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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The goals and objectives of education can best be accomplished if the personnel of the school system clearly understand their duties and responsibilities. This understanding can be facilitated through efficient organization developed in conjunction with established written personnel policies compiled in a policy guide. An employee will be more secure if he knows his assigned tasks and to whom he is responsible for their execution. With the adoption of written policies by the board of trustees, authority is established and the possibility of error and misunderstanding is reduced.

That misunderstandings do exist and that damage to the school system results from them is verified in a recent study made by the American Association of School Administrators. Their report included the following statement:

Recent studies have documented the fact that lack of understanding of the responsibilities and boundaries of their job is a prime source of administrator-board trouble. What makes this news for all people is that administrator-board trouble in schools inevitably damage the system all the way through into the classroom.¹

Defining areas of work and responsibility, then, is important for all school districts regardless of size.

Statement of the Problem.

The problem of this study consisted of three divisions:

First, to determine the status of personnel policies in these elementary school districts in Stanislaus County having a full-time administrator but with less than 900 average daily attendance.

Second, to determine how these districts have developed personnel policies.

Third, to apply the results of this study in the development of personnel policy in the Hughson Union School District.

Purposes of the Study.

There were eight specific objectives of this study:

1. To determine how many of the districts had written personnel policies which had been adopted by the governing board.

2. To determine how many districts had left the application of personnel procedures largely to the discretion of the chief school administrator.

3. To determine to what extent implied or unwritten policies were used in the districts.

4. To determine to what extent the size of the school
district was a factor in determining whether policies were officially recorded.

5. To determine, when districts did have written policies, what attempt had been made to codify them and make these policies available to all concerned.

6. To determine what role the board members and the administrators played in the development of written policies.

7. To determine whether recorded policies were general in nature or were in detail and whether they contained operational procedures.

8. To determine the scope and content of personnel policies in the several surveyed districts.

Importance of the Study.

Conflict of authority and confusion in the conduct of school district functions and operations often arise among trustees, administrators, and employees of the school district where no policies have been formally adopted by the school board as a guide to school personnel. That greater emphasis should be given to the orderly development of school policy by boards of education in avoiding these conflicts is suggested by Smith and Smittle. They also indicate that school operation can be more consistent and more easily facilitated if the policies are codified, available, and understood by all people.
involved in the program of education.\(^2\)

A factor in the conflict of authority in some districts has been the increase in enrollment. Because of this, governing boards are likely to assume many administrative functions in smaller districts where it has been found necessary to include teaching as part of the principal's duties. Relinquishing administrative duties as part of their function is difficult for some boards after they appoint a full-time administrator.

Establishing a clear statement of responsibilities in the form of written guides is important in the development of a manual. Employees involved are more likely to understand the over-all operation and their relationship to the whole part. This understanding will make it essential to follow guides in the performance of duties.

Methods and Procedures.

All elementary school districts in Stanislaus County with less than 900 average daily attendance were asked to participate in this study. These districts were similar in size and organization to the Hughson Union School District, and the data obtained from the study would be useful as a guide in the

development of personnel policies in the Hughson district.

A questionnaire on policy development was sent to the chief executive in each of the districts. Additional copies were enclosed for each trustee if administrators were inclined to make this distribution.

A personal interview was held with each chief executive in the twelve districts included in the study to discuss any part of the questionnaire that needed interpretation or explanation. As part of this interview the investigator requested permission to meet jointly with the administrator and the governing board to review the completed questionnaire. The joint meeting was for the purpose of verifying administrator reactions.

Additional information on the development of personnel policies was obtained by an investigation of manuals and guides that had been published by school districts. Books, periodicals, and research reports were studied to aid in the construction of the questionnaire.

**Definition of Policy.**

For the purpose of this study a policy is defined as a statement of general principle covering solutions to related problems that have been agreed upon by the school board. If the policy has been recorded in the minutes of the board meetings, or has been included in district handbooks or bulletins,
it is then defined as written policy.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter a review is made of the literature on the subject of written policies for school districts. A need for board policies and procedures in the operation of school districts is clearly indicated by this literature. The development of policies delegating responsibilities to a person in charge is also reviewed from research on the subject.

Importance of Policy.

Elsbree pointed out that standards of a school system are determined by policy development, and this pattern for establishing standards by which a school is run has been fixed only recently by school boards. This is confirmed by Elsbree who said:

Until recently, it was not uncommon for school boards to operate on a somewhat opportunistic basis. Salaries, for example, were the result of individual bargaining; sick leave was granted without close adherence to principle; teacher selection followed no regular pattern and was not based on carefully established standards; in short; personnel policies were often inconsistent and illogical. This situation led to confusion, low employee morale, and inefficiency. School boards should survey their personnel practices and adopt a program that specifically covers policies relating to every phase of personnel management. Moreover, there are decided advantages to incorporating these personnel policies into a handbook and making it available to present and prospective employees, board members, and the lay public, so far as the latter is interested. Experience shows that policies are more likely to be revised and
modernized when they are available in printed or mimeographed form than when they are restricted to the minutes or bylaws of the board of education. ¹

Disagreements between board members and administrators must be avoided in maintaining a high standard in a school system. According to Gross, disagreements over objectives of the school program are engendered by absence of outlined rights and obligations of the school board and the superintendent:

Our findings show that superintendents and school boards frequently and strikingly disagree on the objectives of their school system and their respective rights and obligations. We are forced to conclude that in many school systems they are not in agreement over the crucial problems of who is supposed to do what, over what is policy making and what is administration.

