Central Office	Secondary Prin.	Asst. Sec. Prin.	Elem. Prin.	Asst. Elem. Prin.	Dept. Chairman	Teachers	Pupils	Others	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Other	Time by Hours
LESS THAN 6,000 STUDENTS																	
1. Fitzgerald																	
Supt. Adv. Council		1	2	1	1	3						Architect				This committee is for construction purposes only	2½
Central Adm. Staff		1	2	1	1									x			2
MORE THAN 6,000 STUDENTS																	
1. Detroit																	
Superintendent's Executive Committee																	
1 Superintendent																	
1 Executive Deputy Superintendent																	
1 Business Manager																	
5 Deputy Superintendents																	
Superintendent's Administrative Committee																	
The Executive Committee plus --																	
3 Associate Superintendents																	
3 Assistant Superintendents																	
3 Executive Administrative Assistants																	
8 Region Superintendents																	
Superintendent's Administrative Staff																	
The Administrative Committee plus --																	
8 Region Assistants																	
Central Advisory																	
The Executive Committee plus --																	
3 Associate Superintendents																	
3 Assistant Superintendents																	
3 Executive Administrative Assistants																	
2 Assistants to Superintendent																	
1 Director of Public Relations																	
2. Taylor																	
Central Adm. Staff		1	2	4								Business Manager		On Call			
Bargaining Team	3	1	2														
Secondary Prin.		1	2		5												
Elementary Prin.		1	1					28									
Operation Focus		1		3				2		5							
Warren																	
Adm. Cabinet		1										1-Deputy Supt. 4-Assoc. Supt. 1-Adm. Asst.		x			3-3
Warren Woods																	
Team		1	2	1										x			3

Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals

affiliated with
Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations
National Association of Secondary School Principals

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
ARLENE M. FRICK

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
THEODORE B. SOUTHERLAND
Bureau of School Services
The University of Michigan
401 S. Fourth St. at W. William
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103
Area Code 313
764-8240

March, 1969

To all principals and assistant principals who request this model:

It is very important that you read this cover statement thoughtfully and carefully before giving consideration to the enclosed material.

This material is presented for the purpose of assisting you, if a felt need exists in your district, in developing the Team Management Concept. We are anxious to remind you that if conditions are satisfactory in your district between your Board, Superintendent and Principals, then no action should be taken with the exception of asking your Board to officially endorse and include in the minutes of one of the regular Board meetings the fact that it endorses the Team Management Concept as a basis of operating the district.

We also would underscore the fact that this Concept is new to all involved parties and should therefore be approached carefully with tact and understanding. There are two involved parties, namely the Board, whose responsibility is policy-making, and the Management Team (Administrators- Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Principals, Assistant Principals, etc), whose major responsibility is carrying out established policies. It is clear that a very close harmonious working relationship of these two parties is vital to the successful operation of a good educational program for the boys and girls in your school district. The Management Team should be encouraged by the Board to lend its professional knowledge to the Board in assisting in the development of Board policy. Further, the Management Team is not only expected to loyally support the final board policies and act as its representative in the buildings, but is also expected to implement the negotiated contracts with other employee groups in the school district as the Board representative. In order for the Management

Team to intelligently administer these contracts for the Board, it becomes essential that Management Team personnel be actually involved in the negotiating sessions as the Board representative and act in an advisory capacity to the Board. For these reasons it becomes necessary that a very "close team" effort be developed in each district between the Board and their Management Team. The Board will also expect that their Management representatives will work professionally and harmoniously with the teachers under their supervision to further the cause of good education in the district.

The following material is submitted for the consideration of Management Team members and your Board of Education. Together you may wish to use some of the suggested Articles or you may wish to develop additional areas more applicable to your district. Due to the complexity, variation in size, and other factors existing in the several hundred school districts in the state, it is impossible to present a document that will apply equally well in all districts.

If you do develop and adopt some form of agreement in your district, we would appreciate a copy of your final agreement for our MASSP files. In this way we might be better a le to assist other members of our Association who might have need of our assistance.

If we can be of further service, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

Theodore B. Southerland

TBS/af

MODEL TEAM MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT

for
Administrators and Boards of Education

This agreement, entered into this _____ day of _____, by and between the Board of Education of _____(school district)_____ of the City and/or Township of _____, hereinafter called the "Board", and the Administrators of said district, hereinafter called the "Management Team".

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, the Board and the Management Team recognize and declare that providing a quality education for the children of ___(school district)___ is their mutual aim; and

WHEREAS, the philosophy and purpose of this agreement pledges mutual support and loyalty of both the Administration and the Board of Education, and further pledges the Management Team, as Board of Education representatives, to implement the employee contracts that have been negotiated by the Board with the assistance of the Management Team personnel; and

WHEREAS, educational administrators should be particularly qualified to assist in suggesting and developing policies and programs designed to improve educational standards; and

WHEREAS, the parties hereto recognize the need for cooperation, understanding and support between the Board of Education and the Management Team to effectively and efficiently operate a desirable program of educational opportunity; and

WHEREAS, both the Board and the Management Team agree to cooperate and work in good faith to develop salaries commensurate with the Management Concept as applied in the business and industrial world;

THEREFORE, IN CONSIDERATION OF the above mutual covenants, it is hereby agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I - RECOGNITION

SECTION A

The Board hereby adopts the Management Team Concept as the operating policy in the district and under the terms of this agreement neither of the parties hereto shall make unilateral decisions which would in any way affect the provisions of this agreement.

The term "Board" when used hereinafter in this Agreement shall refer to the legally elected representatives of the school district and/or its officially designated representatives.

The term "Management Team" when used hereinafter in this Agreement shall refer to those persons employed by and authorized by the Board to recommend for hiring, firing, and/or supervising professional staff members and other personnel.

