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Abstract of Dissertation

The Problem: The purpose of this study was to develop a proposed policy for in-service education of teachers in larger unified school districts in California.

Procedures: The nature, scope, and status of in-service education policies were ascertained by a review of the literature. Policies of school districts, the State of California, and the federal government were analyzed. The literature was reviewed to identify suggestions and recommendations for changes to school district in-service education policies. Since the State of California and the federal government have adopted separate employee training policies, these policies were used as the basis for drafting guidelines for in-service education of teachers. After review by State and Federal experts, guidelines were submitted for evaluation to eighty selected educators. Responses to this questionnaire indicated overall agreement with the guidelines. A proposed professional development policy was then drafted and submitted for judgment to three district superintendents and four personnel directors. Minor modifications of the proposed policy were recommended and the text was changed where indicated.

Concluding: It was concluded that school districts do not have a separate in-service education policy for developing and maintaining competence of professional staff; in-service education is part of the salary policy.

The State of California and Federal employee training policies were helpful references for developing the proposed policy for use by school districts.

According to survey respondents, the proposed policy is appropriate for use by all school districts regardless of size, and, with proper changes in terminology, can be applied to all personnel of the district.

The proposed policy includes a declaration of policy statement, definitions of terms, assignment of responsibilities, requirement for identification of professional development needs, requirement for assessment of effectiveness, and statements regarding professional development programs. It is declared necessary and desirable that self-development and improvement by teachers be supplemented and extended by professional development in order to build and retain a competent permanent professional staff and in order to improve skills, increase knowledge, and better motivate teachers for performance of present and projected official duties.

Recommendations: It is recommended that additional studies be conducted to (1) determine what changes, if any, should be made in salary policies to reflect deletion of provisions related to implementations of a separate professional development policy, (2) ascertain the current cost of in-service education and compare it to an estimate of the projected cost and benefit under the proposed policy, and (3) review other policies of the State of California and the Federal government to determine if improvements can be made in other school district policies.

It is recommended that school district personnel become familiar with both State and Federal employee training policies, rules and regulations, and practices and seek advice and counsel of training directors prior to implementation of the proposed professional development policy.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of this study to develop a proposed policy for in-service education of teachers in larger unified school districts in California.

The specific purposes of this study were (1) to report the nature and scope of written, in-service education policies of California school districts, (2) to report the nature and scope of employee training policies of the State of California and of the United States government, (3) to summarize in-service education policy changes recommended in the literature, and (4) to develop a proposed policy for in-service education of teachers in larger unified school districts in California.

Need for the Study

There were four specific reasons for conducting this study.

First, in-service education is an important aspect of school management. The need for in-service education to improve and maintain teacher competence has been recognized
throughout the history of American education. The expansion of knowledge is so rapid and the rate of obsolescence so swift that there is need for continuous in-service education in order to provide the quality of educational experiences appropriate for our times.

Second, there is evidence of extensive dissatisfaction with in-service education. The education profession has been criticized for being dormant too long in regard to promoting better types of in-service education. In order to encourage teachers to continue their education, school districts have related salaries to college course credits, degrees, and a variety of other activities. So much emphasis has been placed on higher salary and credential requirements that the real purposes of in-service education have been lost and it is considered a relatively new, little explored avenue.

Third, because of the dissatisfaction with in-service education activities, there is reason for a review of the

---

2Ibid., p. 247.
5Ibid.
policies which govern this area of school personnel management. Teachers have for many years assumed responsibility for their in-service education. However, this tradition is now considered inadequate as a means for assuring up-to-date professional competence. Written personnel policies are recognized as necessary for good management in both industry and government. Whether planned or unplanned, written or unwritten, an institution does have personnel policies and does pay to train and develop its employees. The money may as well be spent wisely.

Fourth, in an earlier study, Lois McMahon recommended that there be a review of in-service education policies of other government agencies to determine if these have any relevancy for districts. There is no evidence in either the literature of research nor studies completed or underway for the specific purpose of recommending a policy for

---


in-service education of teachers which reflects a study of policies of other public agencies. The design of this study is intended to meet this recommendation by McMahon.

For these reasons, the investigator concluded that a study to develop a proposed policy for in-service education is urgently needed. This conclusion was confirmed through informal discussions with educators in various positions of responsibility at the local, state, and national levels.

As a result of this study it is hoped that there will be available a proposed policy for in-service education of teachers which reflects judgments of selected educators and authorities in other areas of public administration.

Limitations of the Study

Although important in in-service education, the following aspects were excluded from the study to develop a statement of policy.

A study of salary policies for professional staff of school districts is not included in the study even though in-service education is related to salary schedules.

Determination of the extent to which in-service education practices conform to written policies was excluded from the study.

Pre-service and certification requirements for
teachers will not be examined, nor is there any effort to relate these to in-service education policies.

The important but complicated question of how to finance in-service education is not considered part of the study.

The study does not concern itself with procedures districts use to develop, implement, or revise policies although these are also considered to be important, related topics.

II. PROCEDURES AND METHODS OF THE STUDY

The literature was reviewed to ascertain the general nature and scope of in-service education policies and what changes, if any, had been recommended. School district in-service education policies were obtained from policy manuals available at the University of California, Berkeley; Sacramento State College; University of the Pacific libraries; and from the California School Boards Association office in Sacramento. Specifically with reference to California, the training office of the California State Personnel Board provided a copy of the State policy for examination. Policies of the Federal government, obtained from the Civil Service Commission office in Sacramento, were analyzed.
To gain further insight, the investigator discussed in-service education with many authorities, among whom were:

The executive secretary for the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association;
The acting executive for teacher education of the California Teachers Association;
Executive secretaries of the San Diego, Pasadena, and Sacramento teacher associations;
In-service education directors of the Montebello and Sacramento Unified School Districts;
The training officer for the State of California;
The executive secretary for the Institute for Local Self Government at Berkeley;
Training officers for the Internal Revenue Service in San Francisco;
The training officer for the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento.

During the planning phase of the study the investigator was a member of a committee to plan a Sacramento Region Conference on in-service education for reading teachers. Committee members represented the University of California at Davis, Sacramento and Stanislaus State Colleges, University of the Pacific, and the Yolo, Placer, El Dorado, Sacramento, and San Joaquin County Schools offices.

During the course of the study the investigator served as a resource person to an ad hoc committee of consultants in the Office of Compensatory Education, California State Department of Education. This committee was charged with responsibility for developing an in-service education policy for Compensatory Education.
The mailed questionnaire method was used to obtain judgments for developing the recommended in-service education policy. First, a mailed questionnaire survey was conducted to assist in establishing guidelines by which the investigator could draft a policy. Then judgments of the policy draft were obtained from superintendents and personnel directors of selected school districts. Judgments were analyzed, and necessary revisions of the policy were made.

Completion of the study included presentation of the recommended policy, and preparation of the conclusions and recommendations.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following terms are used in this study as they are defined below:

Teacher. All persons employed by school districts in positions requiring certification under laws of the State of California.

Policy. A written statement adopted by the board of education to chart a plan or course of action within which the administrators may exercise judgment and discretion.

In-service education. Efforts to develop, maintain, and improve occupational competence of teachers during the period of their employment.
IV. PLAN OF THE DISSERTATION

The remainder of this study is divided into five chapters:

Chapter II is a review of the literature regarding school district in-service education policies and a report of the nature and scope of in-service education and training policies of the State of California and the Federal Government. Recommendations for policy changes are summarized.

Procedures and methods used for collection of data are described in Chapter III.

Chapter IV deals with analysis and interpretation of responses to the questionnaires and interviews.

The proposed policy for in-service education of teachers in larger unified school districts in California is presented in Chapter V.

Conclusions drawn from the study and recommendations for further studies comprise Chapter VI.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purposes of this chapter were (1) to review in-service education policies of school districts, (2) to report for informational use by school districts the nature and scope of in-service training policies of the State of California and the Federal government, and (3) to summarize in-service education policy changes recommended in the literature.

I. THE CONCEPT OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

The concept of in-service education in the field of education is not clear. There is confusion in terminology and in the meaning or definition of the term "in-service education."

First, the term "in-service education" is often used interchangeably with other terms such as in-service training, in-service development, staff development, professional growth, professional development, professional improvement, continuing education, and on-the-job training.10

Second, there is a lack of agreement as to precisely what in-service education means.

The words "in-service education" mean various things to different people. When we try to pin the word down and give it definitiveness, we find ourselves on the horns of a Texas-sized dilemma. On the one hand, if we adopt some of the time-worn stereotypes of in-service education, the term becomes pretty inconsequential. On the other hand, if we develop a newer, more vital view of in-service education, the topic becomes enormous in scope and complexity.11

According to Clifford P. Archer, in-service education means efforts to "increase professional competence."12 However, the meaning of the words "professional competence" is also vague. Bruce Biddle summarized research on teacher competence and concluded that, "Research on teacher competence becomes effective only with an agreement upon language and the variables for which words stand."13

Jack P. Crowther, former Superintendent, Los Angeles City Unified School District, recently stated that one of the most important areas needing new emphasis is "what I choose to call staff development." He explained that development "implies a more or less continuous process of keeping ourselves updated." To him the term "staff


development" was a much more "significant and more inclusive concept than the term "in-service training." He saw staff development as a goal with the highest of priorities.¹⁴

The following three related definitions are contained in the Dictionary of Education:

In-service education. All efforts of administrative and supervisory officials to promote by appropriate means the professional growth and development of educational workers: illustrative are curriculum study, classroom visitation, and supervisory assistance.¹⁵

Training, in-service. Special training or instruction for employed persons, including those in the professions, with a view to increasing the workers' competence.¹⁶

Teacher education, in-service. Activities on the part of employed teachers that contribute to their professional growth and qualifications, for example, travel, professional reading, participation in supervisory and curriculum development programs, attendance at summer session courses, etc.¹⁷

A more recent definition of in-service education by the United States Office of Education excludes college credit programs:


¹⁶Ibid., p. 576.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 550.
A program of systematized activities promoted or directed by the school system, or approved by the school system, that contributes to the professional or occupational growth and competence of staff members during the time of their service to the school system. College credit programs are not regarded in this handbook as in-service education or training.18

Because of lack of agreement on the meaning of in-service education, the investigator's definition of in-service education as presented in Chapter I, "Efforts to develop, maintain, and improve occupational competence of teachers during the period of their employment," is to be considered representative of the general intent of all of the terms noted in the literature and is to be considered an expedient to begin the study.