But not only must there be agreement on basic ground rules, they must be in writing for all to see—the superintendent, the old school board members, the new ones, those who plan to run for the school board for well or ill-intentioned reasons, and the community in general. ²

Gross further established the importance of policy development by school boards, and suggested that strains and tensions between superintendents and board members could be eliminated. He suggested the following:

In order to eliminate negative pressures the superintendent and school board should discuss frankly the pressures to which they are both exposed. They should


²Neal Gross, "Easing the Strain and Tension Between Superintendents and the School Board", The Nations Schools, 56:4, October 1955, p. 44.
establish regular procedures for handling such matters as teacher selection, salary increases, school contracts, and even parents' complaints. And these policies should reflect the highest educational standards. A superintendent or school board member who can point to an established personnel policy can more easily turn down a friend who wants help in pushing his candidate for a position. It is like a mutual protective society.3

The study by Gross pointed out to all interested parties that the development of policy is an important function of the school board and that the policy adopted by the board should be understood by all parties concerned. Gross concluded this study with the following observation:

A clear set of basic ground rules can also be of great importance in gaining public confidence in school board decisions.4

Stapley inferred that poor relationships between the board and administrators in one-fourth of the examples studied were due to ineffective school board behavior. He suggested that there is a more effective operation in the school system where boards have committed their policy to writing. He also stated that writing of policies has been a great help not only to working conditions but also to the understanding by boards and administrators of the respective roles to be performed by each.5

3Ibid.
4Ibid.
Bixby indicated in his study the importance of policy:

All superintendents felt that one great value of policy statement was that it defined the authority and discretion allowed the superintendent.  

It was pointed out by Stapley that policy is important to a school system in giving security to the employees; they then know what is expected of them in the performance of their duties. He further indicated that policies should be clearly differentiated from rules and regulations, and he defined policy as an agreement by members of an administrative body which describes or defines the manner in which this body should act.  

Elsbree felt that the efficiency of a school system depends upon the policy adopted by the board of education. He said:

The efficiency of a school system depends upon human resources, which in turn, depends upon personnel policies and practices. A sound personnel program will include the selection and appointment of gifted individuals, the establishment of a comprehensive program of personnel policies, the provisions for formulating and revising policies cooperatively, a clear definition of functions, a continuous program of in-service education for all employees, attention of morale building through establishment of favorable working conditions, and the provision of wise leadership.


7Stapely, op. cit., p. 51.

8Elsbree, op. cit., p. 10.
Elsbree further confirmed the importance of human relationships as a significant factor in school administration and as a determinant of the effectiveness of the work carried on in the school system:

The principle that is often overlooked in trying to develop a highly efficient school system is that human relations depend upon clarity of function. When employees understand their respective roles and see the relationship of their work to the work of others, they are likely to be more efficient.9

Elsbree again emphasized human relations by recommending development of a personnel program. This program would include personnel policies that were carefully formulated and so publicized that all would be fully informed as to just what these policies had to say in regard to the school system and its employees.10

Bemis concluded that the goal of all personnel policies should be the employment and retention of personnel of the best possible quality and the maintenance and improvement of their efficiency through a high level of morale.11

The Need for Policy Codification.

Smith and Smittle indicated that research has pointed

---

9Ibid.
10Ibid.
to a lack of policy development by boards of education:

A review of related literature and research on the problem of board of education policy development indicates that only a small percentage of the public school systems in the United States have separately stated and printed policies in any form. 12

The need of policy was emphasized by Reeder:

Recent investigations have shown that less than half the boards of education in cities have adopted a set of rules and regulations outlining the administrative procedures and relationships of the schools . . . . A good set of rules and regulations should be adopted by every school system, whether large or small, for the conduct of its business. 13

Stapely suggested that it was often a shock to boards of education to discover how much policy and how many rules have never been committed to writing, even in the board minutes. 14

A lack of policy in the area of teacher-management relations was suggested by Chandler. He implied that a need for policy is urgent in school district administration at the present time. Also, the formulation of these needed policies should be made with reference to the fundamental educational purposes. 15

12Ibid.


Engelhardt confirmed the need for policies in the educational program:

Years of professional study, training, experience, and investigation developed and improved the administrative techniques. The gap between the competence of the superintendent and that of the board to investigate public-school problems and to propose desirable policies for the schools grew as years passed, and was in time recognized by the intelligent board members. The development of the science of education brought with it a new interpretation of the relationship which should exist between the board of education and the trained superintendent.

With these changing conditions opinions based largely upon individual experience could no longer endure as the determinant of policy . . . . A new and intelligent basis for determining policies was inaugurated. In this manner factual and scientific evidence . . . . helped to determine the kind of school that should be operated in a school district and became the basis for planning the work best fitted for the children of the community.

The factual study of educational problems has brought a new life to the administration of public schools.\(^\text{16}\)

A general agreement among educators as to the need for board policies and procedures for the operation of any school district regardless of size was indicated by Tuttle. Furthermore, it was agreed that these policies and procedures, in order to be really effective, must be written and distributed to all persons concerned with them in any way.\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{16}\text{Fred Engelhardt, Public School Organization and Administration (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1931), p. 71-72.}\)

Smith stated that a contemporary review of related studies in the field of policy demonstrated a need for more research in the area of educational policy development. A need for policy development was indicated by the Ethics Commission of the California Teachers Association:

The board should direct the superintendent to obtain all possible assistance which will clearly define the functions and limitations of administrative personnel and the board itself.

Loutensock expressed the feeling that the greatest need for clear lines of responsibility is in the field of personnel and employee relations. Each employee should know to whom he is responsible and for what he is responsible. To do this governing boards should have prepared a set of written rules and regulations which established clearly the lines of communications.

The study of policy needs in large and small districts, according to Sears, will have many basic likenesses in legal foundations, purposes, and types of functions required; however, there will be important differences in the nature and scope of

18Smith and Smittle, op. cit., p. 17.


any one task and the number of elements and relationships involved.21

Chandler, referring to employer-employee relationships, pointed out:

> If the administrative official responsible for the personnel function had time to counsel personally with each staff member upon all problems arising from his relationship with the organization, the formulation of detailed personnel policies would be unnecessary. However, such a practice would be impossible in most school systems.22

The fact that policy is necessary to gear the school program to the needs and customs of the community was verified by Bixby:

> No policy should be written that does not carefully consider the customs, folkways and traditions of the community.23

Sears confirmed the need of considering the local conditions in development of policy:

> Rules for any school system must begin where the statute law leaves off and be designed to project these laws forward to fit local needs and conditions in accordance with the dictates of the science and philosophy of education applied to the local conditions and wishes of the people concerned.24

---


Responsibility for Development of Policy. Hunkin reported that a generally accepted principle of school administration is that the board of education should legislate policies and appraise the results.  