ARTICLE II - MANAGEMENT TEAM RIGHTS

SECTION A

The Board hereby agrees that administrators shall have the right to form a local organization for the purpose of describing and defining professional relationships in the district. The Board further agrees that it will not discriminate against any administrator with respect to professional conditions of employment by reason of his membership in an administrative organization.

SECTION B

The Management Team shall have the privilege of using school building facilities at all reasonable hours for meetings in accord with proper procedures.

ARTICLE III - PROFESSIONAL COMPENSATION

SECTION A

It shall be considered normal procedure when circumstances permit, that the Board shall grant approval and reimbursement for Management Team members to attend appropriate annual state or national conferences and meetings upon receipt of written request to the Superintendent stating pertinent data concerning the conference, anticipated and actual expenses, and length of absence. Management Team members agree to share information from such meetings with board members and other professional staff members in any manner desired by interested parties.

ARTICLE IV - WORKING CONDITIONS

SECTION A

The provisions of this Agreement shall be applied without regard to race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, sex or membership in or association with the activities of any professional organization. No religious or political activities, not limited by law, of any administrator or the lack thereof shall be grounds for any discipline or discrimination with respect to the professional employment of such administrator.

SECTION B

Administrators may make recommendations to the Board or its authorized representatives regarding the program of the school, the conditions of the buildings, grounds, equipment and materials, and other factors important to the efficient management of a school plant or program. The Board agrees to give careful consideration and expeditious handling to such recommendations.

SECTION C

The Board agrees to include Management Team representatives to attend and act in an advisory capacity to the Board in any negotiating or collective bargaining sessions with employees, and the Board may at its decision involve members of the Management Team on its behalf. Representatives of elementary and secondary principals shall be involved in this process as members of the Management Team.

ARTICLE V - LEAVE OF ABSENCE

SECTION A

It shall be the policy of the Board to grant leaves of absence to members of the Management Team for reasons deemed appropriate by the Board of Education.

SECTION B

Applications for leaves shall be submitted in writing to the Board. Leaves may be granted for the remainder of a semester, the remainder of the school

year or for a complete school year, and may be extended upon written request and approval by the Board of Education.

ARTICLE VI - TERMINATION OF SERVICES

SECTION A

Termination of employment by Management Team members shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Michigan Teacher Tenure Act. Termination of employment by the Board of Education of Management Team members shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Contract of employment agreed to and signed by both parties. Any dismissal of Management Team personnel other than as provided in said contract shall provide for full payment promptly of the balance due for the term of the unexpired contract at the time of the termination of the member's services.

ARTICLE VII - INSURANCE PROTECTION

SECTION A

The Board shall provide hospitalization for at least the amount granted to other employees and preferably to include full coverage up to and including family, semi-private, master medical, for each administrator.

SECTION B

The Board is expected to provide group life insurance protection which shall pay to the administrator's designated beneficiary the minimum sum of $10,000 upon death with provision for double indemnity in the event of accidental death.

ARTICLE VIII - EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

SECTION A

All evaluations of any Management Team member shall be discussed with the administrator in question. The Administrator shall receive a copy of each evaluation and a copy shall be placed on file in the Board office and be held in confidence and handled in an ethical manner.

SECTION B

No Management Team member shall be disciplined, reprimanded or reduced in rank or compensation, or deprived of any professional advantage without just cause. The parties agree to handle all such actions in a respectful and professional manner and endeavor to accomplish an efficient and satisfactory solution to professional problems.

ARTICLE IX - VACANCIES, PROMOTIONS AND TRANSFERS

SECTION A

Recognizing the legal right and responsibility of the Board to fill various positions, make promotions and transfers, the Board agrees to give written notice of any administrative vacancies in the district to the members of the Management Team. In selecting personnel to fill such vacancies, the Board will seek the best qualified applicant within or without the system. Due consideration shall be given to employees within the district who meet the qualifications. Vacancies shall be filled on the basis of experience, competency and qualifications of the applicant, length of service in the district, and other relevant factors.

SECTION B

Requests may be made by a member of the Management Team for transfer to a different position or building and shall be filed in writing with the Superintendent stating the reasons for transfer, the building or position sought and the applicant's qualifications. Such requests shall receive careful consideration by the Board. Involuntary transfers will be made only in case of emergency or to prevent undue disruption of the instructional program at which time the Board shall notify in writing the affected administrator and the reasons for such transfer.

SECTION C

Management Team personnel shall be subject to the provisions of the Michigan Teacher Tenure Act and shall be given the opportunity to return to the classroom in their respective district to a position for which they qualify by professional training.

ARTICLE X - CREATION OF NEW POSITIONS

SECTION A

The Board agrees to discuss with the Management Team the creation of new management team positions and following determination of the job description will receive for a five day period all applicants within the system presently on the Management Team. After this period, the Board shall reserve the right to hire the best qualified person whether they are within or outside the school system.

ARTICLE XI - PROTECTION OF ADMINISTRATORS

SECTION A

If any administrator, while acting in a legal manner as an administrator within the jurisdiction of his assignment, is complained against or sued, the Board will provide legal counsel and render all necessary assistance to the Administrator in his defense. It shall be the responsibility of the administrator to bring such complaints to the attention of the Board as soon as possible.

SECTION B

In the event that an administrator is injured while performing his professional duties, expenses incurred for medical, surgical, and hospital care, in excess of those covered by hospitalization insurance provided by the Board, will be assumed by the Board,

ARTICLE XII - GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

SECTION A

The parties hereto agree to cooperate in an efficient and professional manner by providing proper channels and scheduling necessary meetings for the purpose of solving problems or grievances within the Management Team. Should any problems or grievances not be properly and satisfactorily resolved within a reasonable length of time (generally thirty days), the parties agree to request in writing the assistance of the Ethics Committee of the Congress of School Administrator Associations to meet with

the Board and the Management Team at which time the parties agree to cooperate in fact finding sessions and to consider the professional advice and recommendations of the Ethics Committee in an endeavor to resolve the difficulties to the satisfaction of all involved parties.