II. IN-SERVICE EDUCATION POLICIES OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Development of Written Policies

Written school board policies are a recent innovation in education. As late as 1946, few districts had adopted written policies.19 According to a 1948 survey, a "published set of codified policies is conspicuous by its absence."20 By 1959, written school board policies were generally recognized to be necessary for school district operations.21 In 1960 the National School Boards Association and the National Education Association joined to publish a Reference Manual on Written School Board Policies.22 The purpose of this Manual is to provide school districts with examples of policy statements which could be used as guides for the development of local policies.


J. L. Buford pointed out that many school districts had developed policy manuals to meet local needs but that "thousands of schools" either had no written manuals or were functioning with manuals which were greatly in need of revision. A clear, concise statement of how the board of education intends to operate the district is considered essential.

**Status of In-service Education Policies**

Billy Duncan found that many school districts did not have policies and procedures to deal with the many aspects of in-service education. He concluded that board members were not opposed to development of personnel, but they knew that this was another cost which would need to be budgeted. Duncan recommended that the board of education develop policies to enable the superintendent and staff to plan and implement a program of in-service education.

---


24Ibid.

25Ibid.

John F. Staehle examined handbooks and manuals of sixty-one city school systems and eleven of the county-unit type. These were among the larger systems in the nation and all offered both elementary and secondary programs. He determined that in-service education of teachers has been fostered by salary schedules and by semester hour or "point" requirements. Although manuals did not recommend specific courses, workshops or other activities, credits or points were to be secured within a certain time period and distributed according to prescribed rules among the various activities.27

According to the California Teachers Association, the purpose of salary schedule classification is to "promote and recognize professional growth."28

Classification changes usually involve completion of college courses, and the determination of specific courses to increase competency should be the responsibility of the professional teacher.29

---


29Ibid.
Circumstances which give rise to this situation have been described by James B. Conant. Conant reports that in education there is a bewildering complexity of arrangements which relate salary schedules to degrees and earned course credits or points. Until recently, many teachers had not completed a four-year college program. Therefore, salary schedules in almost every district in the nation were adopted so as to induce teachers to continue their formal education. School boards want teachers to obtain degrees and expect to pay higher salaries to teachers with degrees. Willingness to take additional college courses is accepted as evidence that a teacher must be eager for self-improvement and better because of exposure to more instruction. Conant questions the present practice of "so relating salary to further course work that the teacher is bribed into taking whatever course happens to be available." Such a ringing up of cash register credits, course by course, seems an odd procedure to a foreign visitor, or for that matter to many American citizens who hear of it for the first time. No other country has such a practice:

30 Conant, op. cit., p. 189.
31 Ibid., p. 188.
32 Ibid., p. 191.
no other occupation or profession in the United States operates in such a way.33

Leon Ovsie observed that in-service credit for salary increments was "intended basically to encourage teachers to invest their free time and resources in activities that contribute to the improvement of education."34 The board of education was "impressed by the logic of this point of view." Ovsie relates how staff-administered plans were developed and adopted to extend salary schedule increments to non-academic in-service training. Included in a list of these "non-academic" activities were military service and committee work for the district.

Policies which require teachers to earn college credits have been tested in the courts.35 In its decision on the case of Last v. Board of Education, the Court observed that a tenured teacher could be refused re-employment for failure to comply with a reasonable policy which required earning at personal expense, six hours of college credit.

33Ibid., p. 187.


Nature of the Salary and In-Service Education Policies

School district salary schedules for teachers have two main elements: classes based on training levels and steps based on years of experience. Training levels are usually based on college credits, degrees or in-service education points. For example, Class I may include all teachers with a bachelor's degree and a credential. Salaries on Class II may be five percent higher than Class I for teachers with a bachelor's degree and fifteen additional credits. A master's degree or a bachelor's degree plus 45 credits may be the requirement for Class IV. Class VI may require a bachelor's degree plus 60 credits including a master's degree. Some policies include a provision for a bonus of $500 to be paid annually to teachers with an earned doctorate.

Steps on the teacher salary schedule represent years of satisfactory service. Class I may begin at $7,000 on step one and end at $8,500 on step five. On some schedules all classes have the same number of steps. Other schedules

---


38 Ibid.
have fewer steps in the first class and more steps in the highest class. The highest class may have as many as twelve steps. The maximum salary on the schedule is generally at least twice the amount on step one, class one of the schedule.

Some districts have professional growth requirements which are sometimes called "hurdles." Teachers are required to earn college credits or their equivalent in order to advance to the next step. According to a recent survey, intervals at which such requirements must be met vary from each year to every three or four years; the number of credits required varies from two to six. District policies also vary as to the number of such credits which may be used for both hurdle and salary reclassification purposes.

For example, the Sacramento City Unified School District is the most recent of larger California School districts to adopt a new in-service education plan, which is entitled "Professional Improvement of Certificated Personnel." This plan was approved after almost two years of study by

---

39 Ibid.


41 Ibid.

the staff of the district and is similar to one of the plans in the Reference Manual on Written School Board Policies. It requires teachers and administrators to earn six semester hours of college credit every three years in order to advance on the salary schedule. For those who are not seeking degrees, points for travel, research, writing, committee work, and other activities may be substituted, according to certain rules, for college credits. However, the plan does not apply to those who are at salary classification maximum or who do not wish to comply.

It should also be pointed out that the training condition applies only to those who wish to advance on the salary schedule. Those who do not wish to advance, who are at the maximum step in Class V of the teachers' schedule, or who are at the maximum step of their respective ranges on the administrative-specialist schedule are not required to meet this condition.

Basic assumptions for development of the Sacramento plan were stated as follows:

(1) Because pupils and our society need the best educational program available, educators need a plan with incentives to grow professionally.

(2) Although many educators need no imposed incentives for professional improvement there are some who do.

(3) One of the most impressive incentives for professional improvement is salary.

\[43\text{Ibid, p. 1.}\]

\[44\text{Ibid, p. 2.}\]
(4) A program for professional improvement should have many elements other than the undertaking of college training.

(5) Educators will work best for professional self-improvement if they design their own individual plans within general guide lines.

(6) Efforts to evaluate plans for professional improvement will be supported best if the evaluating group includes peers of the person whose plan is being evaluated.45

The Pasadena, California, City School District requires satisfactory performance and six units of appropriate study as prerequisites to advancing beyond certain levels on the salary schedule:

In lieu of formal academic units, it is possible to earn a maximum of 18 equivalent units, provided that not more than nine may be used at any one time to change from one Class to the next higher one.

These 18 units may be earned in three major categories of six units each.

3.07a One year of successful non-teaching work experience (may be cumulative) related to the current assignment (2 months = 1 unit); and

3.07b Travel which is specifically related to improving the employee's service and taken after initial employment in the district (2 weeks = 1 unit); and

3.07c Professional service (1 unit for 9 weeks) supervising a cadet teacher; publication (1 unit for an article of 500 words or more in a recognized professional magazine, 6

pages or more), major leadership in local, state or national professional organizations (2 units for president, 1 unit for other offices); non-credit adult classes provided that the content is appropriate to the current or possible future assignment in the school system. In computing courses 15 hours of class time = 1 unit. Summer workshops, and child study courses not taken for university credit may be used for credit in this category. Courses which are audited are not acceptable.46

The Montebello, California, Unified School District adopted a professional growth plan for teachers which requires completion of two semester hours of college course credit every three years.47 Professional growth is defined as follows:

Professional growth is a continuing process becoming a more interested and cultivated person and developing a flexible and open-minded attitude toward life, people and himself. It requires a balance of thought and action, study and experience, solitude and companionship, enrichment of mind and maintenance of health, pleasurable recreation and spiritual growth.48

Montebello teachers who fail to grow professionally "fail to protect the privileges of tenure."49


47Montebello Unified School District, Professional Growth Record (Montebello, California: The District, 1965).

48Ibid.

49Ibid.
The Bellevue, Washington, policy on in-service education is included in the Reference Manual and clearly shows that the purpose for college credit requirements is increased salary:

To maintain a position on the salary schedule and to be eligible for all benefits, a teacher shall be required to complete twelve quarter hours (or equivalent) of approved credits during every period of six years immediately previous to the renewal of contract for the ensuing school term...

The 12-credit policy shall be interpreted as requiring 12 credits per each six year cycle of employment with Bellevue School District. They may be acquired either from 12 college credits or 12 credits earned through professional activities, as recommended by the Professional Credit Committee, or any combination thereof....

professional credit and college credit requirements will be waived for employees of the school district who have completed a total of 20 years of public school teaching service.

Status of School District In-Service Policies

The general intent or purpose of in-service education as stated in district salary policies is to improve teacher competence. By including in-service education as part of the salary policy, the official purpose of in-service education...
tion has been changed in actual practice to mean accumula-
tion of credits or points for salary increases.

The primary objective of continuous professional development is perverted to the objective of advancement to the next higher salary class.52

College professors complain that too many teacher-students are too little concerned with learning or becoming more professionally competent, but are interested only in finding ways of accumulating credits to be eligible for increments.53

Unavoidably the courses given suffer from the presence of those whose interest is strictly monetary.54

Whether the courses are given by local school employees or by people outside the school system is beside the point, as is the matter of credit--"in-service" or "university." So long as courses of any kind may be used for license renewal or maintenance for salary increments, for placement on a higher schedule, or for examination or qualification for another license, there is real incentive for point


collection quite separate from professional development.\textsuperscript{55}

J. W. Maucker agreed with Conant's criticism of in-service education.

Much malpractice exists in the continuing education of teachers after they are on the job, reflecting the stake of colleges in fees and influence, as well as questionable policies of school districts relating salaries to indiscriminate credit earning.\textsuperscript{56}

In spite of evidence that institutional credit and length of experience are invalid criteria for judging the work of a teacher, most salary schedules are based on these factors.\textsuperscript{57} In short, there is no official in-service education policy in operation in school districts for the expressed purpose of improving teacher competence.