Bixby confirmed that the responsibility of school boards was that of policy development. The feeling of the American Association of School Administrators was that governing boards should spend most of their time in developing policies that will support the actions made by the board, and that these policy statements should be in writing.

In a study made especially for the California School Boards Association in cooperation with Stanford School of Education, the assertion that the major responsibility of board members is in the field of policy development was made by Remis. In this project was included participants, by invitation, from six organizations interested in education throughout California and involved administrators, business officials, parents, teachers, college personnel, state department of education personnel, and school board members. The assertion:

Experienced board members agree that the major functions

---


26 Bixby, op. cit., p. 81.
of any school board are policy making (which includes both planning and legislation) and evaluation.27

Responsibility for Execution of Policy. The role of superintendent of schools as the person responsible for the execution of policies has been established only after many trials covering many years. Moehlman described one step in this process of making it necessary for boards of education to formulate statements of duty when he said:

There were numerous conflicts between these "assistants" and "principal teachers." One of these in Cincinnati resulted in the first definition of principal's and teacher's duties in 1839.28

Moehlman gave additional information in the development of the process having some one responsible for the execution of policies when he related that the boards of education, in 1856, "tried to bring unity out of chaos by appointing a school principal as superintendent."29 Interesting to note is that the appointment was not attempted again until 1863 because of the resignation of the superintendent after serving only one year. The reason for this resignation, Moehlman said, was because of conflict in authority and "each principal reported

27Bemis, op. cit., p. 146.
29Ibid., p. 24.
separately to the school board.\footnote{Ibid., p. 24.}

Smith and Smittle gave some insight into the growth and complexity of school problems and the necessity of school boards appointing a superintendent:

As city school system grew in size and complexity, the tendency was toward small boards which could give consistency of thought to the important aspects of school programs, including the development of logical policy.\footnote{Smith and Smittle, op. cit., p. 13.}

Smith and Smittle also pointed out that a shift of population from rural to urban areas brought with it a need for change in school administration:

Some of these changes have been very slow, some very rapid. School administration, particularly in the area of policy making, must keep pace with these changes.\footnote{Ibid., p. 13.}

The National Citizen's Commission for the Public Schools suggested that not only are these changes presently taking place, but that they increase the complexity of the role of a professional class of superintendent:

In recent decades the growing complexity of school affairs has made a place for growth of a professional class of school superintendents, to whom most boards have delegated administrative authority. Local boards are not as all-powerful as they once were. However, they still have many vital functions and responsibilities.\footnote{National Citizen's Commission for the Public Schools, How Can We Help Our School Boards? (New York: National Citizens Commission for The Public Schools, 1954), p. 11.}
in the development of policy and the superintendents in the
execution of the policy was discussed by Olsen:

The right relationships between boards of education and
superintendents of schools will come to exist when boards
of education cease to think of their function as having to
do with the execution of policies they adopt; when they
scrutinize carefully each proposal brought to them by the
superintendent of schools, and having passed upon it,
stand fast . . . ."34

Administrators have had duties delegated to them care-
fully and slowly by boards of trustees that were inclined to
retain administrative duties among their group while districts
were small in size. As districts increased in size, the burden
of duties assumed by board members began to interfere with
their regular occupation. Hunkin explained that this inter-
ference encouraged them to appoint an administrator to assume
a major part of these duties:

The power and duties of the professional administrator
increased by accretion. The first responsibilities were
those that these early board of education members had nei-
ther the time nor inclination to assume. Some important
functions such as selection and employment of personnel
and business affairs were retained by the board for a long
time. The probable reason for retention lay in the possible
patronage in employment and the mistaken notion that edu-
cators were too impractical to know how to handle business
deals. In the case of business affairs this handly sterio-
type served as a popular explanation, while the real reasons
were in part engendered by the rapidly developing corporate
concepts of the time, and, in part, by opportunities for

personal prestige and private gain by the persons spending the money. These early administrators must frequently have found themselves in the situation of being charged with the responsibility without the means of authority to fill it. Even a cursory study of this period would reveal that this delegation of responsibility and authority by the boards of education under a policy of temporary expediency resulted in almost chaotic condition, because the functional operation of school administration was not built on the foundation of any basic theory. It was a situation in which operation preceded theory, or, in other words, school administration operation out ran what meager theory did exist in the attempt to meet the needs of the expanding educational system.35

The responsibility of the board of trustees for the instructional program does not end with the delegation of responsibilities to the administrator. This was pointed out by Bemis:

It is true that you possess only those powers which are actually granted by the State or those which are necessarily implied in order to carry out the provisions of the Legislature. But within those powers, and they are challengingly broad, the local governing board is free to place for the best program of public education which the needs, conditions and resources of the community permit and demand.36

The experience of a trustee prior to being elected or appointed to serve will influence his decisions as to assignments made to the chief school executive. Also, the size of the community will be a factor in what authority is delegated to the administrator. This was verified by Hunkin when he said:

36Maynard Bemis, Keith Goldhammer, and J. Russel Kent, op. cit., p. 3-4.
In the larger communities the members of the boards of education are likely to have had more opportunity for experience in the delegation of executive duties than those in the smaller communities. The urban board may be composed of members who are directors of banks, foremen in factories, managers of corporations or others with daily practice of delegating duties. The successful delegation of duties may, in fact, be the very basis for their success in daily life.

In contrast, the characteristics of the typical small community board member is apt to be strikingly different. Such a board member may be a proprietor of a small business responsible for the direction of a few or even no employees, a doctor who is his own bookkeeper, a lawyer who does his own typewriting, a farmer who does possibly all his own work, or a housewife, unaccustomed even to directing servants.

With such a background of daily experience it is not difficult to conceive the attitude that these small community leaders will take toward their responsibilities if they find themselves on the board of education. They are used to doing things directly and personally, without delegating much, if any, work to others.37

The responsibility for the execution of school policy belongs to the chief administrative officer appointed by the school board. This responsibility as well as the responsibility that is retained by the board of trustees was affirmed by Bemis, Goldhammer and Kent. Cooperation is necessary between the administrator and the board for effective execution of policy relating to the personnel of a school system.38

37Munkin, op. cit., p. 12.
Summary. A review of the literature on educational policy reveals a need for more emphasis on policy development. Research shows only a small percentage of school districts in the United States having written policies as a guide in school administration.