ARTICLE XIII - MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SECTION A

The provisions of this Agreement shall be incorporated into and be considered part of the established policies of the Board.

SECTION B

Copies of this Agreement shall be made available to all members of the Board and the Management Team by the Superintendent.

SECTION C

It is the responsibility of the Management Team personnel to be professional at all times. It is the responsibility of the Board and/or its designated representatives to discuss any abuse of this responsibility with the individual involved. Any refusal to cooperate or repeated incidents after warning shall be subject to disciplinary action.

SECTION D

Realizing that it is desirable for administrators to be cognizant of current philosophies, trends and techniques, the Board shall provide opportunities

for improvement for the Management Team members in areas deemed necessary by the Board and Management Team members.

SECTION E

In order to improve communications which are vital to an efficiently operated district, regular meetings shall be held between the Management Team personnel and the Board of Education on a schedule acceptable to both parties.

ARTICLE XIV - DURATION OF AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT shall be effective _____ and shall remain in effect until such time as revisions are felt desirable by one of the parties. A written communication to the other party shall be honored and revision of the document shall be undertaken and resolved with thirty days. In the event the parties cannot resolve the issue among themselves, they shall ask the Ethics Committee of the Congress for assistance in resolving the matter.

(Note: You and your Board may wish to develop an official document in which case you will add spaces for signatures for both parties. Otherwise the Board may, in cooperation with you, take action incorporating certain conditions in their minutes and develop that as the official position concerning their relationships with the Management Team.)

APPENDIX B

Charles Kettering Elementary School
1200 Hubbard
Westland, Michigan

April 16, 1970

Dr. Elven E. Duvall
Executive Secretary
Michigan Congress of School Adm.
129 Boone Hall
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Dear Dr. Duvall:

I thank you for your invitation to seek the assistance of your office in collecting data for my research regarding the "management team". When I last visited with you in Atlantic City you suggested I write to you in your capacity as Executive Secretary of the Congress of School Administrators when I was to begin my interviews of local administrators.

I now plan to field test my interview questionnaire and proceed to gather data from various local school administrators.

It would be most helpful to me, especially in approaching school districts other than members of the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, if I had available a letter of introduction over your signature and on Congress letterhead.

If additional information is necessary for your preparation of such a letter I would be happy to meet with you to discuss the research design more fully.

Thank you again for your continued interest in this research and study.

Sincerely,

Waino E. Aukee
35405 Ash
Wayne, Michigan 48184

wa:d

MICHIGAN CONGRESS of SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR ASSOCIATIONS

129 Boone Hall
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Executive Secretary
Elven E. Duvall
313-487-3135

April 24, 1970

Dear School Administrator:

The Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations endorses the need for research in the area of school administration under the Management Team Concept. Such studies directed at investigating the administrative characteristics of school districts as they relate to factors affecting quality education programs are urgently needed.

The Congress encourages your cooperation as a participant in these endeavors. We believe that these research studies, conducted by graduate students under the leadership of university professors of educational administration, will greatly add to the knowledge in the area of Management Team Concept and will assist the Congress in developing this approach to school administration.

Sincerely,

Elven E. Duvall
Executive Secretary
Michigan Congress of School
Administrator Associations

EED:am

METROPOLITAN DETROIT BUREAU OF SCHOOL STUDIES, INC.

FAIRMONT BUILDING, WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
680 MERRICK STREET
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202

AREA CODE: 313
831-0966
831-0613

Executive Director
Dr. Gerald G. Mansergh

TO: MDBSS Members School Superintendents

SUBJECT: Annual Study of Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel

Enclosed please find one copy of the results of the Spring, 1969, "Survey of Superintendents of the MDBSS to Evaluate the Bureau's Annual Study, Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel." In line with the recommendations outlined in this report, the study is being continued; and because of the current negotiating schedules with administrators, the data for the 1969-70 study is being collected in January with publication sometime in March.

One of the enclosed copies of the 1969-70 survey instrument for the study is for your files and the other copy should be returned to the Bureau no later than January 26, 1970, for your school system to be included in the study.

In accordance with the superintendents' recommendations, we have expanded the fringe benefit questions; however, the general format remains the same. Your duplicate copy from last year's report should still be very helpful as a reference.

In an attempt to provide greater continuity and accuracy, please assign just one knowledgeable educator within your district the task of collecting and reporting the requested data.

Please contact Burton S. Knighton or John A. Beckwith, MDBSS research assistants, concerning any assistance or questions about the 1969-70 survey form.

Sincerely,

Gerald G. Mansergh
Executive Director

January 5, 1970

SALARY POLICIES RELATING TO ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL, 1969-70

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT_____

SIZE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM--Total Number of Pupils_____

PERSON COMPLETING THIS REPORT_____SCHOOL PHONE_____

(1) Do you have a regular salary schedule (minimum, maximum, and annual increments) for the following administrative and supervisory personnel?

Superintendents Yes____ No____ Elementary School Principals Yes____ No____

Ass't Supt. Yes____ No____ Secondary School Principals Yes____ No____

Supervisors and Directors Yes____ No____

(2) Is your administrative and supervisory salary schedule related to the teacher salary schedule? Yes____ No____

(2.1) If yes, please identify the method (eg. index number, factor formula etc.):

_____

_____

_____

(2.2) Please indicate the adjustment for:

Superintendents: Factor_____ Base_____
Ass't. Supt: Factor_____ Base_____
Elementary School Principals: Factor_____ Base_____
Secondary School Principals: Factor_____ Base_____
Supervisors and Directors: Factor_____ Base_____

Remarks:_____

_____

_____

(3) What is the length of time for which the superintendent's contract is drawn?