The confusion in in-service education with regard to purposes, needs, responsibilities and effectiveness is reflected in a study done by a commission of the American Association of School Administrators.\textsuperscript{58} The Commission


\textsuperscript{57}Weber, op. cit., p. 264.

reviewed in-service education for school administrators and reported the following conclusions. There was widespread interest and a great involvement of institutions and administrators in in-service education activities. Long-range careful planning was the exception rather than the rule. No continuous thread or purpose ran through the multiplicity of in-service activities in a state or a region. Trial and error rather than adherence to tried and proven principles and movement toward well-established goals characterized these widespread activities. Without awareness of the needs that existed in their school districts, there was no motivation for improvement or reason to turn to an in-service program. Any program which would draw on district resources, the committee felt, should be undergirded by board policy.

Absence of school district in-service education policies also affects in-service education at the state department of education level. A review of personnel practices of state education agencies was recently completed and the report reflects on the status of both local and state

59 Ibid., p. 103.

60 Ibid., p. 104.

61 Ibid., p. 108.
levels of government. According to the report, state education agency personnel are, for the most part, former school district administrators who transfer district personnel practices and attitudes to state levels. "Employee development programs designed to meet the continuing and special training needs of state education agencies were not found." Support staff interviewees stated that there was a need for training programs; however, the professional staff frequently commented, "professional educators are already trained; no further training is necessary."

The study also reports that there is a consensus among school personnel that "no effective means has been devised to rate teacher performance." Therefore, there is a general lack of performance evaluation programs in state education agencies. The study includes a recommendation that each state agency develop written policies and

---

62 Lloyd N. Morrisett, Sr., Director, Personnel Administration in State Education Agencies in the Years Ahead (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1968), 154 pp.
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make them known to all staff members. Employee development is recognized in the report as one of the essential elements of a comprehensive personnel policy.

The effect of the salary policy on in-service education has been described. In-service education or the desire to have teachers complete college degrees and course work has also affected the salary policy.

Salary policies, if they are to be used as motivational instruments to secure, develop, and retain the individuals who possess the skills, attitudes, and knowledge required to meet the purposes of the organization, need to be designed to conform to the supply of teachers.

Ingenious and effective as the single salary schedule was in the third decade of the twentieth century, it is entirely proper in the sixth to inquire about its effectiveness in meeting the school administration problem of motivation.

A salary policy designed in steps of more than five years must, obviously, be put together for the purpose of keeping individuals in a specific school system, rather than reflecting the advances in skill gained by the teacher.

There are relatively few professionally trained wage and salary personnel administrators in public

---
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schools, but there are many in the fields of public and business administration. Research in the fields is voluminous and the effectiveness of various policy measures is well known. There is hardly any scientific reason for the denial of current knowledge about the subject by either the teaching profession or boards of education. 71

It is quite clear that what is needed is quite different from the salary policy first proposed by the National Education Association in 1923 and continued with minor modifications today. 72

Other Related Policies

In addition to salary policies, school districts have adopted personnel leave policies which relate to in-service education.

Professional Meetings. Fixed policies on granting leave with full pay for attendance at professional meetings were reported by only a minority of districts. In general, no districts appear to have formal policies on the granting of leave for professional meetings without pay or with part pay.

Professional Activities. Most districts reported no formal policies on granting of leave for participating in professional activities other than meetings.

Sabbatical Leave. A large number of districts were unable to state specific policies relating to many aspects of sabbatical leave.73

71 Ibid., p. 74.
72 Ibid., p. 78.
Most districts grant sabbatical leave for study and a smaller number also grant such leave for travel. Sabbatical leave is considered to be an "investment in the employee's future value to the district more than a reward for past services." There is no reference to specific instructional objectives or other district goals in the literature relating to this topic.

Although the California Education Code prescribes some specific conditions and minimum provisions, school districts have wide discretion to supplement and exceed employee leave requirements of the Code. The Education Code also authorizes county and district superintendents to hold institutes or in-service meetings. The purpose of such meetings is not stated in the Code, but one of the duties of the superintendent is to secure the attendance of lecturers competent to instruct in the "art of teaching." Teacher institutes, one of the first in-service education activities in the history of education in America, were criticized even before the
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end of the nineteenth century as being a duplication of
the normal school program and as being inefficient in bring-
ing about the desired growth and improvement of teachers.\textsuperscript{78}

Almost every California school district participates
in programs of compensatory education funded by Title I of
the \textit{Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965}.\textsuperscript{79} The
McAteer Act of 1965 implements Federal legislation in Calif-
ornia and stresses importance of in-service education.
There is no evidence in the literature or information avail-
able from consultants specializing in this program that any
policy changes or new in-service education policies have
been adopted by school districts.

On July 1, 1967, the \textit{Education Professions Development
Act, Public Law 90-35}, was signed by the President. This
legislation is designed to attract and train those not cur-
rently engaged in education and to improve and extend com-
petencies of educators and teacher aides. Funds are author-
ized for use in improving school district in-service education
programs. The 1968 session of the California Legislature

\textsuperscript{78}L. J. Lins, "Origin of Teacher Improvement in the

\textsuperscript{79}California State Department of Education, Evaluation
enacted several laws to make use of this Federal aid. However, in-service education is not defined and there is no reference to school district policies or teacher performance of official duties.

III. TRAINING POLICY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In order to obtain additional background information, a review of the training policy of the State of California was conducted. The State of California operates several special schools and employs teachers just as do school districts. Since the Legislature enacts laws which affect both State employees and school district employees, it seemed appropriate to review the State employee training policy to determine if there was any relevance to in-service education policy of school districts.

Development of the Training Policy

Anwar U. Qureshi has provided not only a detailed history of employee training by the State of California, he has also provided valuable insight regarding the status of

80Education Code, Sections 13335, 13390-13399.
the Training Division of the California State Personnel Board.\textsuperscript{81}

According to Qureshi, employee training on a large scale is a post-World War II development in California. While some persons in California State government may have realized, even before 1934, the importance of coordinating training activities for state employees, the first documentary evidence to this effect is the 1937, Twelfth Biennial Report of the Personnel Board. This report describes a threefold program to (1) train employees for performance of specific duties (2) keep them abreast of new developments and techniques, and (3) prepare them for promotion.\textsuperscript{82}

From 1937 to 1943, when the first training officer was employed, the Personnel Board provided only "modest" leadership and guidance in training employees because there was no authority or money to engage in this activity.\textsuperscript{83} It is of interest that the first training officer was Robert Farrington, an employee of the California State Department

\textsuperscript{81}Anwar U. Qureshi, California State Training Division, A Study in Institution Building (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1967).

\textsuperscript{82}Ibid., p. 97.

\textsuperscript{83}Ibid., p. 101.
of Education.  

While he served only a short time because of poor health, he saw his job as that of a conference leader and emphasized a series of work simplification conferences.

In 1947, William K. Smith became the second State training officer and is credited with establishing training as a line function.  

He recognized that training could not be imposed on employees, and that training should be provided only to those agencies which volunteer for it.

The opportunity to establish bench-marks for development of realistic training programs occurred in 1951. The Legislature tried to eliminate training efforts in the Department of Corrections but authorized a survey of formal inservice training needs in the State. The survey was to evaluate the need for in-service training, estimate cost, and determine if such training should be offered on State time, employee time, or a combination of both.

The report of the survey contained thirteen recommendations among which were the following: the Governor should appoint a State Advisory Committee on Training; an overall State training policy and statement of objectives should be developed; training policies for all State agencies should

---

84 Ibid., p. 103.
85 Ibid., p. 105.
86 Ibid., pp. 115-116.
be developed or clarified and should be in writing; supervisors at all levels should be given greater responsibility for training of State employees; all training programs should be evaluated as thoroughly, objectively, and regularly as possible; and each agency should keep adequate records on the amount and cost of training. The appointment of the Advisory Committee in 1952 led to the first draft of an overall State training policy which was recommended to Governor Warren in December 1953. The attempt to cut training funds resulted in the State recognizing and accepting its responsibility for in-service training of its employees. 87

Nature of the Policy

The training policy of the State of California is embodied in law and in executive policy statements. The first policy was a brief paragraph of the Government Code:

As an employer, the California state government must secure the best qualified people available and develop them into an effective working force. In-service training is an important means of achieving this latter objective. It helps create in employees a greater interest and satisfaction in their work, and helps develop and improve their work attitudes, habits, knowledge, and skills. The legislature has recognized the state's responsibility for properly training its employees. The State Personnel Board is directed to work with state

87 Ibid., pp. 118-123.
agencies in the conduct of employee training programs so that the quality of service rendered by persons in the state civil service may be continually improved.\(^88\)

By 1952 it was evident that there was a need for extending and strengthening training programs. In 1956, the State Advisory Committee on Training adopted a resolution recommending enactment of legislation for granting of educational leaves of absence with pay to employees.\(^89\)

On June 12, 1957, section 19451 of the Government Code was enacted for this purpose.

For the purpose of meeting the needs of the state service for scientific, technical, professional and management skills, the board may prescribe: (a) conditions under which employees may be assigned to take specialized training; and (b) conditions under which employees may be reimbursed for tuition fees and other necessary expenses in connection with specialized training authorized by the appointing power to meet the needs of the service. The conditions prescribed by the board shall include but not be limited to the requirements that such training shall be of direct value to the State, be relevant to the employee's duties, and be limited to providing knowledges or skills that cannot be provided through available in-service training. The board shall further prescribe the conditions under which an employee may be required to reimburse the State for the costs of such training in the event he fails to remain in state service for a reasonable time after receiving

\(^88\)State of California, Government Code, Section 18700.

\(^89\)Qureshi, op cit., pp. 156-157.
the training. The Board shall report annually to the Governor and to each house of the legislature concerning activities under this section.90

The training policy issued in 1953 by Governor Earl Warren and later reissued by Governor Goodwin Knight was, in 1960, revised and issued by Governor Edmund Brown. The revision made improvements for clarity but the meaning remained the same.91

Governor Brown, in a covering letter sent along with the policy statement on training to heads of all state agencies, wrote:

This administration is committed to a course which requires the rendering of the highest quality of necessary services to the people of the state in the most efficient and economical way possible. It seems reasonable to assume that the degree of success we experience in achieving our aims depends upon the effectiveness of our employees. Training should be provided which assures that all employees have the knowledge and skill needed to perform their jobs well. For this reason, it shall be my policy, as Governor of the State, to provide for training and development of administrators, supervisors, and employees in order that the best use may be made of their talents and abilities.92

The California Training Policy, dated January 12, 1961, begins with a statement of purpose which is followed by

90 State of California, Government Code, Section 19451.
91 Qureshi, op. cit., p. 122.
assignment of responsibilities, guidelines for organization within departments to assure adequate and necessary training is provided, and a requirement for evaluation of training and development activities. 93

Scope of the Policy

The 1961 Training Policy is applicable to all State employees and would appear to the investigator to provide authorization for whatever training is necessary and appropriate to enable employees to fulfill present and future job requirements. 94

However, certain activities are specifically excluded from consideration as out-service or specialized training:

Institutes, conferences, conventions, or meetings will not be considered specialized training when their program, agenda, or expressed objectives appear to provide primarily for:

a. Enhancement of professional relationships.

b. A general sharing of experiences and broadening of understanding.

c. Exploration of problems pertinent to the sponsoring organization and profession.