A major responsibility of the governing board of a school district, according to the literature, is to develop policy and to make this policy known to all parties concerned in school matters. Responsibility for execution of policy has been a factor in the growth of a professional administrator.

It is the consensus that a policy guide is important in a school district in that it gives security to employees, avoids confusions as to who is responsible in fulfilling assigned tasks, aids in improving the quality of personnel, and improves and maintains high morale among school personnel.
CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Development of the Questionnaire.

An over-all view of existing policies in local school
districts, and specific information on personnel policies in
particular were the objectives of this study. A questionnaire
was designed to obtain policy information from elementary
school districts in Stanislaus County. All elementary school
districts having a full time administrator and an average
daily attendance of less than 900 students were included. The
following districts were in this category: Grayson, Bonita,
Westport Union, Hart-Ransom Union, Keyes Union, Salida Union,
Stanislaus Union, Waterford, Newman, Empire Union, Sylvan
Union, and Patterson.

General areas of policy information for use in develop-
ing the questionnaire were outlined by Smith and Smittle in
their study of school board responsibilities and was used as
a guide in the instrument for this study. The questionnaire
was designed in two parts to obtain from each district the
following information:

---

1Smith and Smittle, op. cit., pp. 49-102.
1. General information on school district policies.
2. Specific information on personnel policies.

In the first part of the questionnaire, information was requested from each district covering the following:

1. Was there some written policy?
2. Was an attempt made to gather policies into a book form?
3. Was a handbook available for teachers and for classified employees?
4. If a handbook was available, was it officially adopted by the governing board?
5. Were policies generally understood by the school personnel?
6. Were there areas of implied policy?
7. Had there been leaders in the development of policy and who were the leaders?
8. Were policies detailed?
9. Were all employees covered by policies?

The second part of the questionnaire, covering more specific personnel policies, was designed to secure the following information:

1. To determine if each district had policy in those areas of personnel listed in the questionnaire.

(See Appendix A.)
2. To determine whether those districts that had developed some policy had it in written form or by implication.

Items included in the first draft of the instrument were examined in forms of the objectives of the study. This resulted in additional items being included for a more adequate coverage of information to be gathered. If it appeared that information gathered from a certain item would not add materially to the data, the item was eliminated. The questionnaire was refined through this process and was then typed for presentation to the thesis committee.

An evaluation by the committee indicated changes that would improve the questionnaire. After making these changes, five superintendents agreed to a preliminary interview for use of the revised instrument. The interviews were for the purpose of evaluating the scope and the wording of the questionnaire. Suggestions from administrators resulted in the elimination of ambiguities, improvement in poorly worded questions, and correction of other defects. After changes had been made, the thesis committee reviewed the instrument a second time and approved it together with the transmittal letter. (See Appendix A.)

Use of the Questionnaire

The cover letter was sent with the questionnaire to the
administrators of the twelve districts named above. The letter explained the purposes for gathering these data and also encouraged the superintendents to give copies of the questionnaire to the board members in their districts. Additional copies of the questionnaire were included for this purpose.

A date was set for a conference of the investigator with each administrator to complete the questionnaire since fewer misunderstandings would result from the participation of both parties in the completion of the instrument. In order to verify any answers given by the superintendents which might be subject to a different board interpretation, permission was requested for the investigator to meet with the board of trustees during a regular meeting with the administrator present. In five of the twelve districts this request was granted. In each of these five districts the board confirmed, with no discrepancies or additions, the information which had been given by the administrator. It was common for trustees to ask the superintendent to clarify an answer when there was some doubt as to the procedures of the district.

Some of the boards were not visited because they had pressing business which took up their time. Others indicated that they had seen the copy their administrator had completed, and they had nothing new to add. The investigator was
encouraged by the fact that no administrator opposed consultation with the trustees. That the validity of the study may not have been affected by the inability of the investigator to meet with the remaining seven boards was confirmed by the duplication of answers and lack of discrepancies in answers in districts where both administrators and trustees participated.

**Summary.** It was established that the status of general policy development and personnel policies could best be determined by a properly executed questionnaire used in conference by the investigator with school administrators. Construction and refinement of this instrument was made with the help of administrators and the thesis committee.

Distribution of the questionnaire was made to administrators and trustees in twelve selected elementary school districts in Stanislaus County. Trustees confirmed responses of administrators in five districts in a conference which included administrator, trustees and the investigator. No administrator opposed this consultation with trustees.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY DATA

An analysis of the survey data in two major divisions is presented in this chapter. Tabulations from the questionnaires covering general policy information comprises the first part. Information dealing with personnel policy of school districts makes up the second part.

Composite findings of administrators and governing boards are used in the tabulations showing the status of personnel policies. As stated in Chapter III, administrators of twelve districts, along with members of five boards of trustees, participated in completing the questionnaire on policies.

General Information on School District Policies

The directions given to the respondents on the questionnaire were to check the appropriate column headed yes or no. By checking yes, the person completing the questionnaire indicated evidence of policy in the district; that is, if the policy had been written in some partially completed general policy manual, a handbook, was in the board minutes, or in a bulletin, it was considered written policy.

All administrators reported that, if the definition of policy was as indicated above, they had some written policy in
their districts. A yes answer to Question 1, as indicated in Table I, was interpreted broadly since the question, "Does your district have some written policy?" was very general. Superintendents indicated limited written policy and yet replied affirmatively to this question.

As indicated in Table I, ten districts had made an attempt to gather policies into a handbook or guide. Two districts had made no effort to collect policies for codification. No evidence of the size of the district as a factor in influencing the collection of policies was indicated. The assumption from this information is that the decision of making a guide book from policies adopted by the district has been left largely to the discretion of the administrator.

Ten superintendents responded affirmatively when asked whether the district had some form of a teacher handbook. Here again the size of the district had no bearing on the development of a teachers' handbook.