Years_____ Weeks in contract year_____ 1969-70_____

(3.1) If the superintendent is on a regular salary schedule what is the:

Minimum_____ Maximum_____ No. of Increments_____

Remarks:_____

_____

(4) Does the Superintendent have a transportation allowance? Yes_____ No_____

(4.1) If yes, please specify if Board of Education:

(a) Provides and maintains a car for Superintendent: Yes_____ No_____

(b) Provides an annual, monthly, or mileage allowance: Yes_____ No_____

(b.1) Indicate the allowance amount: Monthly: $_____ Yearly: $_____

Mileage of_____cents per mile

(4.2) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same transportation allowance, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(5) Does the Superintendent have a specified vacation benefit per year? Yes_____ No_____

(5.1) Number of Calendar Weeks_____or Working Days_____

(5.2) If the Superintendent's vacation benefit differs from other administrative and supervisory personnel, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(6) Does the Superintendent have a specified sick leave benefit in his contract?

Yes_____ No_____

(6.1) What is the number of days allowed per year? _____

(6.2) May the days accumulate over the length of the contract? Yes_____ No_____

(6.3) If yes, what is the maximum benefit? _____

(6.4) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same sick leave benefit, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(7) Does the Superintendent have term life insurance provided by the Board of Education?

Yes_____ No_____

(7.1) Indicate amount of death benefit: $_____

(7.2) Is double indemnity provided? Yes_____ No_____

(7.3) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same term life insurance benefit, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(8) Does the Superintendent have hospitalization (medical and surgical) subsidized by the Board?

Yes_____ No_____

(8.1) Fully Paid_____

(8.2) Half Paid_____

(8.3) Less than half paid_____

(8.4) Other_____

_____

(8.5) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same hospitalization, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(9) Does the Superintendent have long term disability insurance subsidized by the Board?

Yes_____ No_____

(9.1) If yes, please indicate the length or conditions provided for:

_____

_____

_____

(9.2) Fully Paid_____

(9.3) Half Paid_____

(9.4) Less than half paid_____

(9.5) Other_____

_____

(9.6) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same long term disability insurance, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(10) Does the Superintendent have liability coverage provided by the Board?

Yes_____ No_____

(10.1) What is the maximum? $_____

(10.2) Is it a deductible plan? Yes_____ No_____

(10.3) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same liability coverage benefit, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(11) Are tax sheltered annuities available to the Superintendent? Yes_____ No_____

(11.1) What are the minimum and maximum amounts permitted by Board policy:

Minimum_____ Maximum_____

(11.2) How many choices of carriers are available to the Superintendent? _____

(11.3) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same annuity privileges, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(12) Does the Superintendent have a sabbatical leave option in his contract?

Yes_____ No_____

(12.1) If yes, how many years of continuous service are a prerequisite? _____years

(12.2) What are the salary options: Half pay_____ Full pay_____ Other_____

(12.3) What additional obligations are a part of the sabbatical policy:

_____years returned to the District _____written reports

(12.4) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same sabbatical policy, please specify the differences:

_____

_____

_____

(13) Does the Superintendent have conference attendance allowance? Yes____ No____

(13.1) Total allowance for travel and expenses? $_____

(13.2) Are there limits on the number of conventions? Yes_____ No_____

(13.3) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same convention or conference attendances allowances, please specify differences:

_____

_____

_____

(14) Does the Superintendent have his dues paid to professional organizations?

Yes_____ No_____

(14.1) If yes, what organizations are included? _____

_____

(14.2) Is there a dollar limit to dues paid by the Board? Yes_____No_____Amount_____

(14.3) If other administrative and supervisory employees do not receive the same dues paid by the Board, please specify differences:

_____

_____

_____

(15) After completing this survey form, we encourage your written suggestions here that would improve future reporting of the requested data.

PLEASE RETURN TO THE METROPOLITAN DETROIT BUREAU OF SCHOOL STUDIES, INC., BY JAN. 26, 1970
FAIRMONT BUILDING, 680 MERRICK STREET, WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202

TABLE IV

SALARIES BEING PAID AND SALARY SCHEDULES OF CERTAIN CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL, 1969-70

Position	No. of Pers	Work Wks in Yr	Sal's Being Pd During 1969-70		Salary Schedule During 1969-70			Remarks
			Lowest	Highest	Min.	Max.	No. Incr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assoc or Deputy Supt								
Ass't Supt								
Adm Ass't								
Business Mgr								
Ass't Business Mgr								
Purchasing Officer								
Ass't Supt Bldgs & Grounds								
Dir or Spvr Personnel								
" Pupil Personnel								
" Special Services								
" Pes,Tats,& Honours								
" Adult Educ								
" Special Educ								
" Instruction								
" Voc Educ								
" Ind Arts								
" Guidance								
" Library Services								
" Art								
" Music								
" Phys Educ								
" Health Educ								
" Recreation								
" Home Econ								
" Reading								
" Science								
" Primary Grades								
" Elem Grades								
" Junior H.S.								
" Senior H.S.								
School Physician								
Spvring Nurse								
Head, Schl Cafeteria								
Audio-Visual Services								

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT _____ DATE _____

TABLE V

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SALARIES OF CERTAIN CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION, 1969-70

(List here only those Central Office Personnel whose 1969-70 salaries will be included on Page 4, Line 45; and Page 5, Lines 26 and 53, of the Annual Financial Report)

Salary Interval	Number of Positions
$ 28,000 & Above	
27,500-27,999	
27,000-27,499	
26,500-26,999	
26,000-26,499	
25,500-25,999	
25,000-25,499	
24,500-24,999	
24,000-24,499	
23,500-23,999	
23,000-23,499	
22,500-22,999	
22,000-22,499	
21,500-21,999	
21,000-21,499	
20,500-20,999	
20,000-20,499	
19,500-19,999	
19,000-19,499	
18,500-18,999	
18,000-18,499	
17,500-17,999	
17,000-17,499	
16,500-16,999	
16,000-16,499	
15,500-15,999	
15,000-15,499	
14,500-14,999	
14,000-14,499	
13,500-13,999	
13,000-13,499	
12,500-12,999	
12,000-12,499	
BELOW 12,000	