94 Ibid.
Operational purposes, such as public relations, recruiting, planning, etc. 95

Special provisions have been made in order that teachers in state service may continue their education. Persons employed in positions requiring certification may be granted a summer leave of absence with pay for the "purpose of receiving further instruction in pedagogy, vocational education, mental health, or related fields." 96 Leaves shall not exceed two months every three years. Only teachers in the Department of Youth Authority, Mental Hygiene, and Corrections are so authorized. Personnel Board rules and regulations note that this educational leave is not an automatic right based on length of service. 97 The legislation is permissive and is intended to make it possible for selected teachers to have an opportunity for further formal education and training which will improve the department's educational program.

The Training Division of the Personnel Board has published a "Guide" to facilitate preparation of specialized

96State of California, Government Code, Section 19325.
97Training Division, State Personnel Board, op. cit., p. 3.
training proposals authorized by Section 19451. In addition to instructions and forms, the "Guide" includes a definition of terms.98 Training by the State is to maintain the "skills ratio" of a government unit. The "skills ratio" of a government unit fluctuates because of personnel turnover, technological advances, new equipment, and new projects. "Manpower" is defined as people with skill and knowledge equal to the tasks before them and is more effective when the ratio of skills available in relation to the task is high. Training which can be provided within the State service is called "in-service training." When outside institutions provide the training and the State pays the costs, it is called "specialized" or "out-service training."99

Purposes

The purposes for employee training for the State of California as stated in the policy are as follows:

The State has an obligation to its employees and to the people of the State to utilize and develop in full measure the talent and ability of each employee. Managerial and supervisory personnel are accountable for the development and utilization of human resources even as they

98Ibid., Introduction.

99Ibid.
are accountable for the execution of other administrative instructions, rules, and statutes.100

Assignment of Responsibilities

According to the Policy, responsibility for training and development resides in:

(1) The Individual - to himself and to the State for his own development.

(2) All Administrators and Supervisors - to promote and encourage the development of each of their subordinates, to create a situation in which it is possible for employees to develop themselves, and to provide appropriate training, experience, and coaching made necessary by present and future job requirements.

(3) Departments - for developing a "climate" which provides a continuing development process so that competent and industrious employees are available to fill higher level vacancies as such vacancies occur. Agencies are also responsible for establishing management accountability for the training and development of persons they supervise. Likewise, agencies have the responsibility for developing an adequate organization for necessary training.

(4) The State Personnel Board - for providing assistance in organizing for training, assisting in agency and statewide development of administrators, providing assistance in securing training resources, setting standards, determining needs, and securing and disseminating information on resources for specialized training, giving advice concerning current methods, and consulting with agencies on training and development problems.

(5) The Governor and his Council - through the Standing Committee on Personnel and Training or other appropriate means, to encourage and review

100 State of California, Training Policy, loc. cit.
departmental and interagency activities which forward the training and development process of State personnel.101

Also, every department shall organize for training:

(1) Establish a Training Policy which includes:

a. Recognition of responsibility for training that rests with departments and supervisors.

b. Recognition of individual responsibility for self development.

c. A statement of training and development objectives.

d. Outline of methods and means of implementing training and development objectives.

e. Guidelines for evaluation of training and development measured in terms of assistance given to the agency in achievement of its goals.

(2) Develop a Training and Development Plan which gives guidance and direction to both formal and informal phases of the program. Departments may wish to include, at a minimum, training in orientation, public relations, technical fields, supervision and management, work improvement, communications, and safety.

(3) Secure Adequate Training Personnel to render staff assistance to administrators and supervisors so that management has adequate knowledge and skill needed to train employees. Staff personnel should also be available to consult with, advise, and assist line personnel in training and development problems, and to do a minimum amount of supervisory and management training.

(4) Establish a Training and Development Committee (either as part of the departmental executive committee

101]bid.
or as a separate entity) to advise management and the training staff on the direction which may desirably be taken in training and development activities.

(5) Obtain Physical Facilities, Equipment, and Materials needed to carry on necessary training and development programs.

(6) Provide a System of Reporting and Review to give meaningful information which assists management in assessment of past and planning for future training and development. A report of training and development activities shall be made annually to the State Personnel Board and to the Standing Committee on Personnel and Training.\(^{102}\)

Determination of Needs

The California Training Policy assigns responsibility to the State Personnel Board to provide assistance in determining training needs.\(^{103}\) While the Policy does not include further reference to training needs, there is clear implication in various statements of purpose, assignment of responsibility, and evaluation that training should be provided to meet specific needs.

Evaluation of Training

Annual reports of training activities are required. Evaluation of activities is conducted to determine if purposes and objectives are being achieved.

\(^{102}\)Ibid.

\(^{103}\)Ibid.
The most valid evaluation of training and development is made in relation to what such activity has contributed to increasing the effectiveness of the organization's work. This implies evaluation, by the department, of its work effectiveness.\textsuperscript{104}

IV. TRAINING POLICY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Not only is the Federal government a major employer in the nation, it also appropriates considerable sums of money which are used by State and local educational agencies for employment of teachers. A study of the Federal employee training policy was conducted to ascertain whether there were any similarities to the State training policy and if there was any relevance for the development of an in-service education policy for school districts.

Development of the Federal Training Policy

Enactment of legislation to improve the character of Federal service has been continuing for many years. The \textbf{Civil Service Act of 1883}, \textbf{Retirement Act of 1922}, and the \textbf{Classification Act of 1923} are milestones in personnel management legislation.\textsuperscript{105} By 1935, training and development

\textsuperscript{104}Ibid.

of employees had gained status as a necessary function of personnel management.\textsuperscript{106} In 1938, the Order Extending the Competitive Classification Service, Number 7916, officially made training and development of Federal employees a legitimate activity of the government.\textsuperscript{107}

In 1955, a Federal Training Policy was issued by direction of the President.\textsuperscript{108} This policy required agencies to "formulate and maintain a systematic plan of action for the development, training, and effective use of their manpower resources."\textsuperscript{109} At the same time the President also directed the Civil Service Commission to obtain data on employee training in order to inform the President on current practices.

The Commission's report,\textsuperscript{110} completed and submitted to the President on October 16, 1957, included an analysis of department training policies. Policy statements were analyzed to ascertain whether the following elements had been included: indication of the purposes for training; indication of an intent to train; assignment of responsibilities for train-

\textsuperscript{106}Ibid., p. 276.
\textsuperscript{107}Ibid., p. 278.
\textsuperscript{109}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{110}Ibid., p. 1.
ing, authorization for specific types of training, provision for evaluation of training. By the time the Commission's report was published, legislation had been introduced to enact a Federal policy for employee training.

**Nature of the Policy**

The Congressional policy for training of Federal employees is stated in the Government Employees Training Act which was signed into law on July 7, 1958. The first four paragraphs of the Act are a brief statement of policy.

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress:

1. that, in order to promote efficiency and economy in the operation of the Government and provide means for the development of maximum proficiency in the performance of official duties by employees thereof, to establish and maintain the highest standards of performance in the transaction of the public business, and to install and utilize effectively the best modern practices and techniques which have been developed, tested, and proved within or outside of the government, it is necessary and desirable in the public interest that self-education, self-improvement, and self-training by such employees be supplemented and extended by Government-sponsored programs, provided for by this Act, for the training of such employees in the performance of official duties and for the development of skills, knowledge, and abilities which will best qualify them for performance of official duties;

111Ibid., pp. 2-3.

(2) that such programs shall be continuous in nature, shall be subject to supervision and control by the President and review by the Congress, and shall be so established as to be readily expansible in time of national emergency;

(3) that such programs shall be designed to lead to (A) improved public service, (B) dollar savings, (C) the building and retention of a permanent cadre of skilled and efficient Government employees, well abreast of scientific, professional, technical, and management developments both in and out of government, (D) lower turnover of personnel, (E) reasonably uniform administration of training, consistent with the missions of the Government departments and agencies, and (F) fair and equitable treatment of Government employees with respect to training; and

(4) that the United States Civil Service Commission shall be responsible and have authority, subject to supervision and control by the President, for the effective promotion and coordination of such programs and of training operations thereunder.\(^{113}\)

In addition to the Act, which is the basic statute authorizing employee training, Executive Order 10800 of January 15, 1959,\(^{114}\) provides additional Presidential direction as to the manner in which the authority is to be used.

Both the Act and the Executive Order authorize the Civil

\(^{113}\)Ibid.

Service Commission to issue regulations governing various aspects of the law.

Executive Order 10800 also contains a brief statement of Presidential policy.

The head of each department shall . . . formulate plans of action to meet . . . training needs; establish and maintain, to the maximum extent feasible, needed training programs; establish adequate administrative controls to insure that training improves the performance of employees, and contributes to the economy, efficiency, and effective operation of the department and to the attainment of its program goals; stimulate and encourage employee self-development and self-training; . . .

In addition to the Congressional policy statement in the Act and the Presidential policy in Executive Order 10800, there is a statement of policy by the Civil Service Commission. It is the policy of the Commission to:

(1) Provide department heads maximum flexibility to operate training programs in the ways which best fit the special needs of the departments.

(2) Require the minimum amount of administrative recording and reporting consistent with the Act and the need to inform the President currently on the status of training in the Federal service.

(3) Encourage and assist in the establishment of adequate training programs by providing information, written guides, and advisory services.

---
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(4) Stimulate, promote, coordinate, and facilitate interagency training efforts.