In only seven of the ten districts having teacher handbooks had the board officially approved the contents. Lack of official approval suggested the hypothesis that governing boards and administrators were neglecting the area of employee relations, if it is to be construed that official board approval of the teachers' handbook is necessary for proper working relationships.
### Table I

**General Personnel Policy Information From Twelve Elementary School Districts in Stanislaus County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Policy</th>
<th>District Size by Average Daily Attendance</th>
<th>Total No. of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Districts having policy</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Districts attempting to gather policy</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Districts having teacher handbook</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher handbook adopted by board</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Districts having handbook for non-certificated employees</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Non-certificated handbook adopted by board</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Policies understood by employees</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Districts having policies not in written form</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment and duties of non-certificated employees was found to be a neglected area in the school districts covered by this study. As indicated in Table I, no district had a handbook or guide for such employees. It is evident that districts had not been impressed with the importance or necessity of guides for non-certificated employees in the performance of their duties.

All administrators indicated that policies made known to employees were generally understood and were used as guides. Also, where policies were explicit, employees did not hesitate to follow directions in the accomplishment of their tasks.

Policy by implication, because of consistent use of acceptable procedures year after year, was evident in all districts. Administrators substantiated existence of such policy when referring to policies which were not in written form. Prolonged tenure of trustees or administrators led to the acceptance of unwritten standard procedures as implied policy for the district. Respondents readily admitted that determination of much policy in districts of the size in this study was left to the discretion of the superintendent.

Leadership in Adoption of Policy. The administrators were consistently mentioned as being leaders in policy development, as indicated by Table II, in all twelve districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Districts Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher groups</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sharing in this leadership in seven of the districts were the trustees. Five superintendents indicated teachers shared by suggesting what to include in policy development. Since less than half of the districts included teachers as leaders in policy development, it could be assumed that they were either discouraged from participating, or that they did not assert their influence in this area.

A healthy sign of broader participation was found in one district which included the classified employees in the development of the policy. The importance of this participation was that it enabled these employees to understand their duties in relationship to the total school program.

**Specificity of Policy.** In order to determine the specificity of the policies found in the districts, Question 10 was divided into three categories and the following responses were elicited:

1. General in nature  
2. Fairly specific or operational  
3. Detailed

A range from general in nature to fairly specific was reported by one administrator, thus accounting for the thirteen responses from twelve districts. As indicated above, three school districts, each with less than 300 average daily attendance, replied that policies were general in nature.
The six districts in the medium range of attendance revealed that policies were fairly specific or operational. The two districts with the highest enrollment designated their policies as being detailed. According to this information, then, the larger the school district, the greater the likelihood that written policies were in effect.

**Policy Manuals.** An examination of the responses on the questionnaire showed that in ten districts personnel policies were part of the partially gathered general policy manual. Two of these ten districts also had a separate personnel policy manual for employees. One of the twelve districts had neither a general policy manual nor a personnel policy manual, and another reported having a personnel manual but also some personnel policy included in a partially developed general policy manual.

Lack of policy pertaining to school district personnel became apparent through interviews with trustees and administrators. Further information from superintendents about policy manual preparation showed slower progress toward publication of manuals than might be expected.

**Employees Covered by Policy.** The classification of employees covered by personnel policies that have been adopted by governing boards is shown in Table III. Respondents indicated that policies affecting administrators were very limited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees Included</th>
<th>District Size by Average Daily Attendance</th>
<th>Total No. of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246 266 268 438 539 540 562 565 587 632 636 735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x  x  x  x  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries and clerks</td>
<td>x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodians</td>
<td>x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus drivers</td>
<td>x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria employees</td>
<td>x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County office employees</td>
<td>x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    x    1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III

EMPLOYEES COVERED BY ESTABLISHED POLICY IN STANISLAUS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
and general in nature. Guides for the chief school executive
in written form existed in seven districts. Scarcity of
written policy is an indication that trustees are inclined to
leave the duties of the superintendent in the realm of impli-
cation and discretion.

An indication of the importance of the teachers in the
educational program was found in the fact that all districts
have policy concerning teacher activities. The Education
Code of the State of California, which makes school policy
mandatory in certain areas, but also leaves permissive areas
for governing boards to control, may be a reason that all
districts had some written policy for teachers.

In seven districts there was some written policy
defining the duties of secretary and/or clerk. A secretary
was not employed in two districts, and two other districts
stated they had part-time help in this position. Administra-
tor and trustee responses indicated that the office was in an
experimental stage, and that duties and assignments were in
the process of being determined by "trial and error" method.

A guide for school building custodians was in existence
in eight districts. The respondents indicated that policies
included in this guide were very general in nature. The areas
which were covered were vacations, permissive sick leave, and
hours of work.
Bus drivers were given directions by policy in six of the districts studied. Three districts pointed out that transportation of pupils was by contract with a commercial company which made policy for bus drivers less essential than districts owning buses.

Five districts had adopted policy referring to cafeteria employees. No reply was made on cafeteria policy by one district since no cafeteria was in operation.

Working out of the county schools office, sometimes on an optional contract basis paid for by the school district and sometimes as a service to the school district, were nurses, speech therapists and psychologists. These people worked under rules and regulations established by the county office but, as shown by Table III, were seldom guided by rules adopted by local school districts. Only one district had adopted any policy concerning employees from the county schools office who work in local school districts.

Specific Information on School District Policies

Specific Policy Information. Questions concerning specific information concerning school district personnel policies was included as Part II of the questionnaire.

Requirements for Employment. Respondents were asked first if there was policy in the district covering the mentioned
areas, and, second, if so, was it in written form or was it by implication.

Seven of the twelve districts, as indicated by Table IV, had policy on required qualifications for employment in the district. Four had this policy in writing and the other three had policy by implication. According to responses by administrators and trustees, state requirements for credentials protected the districts to some extent against applicants who did not meet minimum standards. Thus, because of the state credentialing program, districts did depend somewhat on the state requirements and lacked policy development in this area. Respondents pointed out that state credentials were a protection to districts only as to academic work completed by an applicants but did not measure his effectiveness as a teacher.

Administrators in six districts indicated that the state requirements for medical examinations were considered adequate protection. Six districts required medical examinations in addition to state requirements; five were by written policy and one was by implication.