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT_____ DATE_____

TABLE VI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SALARIES OF CERTAIN CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTRATION, 1969-70

(List here only those Central Office Personnel whose 1969-70 salaries will be included on Page 7, Lines 45, 46, 47, 48, & 50; and Page 8, Line 17 of the Annual Financial Report, omitting the Superintendent)

Salary Interval	Number of Positions
$ 27,000 & Above	
26,500-26,999	
26,000-26,499	
25,500-25,999	
25,000-25,499	
24,500-24,999	
24,000-24,499	
23,500-23,999	
23,000-23,499	
22,500-22,999	
22,000-22,499	
21,500-21,999	
21,000-21,499	
20,500-20,999	
20,000-20,499	
19,500-19,999	
19,000-19,499	
18,500-18,999	
18,000-18,499	
17,500-17,999	
17,000-17,499	
16,500-16,999	
16,000-16,499	
15,500-15,999	
15,000-15,499	
14,500-14,999	
14,000-14,499	
13,500-13,999	
13,000-13,499	
12,500-12,999	
12,000-12,499	
BELOW 12,000	

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT_____ DATE_____

TABLE VII

SALARIES BEING PAID AND SALARY SCHEDULES OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL IN ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH, SENIOR HIGH, AND ADULT PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1969-70

Position	No. of Emp	Work Wks in Yr	Sal's Being Pd During 1969-70		Salary Schedule During 1969-70			Remarks
			Lowest	Highest	Min.	Max.	No. Incr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Teaching Elementary Principal								
Supervising Elementary Principal								
Ass't Elementary Principal								
Jr. High School Principal								
Jr. High Ass't Principal								
Jr. High Department Head								
Jr. High Dean								
Sr. High School Principal								
Sr. High Ass't Principal								
Sr. High School Dean								
Sr. High Department Head								
Jr. & Sr. High School Principal								
Jr. & Sr. High Ass't Principal								
Trade or Voca. High Principal								
Trade or Voca. H.S. Ass't Prin								
Trade or Voca. Sch. Dept. Head								
Cont. or Adult Sch Full-Time Pr.								
Cont. or Adult Sch Dept. Head								
Dean or President, Jr. College								
Others								

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT _____ DATE _____

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SALARIES OF SUPERVISING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS (WHO GIVE MORE THAN HALF TIME TO ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY DUTIES), BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, 1969-70

Salary Interval	Number of Elementary School Supervising Principals by School Enrollment (in terms of Sept. 26, 1969 membership in the specific school building under the principal's supervision)						
	Under 200	200-399	400-599	600-999	1000-1499	1500 & Over	Total
$ 23,000 & Above							
22,500-22,999							
22,000-22,499							
21,500-21,999							
21,000-21,499							
20,500-20,999							
20,000-20,499							
19,500-19,999							
19,000-19,499							
18,500-18,999							
18,000-18,499							
17,500-17,999							
17,000-17,499							
16,500-16,999							
16,000-16,499							
15,500-15,999							
15,000-15,499							
14,500-14,999							
14,000-14,499							
13,500-13,999							
13,000-13,499							
12,500-12,999							
12,000-12,499							
11,500-11,999							
11,000-11,499							
10,500-10,999							
10,000-10,499							
BELOW 10,000							

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT_____ DATE_____

TABLE IX

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SALARIES OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, 1969-70

Salary Interval	Number of Junior High Principals by School Enrollment (Sept. 26, 1969, membership in the specific school building under the principal's supervision)					
	Under 300	300-599	600-999	1000-1499	1500 & Over	Total
$ 24,000 & Above						
23,500-23,999						
23,000-23,499						
22,500-22,999						
22,000-22,499						
21,500-21,999						
21,000-21,499						
20,500-20,999						
20,000-20,499						
19,500-19,999						
19,000-19,499						
18,500-18,999						
18,000-18,499						
17,500-17,999						
17,000-17,499						
16,500-16,999						
16,000-16,499						
15,500-15,999						
15,000-15,499						
14,500-14,999						
14,000-14,499						
13,500-13,999						
13,000-13,499						
BELOW 13,000						

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT_____ DATE_____

TABLE X

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SALARIES OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, 1969-70

Salary Interval	Number of Senior High Principals by School Enrollment (Sept. 26,1969, membership in the specific school building under the principal's supervision)				
	0-599	600-1000	1000-2000	over 2000	Total
$ 27,000 & Above					
26,500-26,999					
26,000-26,499					
25,500-25,999					
25,000-25,499					
24,500-24,999					
24,000-24,499					
23,500-23,999					
23,000-23,499					
22,500-22,999					
22,000-22,499					
21,500-21,999					
21,000-21,499					
20,500-20,999					
20,000-20,499					
19,500-19,999					
19,000-19,499					
18,500-18,999					
18,000-18,499					
17,500-17,999					
17,000-17,499					
16,500-16,999					
16,000-16,499					
15,500-15,999					
15,000-15,499					
14,500-14,999					
14,000-14,499					
BELOW 14,000					

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT_____ DATE_____

APPENDIX C

MANAGEMENT TEAM WELFARE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. School district code number _____

2. What is your correct title and position?

_____

3. What is the name of the management team or group of which you are a member?

_____

4. How many years have you been in this position? _____

5. How many years have you been in this district? _____

6. How many years have you been in the educational profession? _____

7. What is the highest degree you have earned? _____

8. What is the formula for computing your salary?

_____

9. Who is basically responsible for setting your present salary? _____

10. What is the status of a recognized bargaining unit of administrators in this district?

_____

11. What is your opinion of the possibility of a petition for a separate bargaining unit if in question ten your response is negative to existence of unit at this time?

_____

_____

_____

12. What is the criteria for the assignment of secretarial help for this administrative position?

_____

_____

13. What is the criteria for the assignment of administrative assistants for this administrative position?

_____

_____

_____

14. Is there a differential in the weeks of work of various members of the management team?

___ Yes ___ No

On what is the difference, if any, predicated?