(5) Conduct training programs for other agencies designed to improve the public service.\textsuperscript{116}

Provisions to implement the Act are placed by the Civil Service Commission in Chapter 410 of the \textit{Federal Personnel Manual}. This Chapter is entitled "Employee Development" and is organized according to the following sub-chapters:

- General Provisions
- Determining Training Needs
- Establishing Training Programs
- Interagency Training
- Training Through Non-Government Facilities
- Payment of Training Expenses
- Acceptance of Contributions, Awards, and Payments from Non-Government Organizations
- Attendance at Meetings
- Reports and Interchange of Training Information
- Executive Development\textsuperscript{117}

The \textit{Government Employees Training} Act is part of the merit system of personnel management. The merit system means more than just fairness in hiring practices.

\textsuperscript{116}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 410-5.

\textsuperscript{117}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 410-1,2.
In its broadest sense a merit system in modern government means a personnel system in which comparative merit or achievement governs each individual's selection and progress in the service and in which the conditions and rewards of performance contribute to the competency and continuity of the service. 118

The Federal government is viewed as an important employer seeking and entitled to have and retain personnel equal in talent to those in the private sector. The merit system does not mean that these employees are already fully trained when hired. Glenn Stahl indicates that this point of view is "naive and shortsighted." 119

Scope of the Policy

The following two paragraphs from the Federal Personnel Manual indicate the broad scope of the Federal employee training policy:

The Government Employees Training Act makes available to practically every agency a management tool which, properly used, can help significantly to increase efficiency and effectiveness of operations . . . 120

In general, authorities granted by the Act are sufficiently broad and flexible to enable a department to provide whatever training is

118 Stahl, op. cit., p. 28.

119 Ibid., p. 277.

necessary to develop the skills, knowledge, and abilities that will best qualify employees for the performance of official duties.121

The Act does not apply to the President or Vice-President of the United States, the Tennessee Valley Authority, any member of the uniformed services, any corporation under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, and to other persons who may be exempted by the President.

Latitude for training under the Act is also very broad.

(1) Training under the Act may be full-time or part-time, or on off-duty, day or evening, or any necessary combination of these. It may be given by the department itself, by another government agency, by an educational institution, by a manufacturer, by a professional association, or by other competent individuals or groups in or out of the Government. It may be accomplished through correspondence, classroom work, conferences, workshops, supervised practice, or other methods or combinations of methods.

(2) Departments may pay all or any part of the expenses of authorized training. Payment may be made directly to the training facility (in advance, if need be), or the employee being trained may be reimbursed for the training expenses.122

121 Ibid.

122 Ibid., p. 410-4.
Purposes for Training

In general, the purposes for employee training, contained in the statements of policy quoted earlier in the chapter, are to improve performance of employees and to contribute to the economy, efficiency, and effective operation of Federal departments for attainment of program goals.123

Responsibilities for Training

Responsibilities of the President, Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission, and each department of the Federal government are detailed in the Manual.124 In general, the President is responsible for supervision and control of the training programs of the departments. The Bureau of the Budget is responsible for issuing regulations covering costs of training and for reductions in government payments when non-government funds are awarded or accepted. The Civil Service Commission is to promote, coordinate and facilitate training activities. The Commission shall advise all departments and assist in reviewing training needs and in establishment of programs. The Commission shall also collect and report information on the training programs. Each department is to determine training needs, establish

123 Ibid.
124 Ibid., pp. 410-5, 6.
and operate programs to meet these needs, select and assign employees, evaluate results of training, and encourage self-development by employees. 125

**Determination of Training Needs**

Each Department is required to conduct, at least once every three years, a complete review of training needs and requests. Needs of all categories of employees must be considered and should cover long range as well as immediate needs. Records must be maintained to show the dates, procedures used, findings and recommendations used as the basis for planning. The essential foundation for a training program is a practical method for obtaining dependable information about training needs. The training program is provided in response to such existing or foreseeable needs. 126

An important part of the Act is the provision for executive development. 127 The need for a continuous supply of high quality career executives is widely recognized. Therefore, it is declared necessary to institute a positive program to assure filling of anticipated vacancies with persons of outstanding leadership ability, creative imagination, and sound judgment. Each department is to take steps


to find persons of executive potential and to train them to be able to assume full responsibilities of departmental management. Departments are responsible for periodic surveys of prospective losses of key career personnel and shall consider, develop and install a formal, orderly plan for developing capable replacements.

**Evaluation of Training**

Evaluation is not limited to determining the degree to which employee knowledge, skill, attitude, and performance have changed. Departments must also determine that training programs have actually been provided to cover the areas of greatest need and indicate whether there should be a change in coverage or content of the programs.\(^{128}\)

An inspection staff of the Civil Service Commission will inquire whether the department training reviews are being made, how they are made, how often, and with what results.

Every department is required to submit an annual report on its training program. The report shall outline any major changes in policy or program emphasis, assess the value of training and the economies and improved operations.

\(^{128}\)Ibid., pp. 410-12, 13.
which have resulted, and shall summarize estimated expenditures for all training.129

V. RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO IN-SERVICE EDUCATION POLICIES

Introduction

The literature was reviewed to ascertain what changes were being recommended or suggested with regard to school district in-service education policies. While there are many in-service education activities, projects, and programs, it appears that none of the reports on these efforts includes references to specific changes in policy statements. For example, a computer search involving 2,185 ERIC references was completed but only eleven items were selected for print-out, none of which proved to be useful for the study. The investigator also reviewed the ERIC catalogues but was unable to locate information which could be used in the study. Extensive resources of the California State Library were also searched for appropriate references.

Administrators of the education professions development program in the United States Office of Education were questioned and were not aware of any specific efforts anywhere in the nation to develop in-service education policies or which would suggest changes to such policies. Projects,
funded by this source apparently do not reflect on the nature of district in-service education policies.

Establishment of Policy

If the board of education is to fulfill its responsibility to the community it must declare its intentions as to what it wants regarding the development of personnel and what it is willing to support financially. ³³

It goes without saying that these intentions or convictions are most effective, emphatic, and capable of being implemented when crystallized in the form of written policy. Policies in writing provide the administrator and his staff with the authorization needed to plan the in-service program. They chart the direction in which the policy makers wish the administration to proceed. It is true that policy is not a panacea. While it does not produce plans and programs automatically, it creates the understructure for problem solving. ³³

It is evident that school districts do not have "genuine policies which deal broadly, constructively, and intelligently with the problems of in-service education." ³³

The need to separate in-service education from the teacher salary schedule is frequently mentioned in the literature. For example, Robert's position is very clear on this point.

³³Castetter, op. cit., p. 251.
³³Ibid., p. 251.
³³Ibid., p. 250.
It is high time that we divorce the salary schedule from point collecting and demolish the assumption that courses taken to qualify for advancement of one kind or another somehow promote professional growth.\textsuperscript{133}

According to Bernard McKenna, school districts should adopt "more positive" policies and provide increased financial support for in-service education.\textsuperscript{134}

The importance of adoption of written policy statements was emphasized in the Civil Service Commission's report on the status of employee training in Federal departments. \textsuperscript{135}

Because of the importance of policies in clarifying and gaining better understanding of management's purposes and objectives; in facilitating decisions and promoting action within the framework of these purposes and objectives; in providing a standard against which progress may be assured; and indeed, in making certain that policies actually exist,...\textsuperscript{135}

The absence of an official employee training policy is not unique to school districts. Federal, State of California, Los Angeles City, and other city and county employee training policies were examined as part of a study of professional staffing problems of the City of New York.\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{133}Roberts, loc. cit.


\textsuperscript{135}Civil Service Commission, op. cit., p. 1.

The investigation provided evidence that there was no city-wide training policy and it was, therefore, impossible for departments to meet the training needs of their employees. It was recommended that an executive order be issued "establishing training and development of professional, technical, and managerial personnel as official city policy."137

Scope of the Policy

With regard to scope of an in-service education policy, Castetter states that the policy should make it possible to provide whatever in-service activities are necessary to carry out the function of the administrator which is to recruit, select, induct, and develop personnel to carry out the aims of the school. "The extent to which a local school district should go in formulating the in-service education program is a matter of board policy."138

Stahl provided a brief statement regarding the scope of an employee training policy:

A training policy must cover not only the basic issue of responsibility for training but also such specific points as the essential forms of training, how group training can be arranged for, kinds of training to be done on government time, what respon-
sibility the organization will take for after-hours training, use of outside facilities, recognition of training in promotion policies, training records, selection of instructors, services of the training staff, films and materials available, evaluation, costs that can and cannot be borne by the agency, and statutory limitations. 139

The scope of an in-service education policy is also evident in the advice given to the City of New York by the Brookings Institution:

Such a policy should state that employee training is an essential part of sound management; that staff shall be provided to conduct training; that department officials are responsible for training employees to do their present work most effectively and for developing them for advancement; that City funds may and should be spent for these purposes—both on in-service training courses and on training of employees by outside organizations; that training programs be based on careful studies of needs; and that the Department of Personnel will coordinate training activities, assist departments, and furnish necessary central control. 140

Three essential elements of an employee training program were also listed:

1. Acceptance by management of responsibility for training. This does not deny the responsibility of the individual for self-development. It distinguishes personal "educational and cultural enrichment" at his own expense from training which primarily benefits the agency.

2. Training should be planned, continuous, job-oriented, and directly related to the objectives of the agency.

139Stahl, op. cit., p. 277.
140Stanley, op. cit., p. 295.
3. Organization should be city-wide and departmental. Training staffs should be involved in management decisions.\textsuperscript{141}

Rather than list those items to be included in a statement of policy for in-service education, Castetter listed questions which are important for policy consideration. He suggested a series of studies to provide information on the advantages and limitations of various courses of action:

- To what extent should the local school system engage in in-service development of personnel?
- For whom shall the program be designed?
- How shall responsibility be allocated for initiating, directing, and appraising the program?
- What policies are needed to ensure time, staff, facilities, and resources to stimulate and strengthen the program?
- What studies need to be undertaken to develop the program?
- What kinds of activities shall be included in the program?
- What kinds of activities should be taken to guarantee that in-service needs will be provided through the budgetary process?
- What steps should be taken to ensure program balance?
- What provisions shall be made for continuous review of the program?\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{141}Ibid., pp. 277-78.
\textsuperscript{142}Castetter, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 250.
Castetter further states that a policy regarding in-service education would be incomplete without assignment of responsibilities.