Policy in all districts, as indicated by superintendents, required that the candidate be recommended by the administrator to the board for employment. Four districts had this policy in writing while the other eight districts accepted this practice by implication.
TABLE IV
POLICY ON REQUIREMENTS FOR EMPLOYMENT IN STANISLAUS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Requirement</th>
<th>Number of Districts Having Policy</th>
<th>Policy is Written</th>
<th>Policy is Implied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical examination</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate recommended by administrator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate interviewed by administrator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate interviewed by trustees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents indicated that all districts expected the administrator to interview applicants for a position. This policy was by implication in eight districts and in four it was in writing. Two districts involved the board of trustees in interviewing candidates when it was convenient to do so. Most governing boards wanted to meet applicants but not necessarily participate in the interview. The two districts that indicated trustee participation in interviewing were the smaller districts of this study.

**Instructional Load.** As indicated in Table V, policy relating to special classes existed in four districts. Also, according to respondents, this policy was very general in nature. It was pointed out by administrators that the reason for this was that special classes were under the direct supervision of the county schools office for districts of this size.

Student load for each regular class was made a matter for policy by only two districts; one had this in written form and one had it by implication. The one district with written policy reported that only kindergarten classes were mentioned. Lack of policy in this area suggested more emphasis should be placed on the development of a philosophy of what teacher-child ratio produces the best results in classroom instruction. Trustees mentioned two influences that
### TABLE V

**POLICY ON INSTRUCTIONAL LOAD IN STANISLAUS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Policy</th>
<th>Number of Districts with Policy</th>
<th>Policy is Written</th>
<th>Policy is Implied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limit on number of students in each class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for special classes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left to the discretion of the administrator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
affected the number of children assigned to each class. First, governing boards were inclined to feel that administrators were qualified to make this decision and would make proper placements, and secondly, financial problems involving state income represented by class load were determining factors. Eleven districts gave administrators discretionary power in this area, three by written policy and eight by implied policy.

Teacher Contracts

Contracts for employees, as presented in Table VI, were governed to a great extent by requirements of the State Education Code. Respondents indicated that since the State had many mandatory procedures in this area, districts accepted these without bothering to develop further policy. Mentioned often as an example was the tenure law for all districts of 850 average daily attendance and above. Effects of the state tenure law were apparent since only one district had policy on tenure, and this by implication.

Seven districts had policy affecting probationary employees. Two districts had these policies in writing and five respondents indicated policies by implication.

Procedures for dismissal of employees, according to superintendents, was a somewhat neglected area of policy development which was needed in districts. Five districts reported having some written policy outlining procedures for
### TABLE VI

**POLICY ON TEACHER CONTRACTS IN STANISLAUS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy on Contracts</th>
<th>Number of Districts Having Policy</th>
<th>Policy is Written</th>
<th>Policy is Implied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts for probationary employees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts on tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure for dismissal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual contracts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing contracts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dismissal. Seven districts remained without any established practice for discharging employees.

Annual contracts were included in policy by eight districts, three having them in written form, and the other five by implication. In all probability the remaining four districts followed the procedures outlined in the Education Code; that is, contracts for certificated employees must be on file in the county schools office prior to warrants being processed for payment of salaries.

Since continuing contracts became effective only recently, one superintendent indicated the district had policy concerning this type of contract and that this policy was by implication.

Transfer and Assignment of Employees. Left to the discretion of the administrators in eleven school districts was the assignment and transfer of employees. One district reported having no policy in this area. Once an employee had been given an assignment in districts of this size, as reported by superintendents, there was little need for change. Two districts had policy in writing and nine districts had policy by implication in regard to transfer and assignment of employees.

Promotions. Since there were very little, if any, promotions occurring in districts of this size, respondents
indicated a lack of policy in this area. All promotions were left to the discretion of the administrator in districts in which policy existed, with one district having this in writing and four by implication.

**Substitute teacher.** Four superintendents indicated districts had guides for substitute teachers. These guides were in writing as part of the regular teachers' handbook. One district had no policies for substitutes; the administrator responded that the usual procedure was for the substitute to follow the same rules and procedures as regular teachers. Seven districts pointed out that policy on substitute teachers was left to the discretion of the administrator.

**Leaves of absence.** Policy on leaves of absence is shown by Table VII. Because sick leave for certificated personnel is mandatory by the *Education Code*, respondents indicated the majority of policy on sick leave pertained to classified employees of the district. Nine districts reported sick leave policy in writing and one district had policy by implication.

Sick leave, according to respondents, was in the same category as sick leave in that the *Education Code* requires leave for certificated employees. Thus, policy in this area was mainly for non-certificated workers. Nine superintendents
### Table VII

**Policy on Leaves of Absence in Stanislaus County School Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Leave</th>
<th>Number of Districts with Policy</th>
<th>Policy is Written</th>
<th>Policy is Implied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sick leave</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereavement leave</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency leave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical leave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal business leave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for Exchange teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for service in professional organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reported districts had policy for this type leave; eight had it written and one district had implied policy.

Provisions for emergency leave of school personnel were made in five districts, according to responses. Two districts had this policy in writing while three indicated policy by implication. Thus, seven districts were without policy for emergency leave.

Maternity leave, as reported by administrators, was a matter of policy in eight districts. Six of these districts had policy in writing while two had implied powers. Four districts made no policy statement for employees on maternity leave.

One district only had policy concerning military leave, and this was in writing.

The lack of financial ability was mentioned by respondents as being responsible for lack of policy on sabbatical leave. Two districts had policy, in written form, outlining sabbatical leave for employees.

Four districts in their policy allowed leave for business reasons. One district, according to respondents, had policy on this type of leave by implication while three districts had policy in written form.

No district reported policy granting leave for exchange teachers.
Policy allowing leave for employees to participate in professional organizations was reported by two administrators; this was by implication. Respondents indicated, however, that leave would be granted for this purpose should an employee of the district ask permission to participate in some worthy event sponsored by a professional organization.

Resignations. Ten districts, as reported by administrators, left procedures for resigning to the discretion of the chief school executive. Three districts had this as policy in writing while seven reported having this policy by implication. Two districts had no policy on resignations.