_____

_____

15. How are administrative openings posted? _____

_____

16. What, if any, is the informal advancement procedure from building level to central office?

_____

_____

17. What are positive elements of management team?

_____

_____

_____

18. What are negative elements?

_____

_____

_____

SUMMARY SHEET FOR MANAGEMENT TEAM

WELFARE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. School District code number _____

2. Correct title and position _____

3. Name of the management team or group administrator is member of:

___ Administrative Cabinet
___ Administrative Council
___ Advisory Council
___ Advisory Staff
___ Curriculum Council
___ Central Administrative Staff
___ Superintendent's Advisory Committee
___ Bargaining Team
___ Secondary Principals
___ Elementary Principals

Other _____

_____

4. Number of years in this position _____

5. Number of years in the district _____

6. Number of years in the educational profession _____

7. Highest degree earned ___ B.S. ___ M. A. ___ Ed. S.
___ Ed. D. ___ Ph. D.

8. Formula for computing salary:

___ Index
___ Merit
___ Set salary schedule
___ Other - describe _____

_____

9. Who is basically responsible for setting salary?

___ Superintendent
___ Superintendent and Board
___ Board alone
___ Management team committee
___ Negotiations
___ Other - describe _____

_____

_____

10. What is the status of a recognized bargaining unit of administrators in this district?

___ No group
___ Various groups but not unified
___ Established and recognized unit
___ Other - describe _____

_____

_____

11. What is the possibility of a unit if the answer to question 10 indicates there is no unit at this time?

___ None
___ Possible
___ Under study
___ Other - describe _____

_____

12. What are the criteria for the assignment of secretarial help?

___ Size of school
___ Level of School
___ Other - describe _____

_____

13. What are the criteria for the assignment of administrative assistants?

___ Size of school
___ Level of school
___ Other - describe _____

_____

14. Is there a differential in weeks worked?

___ Yes ___ No

On what is it predicated?

___ Size of school
___ Level of school
___ Board office role
___ Title
___ Other - describe

_____

_____

15. How are administrative openings posted?

___ Announcement
___ Mailings
___ Other - describe _____

_____

16. What is the informal advancement procedure within the district? Example: teacher, elementary principal, central office _____

17. What are positive elements of management team?

___ Status
___ Involvement in decision making
___ Higher salary
___ Other

18. What are negative elements?

___ Longer work year
___ Greater gulf between staff and administration
___ Closer evaluation and scrutiny of work performed

19. General comments positive -

_____

_____

_____

20. General comments negative -

_____

_____

_____

SCHEDULE OF WEEKS WORKED BY POSITION OF VARIOUS BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS IN SINGLE, DUAL, MULTIPLE, AND DIVISIONAL STRUCTURES OF TEAM MANAGEMENT

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATION AND SPECIFIED VACATION

SINGLE MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 1	NUMBER	WEEKS
Supervising Elementary Principal	2	42
Junior High School Principal	1	42
Senior High School Principal	1	48
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	42
SCHOOL SYSTEM 2		
Teaching Elementary Principal	5	46
Junior High School Principal	1	47
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	47
Senior High School Principal	1	47
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	47
SCHOOL SYSTEM 3		
Supervising Elementary Principal	5	42
Junior High School Principal	1	52
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	44
Senior High School Principal	1	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	44
SCHOOL SYSTEM 4		
Supervising Elementary Principal	19	47
Junior High School Principal	4	48
Junior High Assistant Principal	4	45
Senior High School Principal.	3	51
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	48
Secondary Adminis. Assistant	10	
SCHOOL SYSTEM 5		
Supervising Elementary Principal	4	44
Junior High School Principal	1	46
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	44
Senior High School Principal	1	46
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	44
SCHOOL SYSTEM 6		
Supervising Elementary Principal	2	42
Junior High School Principal	1	44
Senior High School Principal	1	52

SINGLE MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 7

Supervising Elementary Principal	7	42
Junior High School Principal	1	43
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	42
Senior High School Principal	1	57
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	42

SCHOOL SYSTEM 8

Supervising Elementary Principal	10	42
Senior High School Principal	1	
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	

SCHOOL SYSTEM 9

Supervising Elementary Principal	3	46
Junior High School Principal	1	46
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	40
Senior High School Principal	1	46
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	46

SCHOOL SYSTEM 10

Supervising Elementary Principal	4	44
Jr-Sr High School Principal	1	44
Jr-Sr High Assistant Principal	2	44

SCHOOL SYSTEM 11

Supervising Elementary Principal	4	44
Junior High School Principal	1	45
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	44
Senior High School Principal	1	47
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	44

SCHOOL SYSTEM 12

Supervising Elementary Principal	22	44
Junior High School Principal	4	44
Junior High Assistant Principal	4	44
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	3	44

SCHOOL SYSTEM 13

Teaching Elementary Principal	5	40
Junior High School Principal	1	40
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	40
Senior High School Principal	1	46
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	40

DUAL MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 14	NUMBER	WEEKS
Supervising Elementary Principal	18	45
Junior High School Principal	5	45
Junior High Assistant Principal	5	45
Junior High Department Head	23	25
Junior High Asst. to Principal	5	45
Senior High School Principal	2	48
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	48
Senior High Department Head	12	35
Senior High Asst. to Principal	2	35
Senior High Asst. to Principal	2	45
Jr & Sr High School Principal	7	
Jr & Sr High Asst. Principal	7	
SCHOOL SYSTEM 15		
Supervising Elementary Principal	7	44
Junior High School Principal	1	48
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	44
Junior High Department Head	5	40
Senior High School Principal	1	48
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	48
Senior High Department Head	9	40
Spvr. of Sec. Sch. Attendance	1	42
SCHOOL SYSTEM 16		
Supervising Elementary Principal	10	47
Assistant Elementary Principal	1	45
Middle School Principal	3	47
Junior High Assistant Principal	6	45
Senior High School Principal	2	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	4	45
SCHOOL SYSTEM 17		
Supervising Elementary Principal	9	52
Junior High School Principal	2	52
Junior High Assistant Principal	2	52
Senior High School Principal	1	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	52