It is generally accepted that responsibility for in-service development of personnel belongs to the superintendent of schools. Not only should this point be clarified by policy, but the general nature of his responsibility and that of other administrative officials involved in the program should be clearly identified. The general outline of in-service responsibilities of the chief executive include:

1. determining development needs;
2. encouraging staff participation in in-service programs;
3. establishing programs to meet immediate and long range needs;
4. providing time, resources, and facilities to implement the program;
5. evaluating results of existing programs;
6. planning for the continuous improvement of the school staff; and
7. delegation of responsibilities to staff members involved in the administration of the program.\(^{143}\)

In sum, the chief executive must have unsplintered authority to make certain that the school system will be staffed today and tomorrow with personnel who will contribute maximally to the purposes of the enterprise.\(^{144}\)

McKenna points out that the professional staff member is not relieved of the important responsibility for his own professional growth.\(^{145}\) However, he also recommends that the school board assume greater financial support for

\(^{143}\)Ibid., pp. 253-55.

\(^{144}\)Ibid., p. 255.

\(^{145}\)McKenna, op. cit., p. 100.
in-service education and pay tuition and other necessary expenses for staff to attend college courses or workshops for specified purposes. 146

Conant was so concerned by the "highly unsatisfactory state of affairs regarding continuing in-service education" that he proceeded to "issue dogmatically a set of radical recommendations." 147 Although Conant does not recommend a specific in-service education policy to improve and maintain teacher competence, his recommendations point in that direction.

In general, Conant would also "drastically" revise salary schedules so that teachers would receive additional increments only when tenure is granted and when the teacher completes a master's degree in a program designed to improve the competence of the teacher as a teacher. He recommends that school boards grant leaves of absence with pay and provide financial support for teachers to enroll in summer schools to complete such master's degree programs. 148

In an effort to keep teachers up-to-date, Conant recommends that school boards contract with educational institutions to provide workshops or seminars during the

146 Ibid., p. 102.
147 Conant, op. cit., p. 195.
148 Ibid., pp. 195-196.
school year. Teachers would participate without cost to themselves and without salary credit. 149

Willard Elsbree and Edmund Reutter recognize that in-service education is part of the salary schedule and indicate that broadening of the classifications of the schedule would be a step in the right direction. 150 Salary increases, promotions and praise are recommended in order to motivate staff. They do recommend that all school employees be involved in in-service education and that they need to participate in defining problems and concerns for in-service education. 151

Chandler and Petty note that many districts use in-service education equivalency credits as part of the salary policy and "those who operate on sound equivalency plans are on safe grounds." 152 They recommend salary policies with twelve to fifteen increments on the basis of preparation and years of experience. 153

Oliver Gibson and Herold Hunt relate in-service educa-

---

149 Ibid., p. 204.
151 Ibid., p. 221.
152 Chandler and Petty, op. cit., p. 189.
153 Ibid., p. 257.
tion to school district supervisory practices and describe the operation of typical teacher salary schedules. They state that activities "concerned with development of task and career performance should be included as an integral part of the workload." James Olivero and Edward Buffie would use a systems approach to in-service education. They are of the opinion that planning of programs and continuous evaluation are necessary if programs are to move ahead realistically. Weber recommends that teachers should periodically provide evidence to the board of education that they have kept abreast of theory, practice and research in education pertaining to education in general and in their particular field of specialization. The board of education should provide facilities which will enable teachers to become increasingly competent. "The most important criterion for judging a board of education and its administrative machinery and policies is: Have the teachers in the system grown?"

155 Ibid., p. 309.
158 Ibid., p. 266.
159 Ibid., p. 268.
This recommendation for reporting to the board of education regarding efforts by teachers and supervisors to grow in service is also noted in a 1928 report by Jesse B. Sears:

Some provision must be made for a real program of training in service. If a teacher fails at the outset the full reasons for failure should be known and through study, supervision, and reassignment perhaps, every effort should be made to overcome the weakness. If every principal were required to do some planning on this matter, and to discuss those plans with the superintendent or deputy superintendent at the beginning of the year, and to report progress at intervals; and if full record were kept of the work done by each member of the staff; and if those records were assembled and worked into a report on the 'Progress of Training in Service;' and if account were taken of this work when salary increases were decided upon it would do much to discourage the sort of professional drifting that is clearly apparent in certain places where there should be progressive intellectual leadership.  

Leonard White differentiates between education for public service prior to appointment and training within the service following appointment:

Such (post-entry) training is a recognizable investment in long-time service. The employee is performing a particular function which in the public interest should be well performed; and he is eligible for promotion to other positions where competence and special knowledge are equally desirable. The specific

object in view is performance. Training to improve performance may be special or general, but the immediate objective is definable in terms of present or future responsibility. The instrument of training is not the public school system primarily, but the service itself. For these reasons, it is desirable to make a distinction between pre-entry education and post-entry training.161

White emphasizes that, "Training programs imply permanent service; that is, a bureaucracy but an intelligent one."162 It is an obvious waste of public money to train "birds of passage." It is important for employers to note that there may be a substantial investment in employees at various levels of personal development and experience but without any of the attendant property rights.163

Since there is much confusion in the field of education regarding the definition or meaning of in-service education, the Federal definition of training is included below:

The term "training" means the process of providing for and making available to an employee, and placing or enrolling such employee in a planned, prepared, and coordinated program, course, curriculum, subject,


162Ibid., p. 388.

system, or routine of instruction or education, in scientific, professional, technical, mechanical, trade, clerical, fiscal, administrative, or other fields which are or will be directly related to the performance by such employee of official duties for the Government, in order to increase the knowledge, proficiency, ability, skill, and qualifications of such employee in the performance of official duties.\textsuperscript{164}

A question has been raised regarding the limited purposes for which training or in-service education is provided by government agencies. There seems to be some tendency to move in the direction of the in-service education policy statements such as that of the Montebello district regarding the mature teacher. The League of California Cities recently sponsored a study of post-entry employee training needs and resources in California.\textsuperscript{165} Post-entry training is generally viewed as a function to improve performance of official duties rather than an avenue for promotion or general collegiate experience or academic degrees.\textsuperscript{166} While noting California's achievements in this area of personnel management, basic questions of policy and philosophy are raised:

\textsuperscript{164}\textit{Government Employees Training Act}, Section 3, (5).

\textsuperscript{165}\textit{League of California Cities, Municipal Post-Entry Training Needs and Resources in California}, December, 1966

\textsuperscript{166}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 3.
Many councils need to re-examine their basic training policy philosophy. Councils may well ask whether training is only to provide a better employee in his present or next job (as has been the dominate philosophy for nearly a half century), or is it also a legitimate expenditure of public funds to inculcate broad public administrative principles and concepts into those who may reasonably be expected to rise in the city's service? Do cities have any responsibility to train the whole man, abreast of current problems in local government, rather than just that part of him engaged in a specialty in the local public service? Is it useful and important to assist municipal employees, as persons, to be better-rounded citizens? Debate is needed.167

The report includes another observation regarding college course work which may be as applicable to school districts as it is to cities with regard to the availability of potential training staff.

At best, only one out of four cities conducts a passable training program 'in-house' for itself. The situation seems doubly quixotic when research reveals several cities that have no organized, regular, formal training program but whose department heads are on the instructional staffs of nearby educational institutions.168

An employee training policy should include identification of responsibilities of management personnel to establish an organized, regular, formal employee training program.

167 Ibid., p. 5.
168 Ibid., p. 7.
VI. SUMMARY

The purposes of this chapter were to report the nature and scope of school district in-service education policies and employee training policies of the State of California and the Federal government and to summarize in-service education policy changes recommended in the literature.

There is a multiplicity of terms which are used interchangeably with in-service education and a corresponding ambiguity as to exactly what is meant by these terms. Because of this lack of agreement in the literature, the investigator defined in-service education and considered that term to be representative of all of the terms and meanings noted in the literature.

Written school board policies are a recent innovation in education. Many school districts do not have written policies and a separate written policy for the purpose of improving and maintaining competence of the staff was not evident in the literature.

Districts have used salary policies to encourage teachers to continue their formal education. Teachers who have advanced degrees may substitute other activities for college course credits. It has been a tradition in education
that it is the responsibility of the teacher to select courses required to increase professional competence.

However, both opinion and research indicate that the salary schedule and policy are not effective means for accomplishing in-service education objectives. Efforts to obtain credits and points for salary increases or license renewal are criticized as being quite separate from efforts to improve professional competence. There is considerable confusion with regard to purposes, needs, responsibilities, and effectiveness of in-service education.

School districts have other policies which are related to in-service education. Policies for professional meetings, sabbatical leaves, and other activities were noted in the literature. Certain Federal programs require in-service education as part of the requirements for funding. In spite of this legislation, in-service education has not been defined nor is there any indication of efforts to develop new in-service education policies.

The employee training policy of the State of California was reviewed for background information and possible relevancy to the development of a policy which might be used by school districts. Training of California State employees is a post World War II development. In 1952, employee training was authorized by law. In 1960, Governor Brown issued a revised training policy which required each
department in the State government to develop a training policy. The policy was to include a statement of objectives, an outline of the methods and means of implementing training and development objectives, and guidelines for evaluating results. The term "in-service" was used to distinguish activities conducted by the State from those "out-service" or "specialized" activities which utilize non-State resources. The State employee training policy which is three pages in length has been praised as a clear and concise statement.

Since Federal funds are used to provide teacher salaries and since in-service education is required in certain Federal educational programs, a review of the Federal employee training policy was also conducted. In 1958, Congress enacted the Government Employees Training Act and authorized government sponsored employee training to supplement and extend self-development and improvement by employees. It is the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission, under direction of the President, to promote and coordinate training programs of each Department of the Federal government. Provisions to implement the Act are included in Chapter 410 of the Federal Personnel Manual. In general, authority granted by the Act is sufficiently broad and flexible to enable a Department to provide whatever training is necessary
to develop employees for performance of current and projected official duties.

The literature was reviewed to ascertain what specific changes in school district in-service education policies are being recommended or suggested.