Salary Schedules. The importance of salary schedules is pointed out by the fact that ten districts had policy in written form, as indicated in Table VIII. General steps for advancement on the salary schedule were included in ten districts. Ten districts had provisions for outside experience as the determining factor of the placement of employees on the salary schedule.

Added as an incentive for advancement to higher steps on the salary schedule in nine districts was professional growth, either through extra college units or traveling. Five districts made allowance for payments above actual steps on the salary schedule.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Schedule Provisions</th>
<th>Number of Districts with Policy</th>
<th>Policy is Written</th>
<th>Policy is Implied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General steps</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside experience</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary period</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay above schedule</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of schedule</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promotions on the salary schedule were covered by policy in only two districts. This would verify earlier responses that promotions were uncommon in districts of this size.

Six districts had provisions for salary schedule revisions in their policies.

Each of the two districts not having salary schedules had less attendance. This might indicate that smaller districts are less inclined to develop policy.

Outside Employment. Evidently outside employment has not been a problem to districts of this size since ten districts lacked policy development in this area. Two districts, according to responses, had brief statements of policy relating to outside employment of school district personnel; in both districts the policy left this to the discretion of administrators.

Retirement. Eight districts reported they had no policy regarding retirement of employees. Three districts, by implication, left retirement to the discretion of the administrator, while one district had this in writing. Here again is evidence that retirement has not been much of a problem for the districts covered by this study.
Vacations. Nine districts, as reported by administrators, had limited policy relating to vacations for employees. In all cases these vacations were left to the discretion of the superintendent; six were by written policy and three were by implication.

Other Comments. Item 13 in the questionnaire requested respondents to list other areas of personnel policies which had not been covered by the instrument. Three administrators replied to this request. One comment was on channels of authority which relates to personnel but is usually part of the administrative code. Another mentioned party policy for classes, and the third listed teachers' duties as part of district written policy.

Because of the nature and briefness of these comments, it did not add materially to the data gathered and was not given further treatment in this study.

Summary. According to data collected from the twelve selected elementary school districts in Stanislaus County, progress was being made in gathering policies for codification and use in each district. Ten districts reported they had a teacher handbook, but only seven of these districts had had it officially adopted by the board.

Much discretion has been given administrators by boards in policy matters. Prolonged tenure of trustees and administrators has been the reason for considerable implied policy.
Administrators were consistently mentioned as being the leaders in policy development.

Policy statements existing in districts were fairly specific or operational. No district had a policy manual in existence but ten districts did indicate they had a partially gathered policy manual.

Personnel policies were more likely to be found in areas emphasized by the Education Code. Classified employees had very little written policy to use as a guide in carrying out their duties.

Information in areas covered specifically by school district policy was found to be somewhat limited. Boards were inclined to depend upon minimum state requirements in governing actions as to qualifications and medical examination of employees. Administrators were expected to recommend candidates for employment to the board.

Instructional load per teacher was left to the discretion of the administrator by implication as was transfer and assignment, promotion, substitute teachers, resignations, and outside employment.

Districts were inclined to have more written policy on contracts, salary schedules, and leaves of absence than they had in other areas affecting personnel.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of personnel policies in the twelve elementary school districts of Stanislaus County selected on the basis of having a full-time administrator and less than 900 average daily attendance. An attempt was also made to find out how policy had been developed in these school districts.

The eight specific objectives of this survey of the twelve districts were to determine how many had written personnel policies, how many left the execution of policy to the discretion of the superintendent, how many had implied or unwritten policy, if the size of the district was a factor in adoption of policy, how many had made an attempt to codify written policy, what role trustees and administrators played in the development of policy, to what degree adopted policy was general or detailed, and the scope and content of personnel policy.

A review of the literature revealed that only a small percentage of school districts in the United States have written policy. Lack of policy clearly defining duties and responsibilities, according to the authorities, results in
confusion among trustees, administrators, and employees. A major responsibility of the governing board is to develop policy; high morale is a result of well planned policy guides.

Information needed for this study was assembled by use of a questionnaire in a conference with the superintendent and in five districts with the school board as well.

The study indicated that even though all districts had some written policy, it was in limited scope in the majority of those surveyed. In no district was there one official policy guide adopted by the school board. Written policy, as pointed out by respondents, was not formulated until a solution was needed for some problem. Such policy was found scattered throughout board minutes. Ten districts had made an attempt to codify this policy into a central manual.

Personnel procedures had been left largely to the discretion of the administrator. This delegation of authority resulted in inconsistencies in district regulations; these inconsistencies were being overcome in part by the adoption of handbooks for employees.

That implied and unwritten policies were being used rather extensively was confirmed by interviews with the superintendent and the five school boards interviewed. Procedures, accepted through common understanding by trustees and administrators, were accepted as policy. All districts indicated having some areas of policy that were not in written form.
District size was not a determining factor in whether or not policy was recorded. Administrators appeared to be the ones to decide whether policy was gathered into a central policy manual. Codification of policy was very limited. The common consensus, as indicated by respondents, was that there is yet much work to be done in policy development.

Administrators reported that policy was very general in nature. Specific policy directions were found in limited amounts.

Respondents revealed that much of the area of personnel policy was left to the discretion of the administrator. Administrators indicated some feeling of insecurity because of the lack of clear definition of duties and responsibilities.

Administrators pointed out that they were aware of the absence of written policy. Most superintendents reported they were in the process of starting a policy manual.

Recommendations

In applying the results of this survey to the Hughson School District, the following recommendations are made:

1. Need for Policy Manual. It is desirable that the investigator convey to the Hughson school board the results of this study showing need and desirability of written policy. A request should be made by the investigator that the board give him formal approval to proceed with developing a draft
of a policy manual for the district.

2. **Collecting Policy Statements.** Minutes of the board meetings and other official school records should be examined for evidence of actions, statements, and resolutions which would indicate policy. Policy statements should be examined and classified for later review by the board. Outdated policy should be deleted, desirable revisions recommended, and gaps in policy area identified for further action by the board. Policy relating to personnel should be evaluated for determining what additional coverage would be desirable in the Hughson School District.