DUAL MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 18	NUMBER	WEEKS
Supervising Elementary Principal*	7	
Junior High School Principal	1	
Junior High Assistant Principal	1	
Senior High School Principal**	1	
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	
Secondary Adminis. Assistant	2	
Secondary Adminis. Interns	2	
Junior High Department Head		
Senior High Department Head		
SCHOOL SYSTEM 19		
Supervising Elementary Principal	35	44
Assistant Elementary Principal	11	44
Junior High School Principal	9	45
Junior High Assistant Principal	9	45
Senior High School Principal	4	48
Senior High Assistant Principal	11	45
SCHOOL SYSTEM 20		
Supervising Elementary Principal	7	44
Assistant Elementary Principal	1	44
Junior High School Principal	2	46
Junior High Assistant Principal	2	46
Senior High School Principal	11	46
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	46
SCHOOL SYSTEM 21		
Supervising Elementary Principal	9	46
Junior High School Principal	3	46
Junior High Assistant Principal	3	43
Senior High School Principal	1	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	52
Cont. or Adult Sch. Full-Time Pr.	1	
Cont. or Adult Sch. Dept. Head	1	
SCHOOL SYSTEM 22		
Teaching Elementary Principal	1	52
Supervising Elementary Principal	15	52
Junior High School Principal	5	52
Senior High School Principal	2	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	4	52
Senior High School Dean	4	44
Senior High Department Head	14	40
Trade or Voc. Sch. Dept. Head	2	44

*Elementary principals work 8-15 -- 6-30; 10 1/2 months or about 209 actual working days per year.

**Secondary principals and assistants work 11 months (8-1 -- 6-30) or about 219 days per year.

DUAL MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 23	NUMBER	WEEKS
Supervising Elementary Principal	8	43
Junior High School Principal	2	52
Junior High Assistant Principal	2	43
Senior High School Principal	2	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	3	52
Cont. or Adult Sch. Full-Time Pr.	1	52
SCHOOL SYSTEM 24		
Supervising Elementary Principal	25	44
Assistant Elementary Principal	4	44
Assistant Elementary Principal-Intern	3	40
Junior High School Principal	5	44
Junior High Assistant Principal	4.5	44
Junior High Department Head	28	40
Junior High Dean of Stu. Affairs	.5	40
Senior High School Principal	1	46
Senior High Assistant Principal	3	46
Senior High Department Head	20	40
Jr. & Sr. High School Principal	1	46
Jr. & Sr. High Ass't. Principal	3	46

MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 25		
Supervising Elementary Principal	6	43
Junior High School Principal	2	45
Junior High Assistant Principal	2	45
Senior High School Principal	1	48
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	45
SCHOOL SYSTEM 26		
Supervising Elementary Principal	4	43
Junior High School Principal	2	44
Senior High School Principal	2	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	1	52
SCHOOL SYSTEM 27*		
Teaching Elementary Principal	9	43
Junior High School Principal	4	44
Junior High Assistant Principal	4	43
Senior High School Principal	2	48
Senior High Assistant Principal	4	44

*Does not include sums paid for advanced preparation and incentive pay.

MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 28	NUMBER	WEEKS
Supervising Elementary Principal	5	42
Assistant Elementary Principal	2	42
Junior High School Principal	3	46
Junior High Dean	3	42
Senior High School Principal	1	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	3	42
Trade or Voc. Sch. Dept. Head	1	52
Cont. or Adult Sch. Full-Time Pr.	1	52
Cont. or Adult Sch. Dept. Head	1	42
Dean or President, Junior College	1	52
Assistant Dean	1	52
SCHOOL SYSTEM 29		
Elementary Principal	27	44
Assistant Elementary Principal	1	44
Junior High School Principal	6	44
Junior High Assistant Principal	8	44
Junior High Department Head	34	40
Jr. High Asst. Prin. Attendance	5	42
Senior High School Principal	2	48
Senior High Assistant Principal	6	44
Senior High Department Head	24	40
Sr. High Asst. Prin. Attendance	2	42
Area Voca. High Principal	1	48
Coordinator, Adult Education	1	48
SCHOOL SYSTEM 30		
Supervising Elementary Principal	18	43
Assistant Elementary Principal	1	42
Junior High School Principal	4	43
Junior High Assistant Principal	4	42
Senior High School Principal	2	52
Senior High Assistant Principal	4	52
Senior High Associate Principal	2	52
SCHOOL SYSTEM 31		
Supervising Elementary Principal	18	42
Junior High School Principal	4	44
Junior High Assistant Principal	4	44
Senior High School Principal	2	46
Senior High Assistant Principal	6	46
SCHOOL SYSTEM 32		
Supervising Elementary Principal	9	44
Junior High School Principal	2	46
Junior High Assistant Principal	2	44
Senior High School Principal	1	48
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	44

MULTIPLE MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 33	NUMBER	WEEKS
Supervising Elementary Principal	25	43
Junior High School Principal	3	49
Junior High Assistant Principal	5	43
Senior High School Principal	3	49
Senior High Assistant Principal	6	43
Cont. or Adult Sch. Full-Time Pr.	1	49

DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 34

Supervising Elementary Principal	184	39
Assistant Elementary Principal	229	39
Junior High School Principal	51	39
Junior High Assistant Principal	55	39
Junior High Department Head	164	39
Senior High School Principal	20	39
Senior High Assistant Principal	48	39
Senior High Department Head	165	39
Technical High School Principal	1	39
Technical High Asst. Principal	3	39
Technical High Department Head	13	39
Trade High Principal	1	43
Trade High Principal	1	52
Trade High Sch. Assistant Principal	1	39
Trade School Department Head	1	43
Trade School Department Head	1	47
Adult Day School Principal	1	39
Adult Day School Asst. Principal	1	39
Youth Home School Principal	1	47
Voc. Rehab. Program Principal	1	52
Special Education Principal	7	39
Special Education Asst. Principal	11	39