While there is ample evidence of the need for more and better in-service education, the literature is almost totally void of specific recommendations or suggestions for improvement of written in-service education policies of school districts. Elsbree and Reutter, Chandler and Petty, and others consider in-service education to be part of the salary schedule and recommend changes in the operation of that schedule. Conant and others would drastically revise the salary schedule and separate in-service education from the salary policy. Conant would have school boards contract with educational institutions to provide workshops or seminars to keep teachers up to date. It is recognized by Castetter, McKenna, and others that school districts do not have policies for in-service education and that more positive policies should be adopted. Castetter suggests a series of studies to provide information on the advantages and disadvantages of various policy considerations. He is concerned with questions such as the extent to which a school district should engage in in-service education, how
responsibility for the program should be allocated, what activities should be included, how funds should be provided, and what policies would be needed to stimulate and strengthen the program. Although teachers are public employees, available literature in the field of education does not refer to use of the Federal or State of California employee training policies in order to change and improve in-service education in school districts.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this chapter are to report the design and method of the study and to identify persons who served as the jury to assess the in-service education guidelines and the proposed policy.

I. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The design of the study to develop a proposed in-service education policy for larger unified school districts included the following five activities:

First, guidelines for in-service education were developed by the investigator from information obtained through the review of the literature.

Second, these guidelines were submitted for evaluation to eighty selected persons in the field of education.

Third, evaluations of the guidelines were used to draft a proposed in-service education policy statement.

Fourth, the proposed policy statement was then submitted to seven selected school superintendents and personnel directors for evaluation, comment, and editorial modification.
Fifth, based on an interpretation of these responses the proposed policy statement was refined and prepared for inclusion in this dissertation.

II. METHOD AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The survey questionnaire method was selected to obtain data regarding guidelines for in-service education. The Federal and State of California employee training policies were used as references for development of 26 guidelines for in-service education of teachers. In addition, 13 questions regarding district in-service education practices and policies were drafted and the guidelines and questions were organized into a survey instrument. The primary purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain from persons in education evaluations of in-service education guidelines based on Federal and California employee training policies. Questions regarding in-service education were included in the instrument in order to supplement information obtained in the review of the literature. Space was provided on the last page of the questionnaire for the respondents to comment about the guidelines and to indicate district plans, trends, or other information which might be of value to the investigator in this study.

It was desirable that persons who would reflect the position of the teacher, school administrator, and the
teacher training professor be included in the sample selected to evaluate the in-service education guidelines. Therefore, the following groups of persons were included in the survey:

1. All full-time executive secretaries of teacher associations in California school districts. There were twenty persons holding this type of position at the time of the survey.

2. All presidents of California locals of the American Federation of Teachers. There were nineteen presidents in this group.

3. All persons listed in the Directory of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel in California Public Schools, 1966 169 whose position title included the word "in-service." There were nineteen persons so listed.

4. All members of the California Council on the Education of Teachers who received the report of the Committee for In-Service Education. These persons held positions in California public and private colleges and universities and in the California State Department of Education. There were 22 persons in this group.

Eighty persons were in the above four groups.

Responses to the questionnaire were used by the investigator to draft a proposed policy statement for in-service education. The policy statement, arranged similar to the format of the guidelines questionnaire was submitted to three superintendents and four personnel directors of larger unified school districts in California.

The purposes of this questionnaire were (1) to obtain assessments of each of the statements of the proposed in-service education policy, (2) to submit the policy for editing and other modification by seven professional experts, and (3) to secure the opinions of these experts regarding the scope of applicability and feasibility for implementation of the proposed policy.

To obtain information regarding applicability and feasibility of the proposed policy the following three questions were included in the questionnaire.

1. If the policy were retitled "Personnel Development" and properly edited, would the policy be desirable for all district personnel?

2. Is the policy appropriate for all California school districts regardless of size? Which districts would be excluded?

3. To determine the feasibility of implementation of this policy, what conditions must exist before you would recommend this policy to the Board of Education?
It was arbitrarily decided to select superintendents and personnel directors from unified school districts in California which had more than 25,000 average daily attendance but to exclude Los Angeles Unified since it was so large as to be considered atypical. Evidence of district involvement in in-service education through establishment of coordinator or similar type positions for in-service education was considered in the selection process. Consideration was also given to the location of districts within the State with the intent of selecting districts from each of the northern, central, and southern regions. Respondents who agreed to participate were from school districts in Oakland, Richmond, Stockton, Fresno, Montebello, Long Beach, and San Bernardino.
CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENT OF A PROPOSED IN-SERVICE EDUCATION POLICY

The purposes of this chapter were: (1) to describe the development of guidelines for in-service education; (2) to describe the development of a proposed policy statement for in-service education of teachers in larger unified school districts in California; and (3) to report modifications of the proposed policy which were suggested by selected superintendents and personnel directors of larger unified school districts in California.

I. DEVELOPMENT OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION GUIDELINES

The review of the literature revealed a contrast between the many definitions of in-service education in the field of education and the formal employee training policy statements, definitions of terms, and regulations adopted by the State of California and the Federal government. School districts include in-service education as part of the salary policy; there is no evidence in the available literature of any school district in-service education policies which are independent of the salary policy.170

Consequently, it was decided to develop guidelines.

170 See Chapter II.
based on California State and Federal employee training policies in order to establish a point of departure for development of an in-service education policy statement for larger unified school districts. These guidelines would then be submitted to experts in the field of education for their appraisal. If these experts found the suggested guidelines acceptable, or offered constructive revisions, then they could be used as the basis for a draft of a proposed policy statement.

To avoid confusion in terminology in the guidelines, certain arbitrary decisions were made. In the Federal and State employee training policies the term "in-service" is specifically used to differentiate between activities conducted wholly within the agency and "out-service" or "specialized" employee training which is conducted outside the agency with outside resources. In order for the guidelines to include a differentiation of types of training, it was decided to change the title of the proposed policy from "in-service education" to some other term. Since Castetter had used "personnel development" and "in-service education" interchangeably, it was decided to use the term "personnel development" as the proposed policy title. This would make it possible to use the term "in-service" to identify one of

---

171 Castetter, _op. cit._, p. 246.
the classes or types of development activity.

After the tentative guidelines were developed, the investigator submitted them to State and Federal experts for review. Since Federal and State of California documents were the basis of the guidelines, the training officer of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in San Francisco and the training officer of the State of California were consulted to determine whether major elements of the Federal and State training policies had been included.172 The California training officer suggested inclusion of the term "well-motivated" in the definition of personnel development. He believed this change would make the statement more effective. His suggestion was followed.

Randy Hamilton, director of the Institute of Local Self Government in Berkeley, and George Roehr, chief of the Bureau of Administration and Finance of the Department of Education, were asked to edit the guidelines to insure clarity.

After the suggested change in the definition of personnel development had been made and the guidelines had been edited, they were incorporated into the "Guideline Questionnaire" (Appendix A).

172 See Appendix A.
II. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE GUIDELINE QUESTIONNAIRE

Organization of the Questionnaire

The guideline questionnaire (Appendix A) was organized into three parts. Part I consisted of twenty-six guidelines for personnel development. Statement 1, however, had three subparts, each of which was to be evaluated. Evaluators were instructed to check a number for each guideline statement on the basis of a five point scale in which 5 meant "strongly agree," 4 "agree," 3 "undecided," 2 "disagree," and 1 "strongly disagree."

Part II consisted of thirteen questions which were directed only to respondents employed in school districts which had adopted a "written personnel development" policy. The objective of these questions was to verify and, if possible, obtain more recent information on in-service education policies than that obtained through the review of the literature.

In Part III space was allocated for respondents to comment on the guidelines or on district plans or programs regarding in-service education.
Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire and letters of transmittal were mailed along with return envelopes to eighty persons who were teacher association executive secretaries, teacher organization presidents, district in-service education coordinators, or members of the California Council on the Education of Teachers. Included was a letter from Wilson C. Riles, then Associate Superintendent and Chief of the Division of Compensatory Education of the California State Department of Education, who stressed the importance of the study and stated his interest in the topic of in-service education. Raymond Pitts, project specialist in research and teacher training of the Office of Compensatory Education of the Department of Education, and Rollin Fox, Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration of the University of the Pacific were listed at the bottom of the transmittal letter as having endorsed and approved the study.

Reminder notices were sent to those who had not returned the questionnaire. Fifty-six questionnaires (70 percent) were returned. The responses were tabulated by group, as shown in Table I: sixteen teacher association executive secretaries (80 percent), seven teacher organization presidents (37 percent), eighteen district in-service education coordinators (95 percent), and fifteen members of the California Council on the Education of Teachers (68 percent).
### TABLE I

**TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY GROUP TO THE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION GUIDELINE QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Association Executive Secretaries</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Organization Presidents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education Coordinators</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members, California Council on the Education of Teachers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Tabulation and Analysis of Responses to the In-service Education Guideline Questionnaire

Tabulation of Responses to Guideline Statements---Part I

Scaled score responses to the guidelines statements
in the first part of the questionnaire were tabulated and
converted to percent rounded to the nearest whole number,
as shown in Table I.

Analysis of the responses to the guideline statements
for personnel development revealed that a majority of the
fifty-six respondents checked "strongly agree" or "agree"
for each of the twenty-six statements, inclusive of three
subparts to statement 1. This overall positive response was
interpreted to reflect approval of developing a proposed
statement for school districts along the lines of the
Federal and State of California employee training policies.