3. **Cooperative Involvement of Personnel.** A request should be made to the board for involving all groups concerned with personnel policies. School employees, laymen, administrators, and board members can combine their thinking and efforts in developing effective policy statements for official action and adoption by the board.

4. **Study by School Board.** It is important that policy statements be studied and understood by all board members before being officially adopted. Some time should be spent in each board meeting for this purpose. To facilitate study of policy statements, proposals should be sent to the board members at the same time the regular meeting agenda is sent. A long range program should be considered in an effort to meet the demands of growth and changes that occur in the school.
district.

5. **Trial Adoption.** If some doubt is expressed by board members as to the value of a certain policy, a trial period should be agreed upon prior to official adoption of this policy by the board. A harmful or unfair policy can be avoided by this trial period. Thoroughness in the completion of a policy manual for the district should be encouraged even though several years may be necessary in the accomplishment of this project.

6. **Periodic Review.** Since it is possible that the completion of an officially adopted policy manual for the Hughson School District may take several years, the board should be encouraged to establish procedures for an annual review of adopted policies, and this should be continued after the manual is completed. This annual evaluation would be for the purpose of revising policy, deleting outdated materials, and keeping the policy manual current.
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APPENDIX

1. Transmittal Letter to School Districts

2. Questionnaire for Determining Status of Personnel Policies in Selected School Districts in Stanislaus County
Dear

You are invited to participate in a personnel policy survey of school districts in Stanislaus county with full-time administrators and which have less than 900 average daily attendance. The results of the survey will be made available to your district.

It is my hope to determine the present status of personnel policies in these districts as a basis for completing a comparable project at Hughson.

I would appreciate working with you in completing the enclosed questionnaire. May I suggest that after meeting with you and, with your approval, we meet with your governing board in going over areas in the questionnaire that are not clearly defined in your district. This should be of help to you and your board and might make the study more valid and reliable.

Should you feel that your board would like to go over this material prior to our meeting, I am enclosing sufficient copies so that you may send one to each of them.

A copy of your policy guide, or the privilege of reviewing a copy, will be most helpful in this survey.

Your help will be greatly appreciated.

Very Sincerely,

Grant B. Jacobs
District Superintendent
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DETERMINING STATUS OF PERSONNEL POLICIES IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN STANISLAUS COUNTY

Name of district

Average daily attendance for year 1956-57

Number of full-time teachers

Number of non-certificated employees

Position of respondent(s): (check)

Administrator

Trustee(s)

Other(s) (give position)


In this questionnaire a policy is defined as a statement of general principle that the board has agreed upon as covering solutions to related problems. If a policy has been put in writing in minutes, handbooks or bulletins, it is then defined as written policy.

Please check

1. Does your district have written policies as defined above?

2. If it does, has there been an attempt to gather these written policies in some form such as a booklet, a policy manual, or guide?

3. Does your district have a teachers' handbook?

4. If it has one, has this handbook been officially adopted by the board?

5. Does your district have a handbook for non-certificated employees?
6. If it has one, has this handbook been officially adopted by the board?  

7. Do you believe that the policies are generally understood by persons involved?  

8. Are there areas of policies not in written form in your district?  

9. Who has been the leader in the development of policy, or what is accepted as policy in your district? (Check one or more)  
   (a) Administrator  
   (b) Trustees  
   (c) Teacher groups  
   (d) Other (specify)  

10. Classify the type of policy mentioned in 9 above in one of the three categories below: (Check one or more)  
   (a) General in nature  
   (b) Fairly specific or operational  
   (c) Detailed  

11. Does your district have personnel policies as part of general policy manual or as separate policy?  
   (a) As part of general policy manual  
   (b) Separate personnel policy  

12. If you have personnel policies, which of the following employees do they cover?  
   (a) Administrators
(b) Teachers
(c) Secretaries and clerks
(d) Custodians
(e) Bus drivers
(f) Cafeteria workers
(g) Employees from the County schools office:
   (1) Nurse
   (2) Speech
   (3) Psychologist
   (4) Other (specify)

(h) Other employees (specify)

Part II. Specific Policy Information.

Please check appropriate column applying to your district. Includes other than policy that is mandatory by Education Code.

Have policy? Policy is:
   Yes No Written Implied

1. Policy on requirements for employment—both certificated and non-certificated.

   (a) Qualifications

   (b) Certification

   (c) Medical examinations

   (d) Candidates recommended by administrator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have policy</th>
<th>Policy is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Policy on instructional load which includes:

- (a) Limit on number of pupils in each class

- (b) Provisions for special classes

- (c) Policy left to discretion of administrator

- (d) Other (specify)

3. Policy on teacher contracts which includes:

- (a) Probationary employees

- (b) Tenure

- (c) Procedure for dismissal

- (d) Annual contracts

- (e) Continuing contracts

- (f) Other (specify)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have Policy:</th>
<th>Policy is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transfer and assignment of employees within the system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Policy left to discretion of administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Policy covering promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Left to discretion of administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Policy covering work of substitute teacher which includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Statements in teachers handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Left to discretion of administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Policy covering leaves of absence which includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sick leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Bereavement leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Emergency leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Maternity leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Policy:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Military leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Sabatical leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Personal business leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Exchange teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Leave for service in professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Policy covering resignations which is:

(a) Left to discretion of administrator |     |    |         |         |

(b) Other (specify)

9. Policy on salary schedule which includes:

(a) General steps |     |    |         |         |
| (b) Outside experience |     |    |         |         |
| (c) Professional growth |     |    |         |         |
| (d) Probationary period |     |    |         |         |
| (e) Pay above schedule |     |    |         |         |
| (f) Promotions |     |    |         |         |
| (g) Revisions of schedule |     |    |         |         |
| (h) Other (specify) |     |    |         |         |
10. Policy on outside employment which is:

(a) Left to discretion of administrator

(b) Other (specify)

11. Policy on retirement which is:

(a) Left to discretion of administrator

(b) Other (specify)

12. Policy on vacations which is:

(a) Left to discretion of administrator

(b) Other (specify)

13. List any areas of personnel policies that your district may have which have not been covered in the questionnaire.