SCHOOL SYSTEM 35

Supervising Elementary Principal	4	44
Spvr. of Elementary Education	1	52
Elementary Grade Chairman	28	40
Junior High Department Head	4	40
Senior High Department Head	17	
Director of Attendance	1	43
Jr. & Sr. High School Principal	1	52
Jr. & Sr. High Asst. Principal	1	45
Director Junior High School	1	44
Assistant Director Attendance	1	41
Dir. of Adult & Voc. Education	1	43
Director Special Education	1	45
Director of Athletics	1	43
Director of Reading	1	44

DIVISIONAL MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL SYSTEM 36	NUMBER	WEEKS
Supervising Elementary Principal	22	42
Junior High School Principal	3	46
Junior High Assistant Principal	4	43
Senior High School Principal	2	47
Senior High Assistant Principal	4	44
Senior High Department Head		
Senior High Department Head		
SCHOOL SYSTEM 37		
Supervising Elementary Principal	28	43
Assistant Elementary Principal	6	42
Junior High School Principal	7	44-46
Junior High Assistant Principal	7	44
Senior High School Principal	3	46
Senior High Assistant Principal	10	44
SCHOOL SYSTEM 38		
Supervising Elementary Principal	11	41
Junior High School Principal	2	41
Senior High School Principal	1	41
Senior High Assistant Principal	2	41

KEY TO IBM CARDS

Column	Information
1	Blank
2 S	Management Team Pattern of School Organization Structure - Single=1, Dual=2, Multiple=3, Divisional=4
3	School District Size - Middle=1, Large=2
4	Individual Position - Superintendent=1, Central Administrator=2, Secondary Principal=3, Assistant Secondary Principal=4, Elementary Principal=5, Assistant Elementary Principal=6
5-6	School District Number
7	Blank
8	Number of teams or groups the administrator is a member
9-10	Blank
11-12	Number of years in position
13-14	Number of years in the district
15-16	Number of years in the profession
17	Highest degree earned - B.S.=1, M.A.=2, EdSpec.=3. D.Ed.=4, Ph.D.=5, Other=6
18	Formula for setting salary - index=1, merit=2, salary schedule=3, formula=4
19	Responsible for setting salary - Superintendent=1, Superintendent and Board=2, Board Alone=3, the Management Team Committee=4, Negotiations=5, Other=6
20	Status of recognized bargaining unit - Established and recognized (yes)=1, No group (no)=2, Various groups but not unified=3, Other=4
21	What is the possibility of a unit - Possible=1, None=2, Under Study=3, Other=4
22	Criteria for secretarial assignment - Size of school=1, Level of School or Board office Role=2, Superintendent's recommendation=3, None=4

KEY TO IBM CARDS - continued

Column	Information
23	Criteria for administrative assistants assignment- Size of school=1, Level of school or board office role=2, Superintendent's recommendation=3, Other=4
24	Is there a differential in weeks worked - Yes=1, No=2
25	What is differential in weeks predicated upon - Size of school=1, Level of school=2, Board office role=3, Title=4, Other=5
26-27	Actual number of weeks worked
28	How are administrative openings posted - announcement=1, mailings=2, posted according to contract guidelines=3, other=4
29	Is there an informal advancement procedure in the district - yes=1, no=2, intern program=3
30-80	Blank

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Anderson, Conwell A., ed. Administrative Team Leadership in Concept and Practice. Athens, Georgia: Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, 1966.

Blake, Robert R. and Mouton, June S. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959.

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1969.

McGregor, Douglas. The Professional Manager. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Moore, Franklin G. A Management Sourcebook. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Moore, Franklin G. Management Organization and Practice. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Morphet, Edgar L.; Johns, Roe; and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Organization and Administration, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Pigors, Paul, Myers, and Malm, Readings in Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Roethlisberger, Fritz J. Man - in - Organization. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968.

Smith, David C. The Management Team - A Position Paper. East Lansing: Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals, August 13, 1968.

ARTICLES

Anderson, Lester W. "Management Team Concept." Michigan Journal of Secondary Education, X (Spring, 1969), 24-33.

"A Time for Reflection and Reinforcement," Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, X (April, 1969), 1.

Heselton, Frank. "Management Team Concept from Board Member's Viewpoint." Michigan School Board Joutnal, XV (January, 1969), 6,23.

"Hillsdale, Michigan, Ruling Gives Administrators Right to Bargain," Educators Negotiating Service-Complete Texts, (January 15,1969), 1-5.

Finis, Fritz. "The Management Team Concept Myth of Reality." Michigan School Board Journal, XB (January, 1969), 7.

Walker, Robert. "The Management Team Concept." Michigan School Board Journal, XV (January, 1969), 8-9.

Walker, Robert and Hammel, Eugene C. "Management by Design-Using the Team Approach." Michigan School Board Journal, XVI (February, 1969), 12-14.

REPORTS AND OTHER UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

"Management Team Concept," (A position statement by the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations, March 21, 1968).

"Membership, Financial Data, and Costs Per Pupil In Metropolitan Detroit Schools". Detroit: Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., Wayne State University, February 1968.

"Membership, Financial Data, and Costs Per Pupil In Metropolitan Detroit Schools". Detroit: Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., Wayne State University, March 1969.

Pichel, Frank M. The Financial Effects of Teachers' Strikes in Selected Michigan School Districts. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969.

"Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel in Metropolitan Detroit Schools". Detroit: Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies, Inc., Wayne State University, March 1968.

"Salaries of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel in Metropolitan Detroit Schools". Detroit: Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of Schools Studies, Inc., Wayne State University, March 1969.