Analysis of responses to each of the statements is
reported following Table II.
**TABLE II**

**SCALED SCORE RESPONSES BY PERCENT OF FIFTY-SIX RESPONDENTS TO THE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION GUIDELINE QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses by Percent</th>
<th>GUIDELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 40 4 4 0</td>
<td>(1) Personnel-development is defined as the continuing process of providing for and involving staff in planned and coordinated training and development programs in order to have more effective, efficient, and well-motivated personnel who are knowledgeable and skilled in the performance of present and projected official duties. Three classes of personnel-development are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 47 5 13 5</td>
<td>A. In-service personnel-development programs are directly related to official duties, supported and controlled by the district, and attended only by district personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 57 9 0 0</td>
<td>B. Out-service personnel development programs are directly related to official duties, supported but not controlled by the district nor is attendance limited to district personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 47 9 10 2</td>
<td>C. Self-development programs or activities are voluntarily assumed by staff members and encouraged by the district but not supported by district resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reduction Scale: 5-strongly agree; 4-agree; 3-undecided; 2-disagree; 1-strongly disagree.*
TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses by Percent</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55 32 11 0 2</td>
<td>(2) Written personnel-development policies shall be adopted by the board of trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 36 4 0 0</td>
<td>(3) Special terms used in personnel-development policies shall be defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 38 2 0 0</td>
<td>(4) Purposes of personnel-development shall be stated in the policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 43 2 3 0</td>
<td>(5) The function of personnel-development is to improve skills, increase knowledge, and motivate each staff member for better performance of official duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 50 7 9 0</td>
<td>(6) Personnel-development shall lead to the building and retention of a permanent staff of professional personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 4 8 38 50</td>
<td>(7) Only selected staff members shall participate in in-service or out-service personnel development leading to promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 35 4 2 2</td>
<td>(8) All qualified staff members shall have equal opportunity to participate in in-service or out-service personnel development leading to promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 50 12 0 2</td>
<td>(9) Responsibilities of the staff for personnel-development shall be stated in the policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 38 13 2 4</td>
<td>(10) The district shall provide personnel-development programs required for performance of official duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 49 9 2 0</td>
<td>(11) Each member of the certificated staff is responsible for development required for performance of official duties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses by Percent</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64 27 5 4 0</td>
<td>(12) Administrators and supervisors are responsible for encouraging development, creating an environment wherein development does occur, and providing reasonable resources to enable staff to meet present and projected duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 42 23 5 7</td>
<td>(13) Annual reports of personnel-development shall be prepared by the personnel office, approved by the superintendent and transmitted to the board of trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 50 10 0 0</td>
<td>(14) Participants shall evaluate development leaders and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 41 7 2 0</td>
<td>(15) Employee associations shall be consulted when personnel-development programs are being planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 2 4 43 51</td>
<td>(16) A survey of district personnel-development needs is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 43 25 7 2</td>
<td>(17) A survey of district personnel-development needs shall be conducted at least once every three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 55 9 5 0</td>
<td>(18) The superintendent shall be required to submit a personnel development budget to the board of trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 27 2 2 0</td>
<td>(19) Costs of personnel-development shall be recognized as a necessary cost of operation of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 40 19 3 0</td>
<td>(20) If directly related to official duties, out-service costs which may be paid by the district include salary, tuition, travel expenses, library and lab fees, essential supplies, and membership fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses by Percent</td>
<td>Guideline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 57 7 2 0</td>
<td>(21) Administrative procedures shall require evaluation of personnel-development programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 54 9 3 2</td>
<td>(22) Assessment of the effectiveness of personnel-development shall be required by policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 9 0 0 0</td>
<td>(23) In selection of persons or facilities for development, there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was 92 percent agreement by respondents on statement 1, the definition of personnel development. Over half of the replies indicated "strong agreement" with the definition (a 5 rating); 40 percent checked "agree" (a 4 rating).

Classification of personnel development into "in-service," "out-service," and "self-development" was supported by combined "strongly agree" and "agree" responses, totalling 77, 91, and 79 percent respectively. However, while there was no "disagreement" with the definition for "out-service personnel development," combined "strongly disagree" and "disagree" responses of 18 and 12 percent were checked for definitions of "in-service personnel development" and "self-development" respectively.

Guideline statement 2 requires that written personnel development policies shall be adopted by the board of trustees. A total of 55 percent of the respondents "strongly agreed," 32 percent "agreed," and 11 percent were "undecided" about the statement.

Statement 3 requires that special terms used in personnel development policies be defined. A total of 60 percent of the respondents "strongly agreed" and 36 percent "agreed" with this guideline.

The purposes of personnel development shall be stated in the policies, according to statement 4. Responses
to this statement were almost identical with responses to statement 3, as there was a total 98 percent agreement.

Statements 5 and 6 describe the function and goal of personnel development. There was a total of 95 and 84 percent of combined "strongly agree" and "agree" responses respectively for these items.

Only two guidelines, 7 and 16, were rejected by the evaluators; these were statements which differ from guidelines derived from the Federal and State policies. According to statement 7, only selected persons may participate in personnel development which may lead to promotion. This statement was rejected in favor of statement 8, which requires that equal opportunity be provided to all persons to participate in personnel development.

According to statement 9, responsibilities of the staff for personnel development shall be stated in the policies. A total of 56 percent of the respondents "strongly agreed" and 50 percent "agreed" with this statement. Twelve percent, however, were "undecided."

District responsibility for providing necessary personnel development for performance of official duties (statement 10) was checked with a total of 81 percent "strongly agree" and "agree" responses.

A total of 89 percent "strongly agree" and "agree" responses were tabulated for statement 11, which states
that each certificated staff member is responsible for development required for performance of official duties.

There is "strong agreement" (64 percent) with statement 12 that administrators and supervisors are responsible for encouraging personnel development and for providing reasonable resources to enable the staff to meet present and projected duties.

Annual reporting of personnel development is required by statement 13. A total of 65 percent of the respondents were in agreement; however, 23 percent were "undecided," and 12 percent disagreed. This distribution of responses is about the same as was recorded for the requirement for a survey of personnel development needs every three years (statement 17). These were the highest percentages of "undecided" responses to any of the statements.

There was "agreement" that personnel development participants should evaluate leaders and activities (statement 14), and that employee associations should be consulted when personnel development activities are being planned (statement 15).

Statement 16, which indicates that a survey of personnel development needs is not necessary, was checked "strongly disagree" and "disagree" by 94 percent of the respondents. Sixty-six percent of the respondents "agreed" with statement 17 that a survey of district personnel development needs is necessary every three years, but
25 percent of the respondents were "undecided."

While only 31 percent of the responses checked "strong agreement," a total of 86 percent were in "agreement" with statement 18, which requires the superintendent to submit a personnel development budget to the board of trustees.

It is noteworthy that the statement which was given the second highest number of responses of "strong agreement" (69 percent) was guideline statement 19, which recognizes personnel development costs as a necessary part of the operation of the district.

There were also 78 percent of the responses in agreement with statement 20, which lists costs appropriate for payment for approved personnel development activities.

Respondents were in agreement with statements 21 and 22, which require administrative procedures to evaluate personnel development programs and a requirement for assessment of the effectiveness of personnel development.

Statement 23 prohibits discrimination among personnel, and 91 percent of the respondents checked "strongly agree" (a 5 rating) for this statement.
Responses to Questions--Part II

Part II of the questionnaire included thirteen questions regarding written in-service education policies of school districts. Two respondents did not fill in part II of the survey because they determined that their district's policy was a salary policy and not personnel development or in-service education policy. Since the form of the responses varied according to the type of question, it was not practical to construct a table to report tabulation of responses. Where possible, responses were tabulated and are reported in conjunction with the analysis. Responses to this part of the questionnaire were consistent with information on in-service education policies and practices noted during the review of the literature.

According to responses to the first two questions, the term "personnel development" is not in use by any of the respondents' districts, but the term (as mentioned below) which is used is defined by fewer than one-third of the districts. The term most frequently mentioned is "in-service education" (fourteen references), which was followed in frequency of mention by "in-service training" (four references), "professional growth" (three references), and "professional improvement" (one reference).

The purposes of personnel development, as reported in response to question 3, were classified into two
categories: for general improvement of the individual, or to increase salary. The following three responses are indicative of the statements regarding general improvement of the individual:

To encourage the individual to reach the maximum of his potential and thereby become more valuable to the district.

-------------

Personnel development is broadly conceived so that post-graduate education need not be directed or related solely to official duties. The individual must maintain and improve professional competence but, in addition, we encourage our people to be literate, liberally educated persons. We do not wish our teachers to become inbred specialists but persons of vision, catholic tastes, and intellectual security.

-------------

Providing professional experiences which will assist staff members in keeping up-to-date in their subject areas, in improving their instructional methods and techniques, and in orienting staff members to their assignments and to the districts.

The other purpose for in-service education is for salary schedule placement. One district's procedure includes a salary penalty for failure to comply with this in-service education requirement:

It should be emphasized that the training condition applies only to those who wish to advance on the salary schedules. There is a "decrement" for failure to meet the condition.
According to responses to question 4, inclusion of the words "performance of official duties" in a district personnel development policy would be approved by seventeen persons, or over 80 percent of those responding. However, a teacher organization president questioned the meaning of the words. There was no objection if the definition meant "professional duties," which he defined as relating to classroom instruction and not "john watching."

Of the twenty-one responses to question 5, fifteen indicated that college credit programs were considered to be in-service education. This is contrary to the definition of in-service education as published by the Office of Education and reported in Chapter I.

According to respondents, only five districts annually survey personnel development needs (question 6) and annually require principals to report such needs (question 8). The remainder of the seventeen responses to these two questions indicated that personnel development needs surveys and reports are not required, are never done, or are submitted on an irregular schedule. Similar responses were reported for question 7 regarding the frequency of providing assessments of personnel development to the board of trustees.

Only five of the twenty-one respondents reported that sabbatical leave costs were related to the personnel development budget (question 9).
Only two of the districts, as reported in responses to question 10, reflect the cost of teachers moving to the next higher salary classification as being related to personnel development.

There was a lack of agreement as to the amount of money to be budgeted for personnel development. Of the twenty-one responses to question 11, twelve suggested a range of between 1 and 5 percent of the certificated salary budget, and other responses ranged from a low of .1 percent to a high of 15 percent. Several persons replied that they did not know what amount to suggest.

The salary involvement in district in-service education practices was also evident in questions 12 and 13 with regard to "professional growth points." While eighteen districts permitted salary increases based on "professional growth points," only three would allow equal credit for salary purposes if the person transferred into the district.
Comments by Respondents--Part III

In the third part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to comment or provide information on in-service education plans or programs. Nineteen comments were made, and all of them referred to the importance or need for the study, as indicated by the following statements.

Assumption by school districts of greater responsibility for "staff maintenance" and personnel-development is one of the most pressing educational needs of our day.

In my opinion, in-service training is the most criticized district program (by teachers). It should be an integral, valuable asset to high quality teaching. If a person could figure a way to "get the job done" properly, he would emerge as a significant figure in educational history!

We recently presented a paper to the local board of education on full-time, in-service education. The Board frankly received the notion as somewhat foreign and new. I would suggest that the State Department of Education take every opportunity to broadcast this in-service concept to Boards of Education.

Though there are specific Board rules and administrative regulations defining and governing these activities, there is not one written policy relating to the total in-service education or "personnel-development" program of the district. Your questionnaire has clearly pointed out a need in this regard.
IV. DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT SURVEY

Development of the Proposed Policy Statement

The proposed policy statement evolved from interpretation of the responses to the guideline questionnaire, further study of the Federal and State employee training policies, and opinions by consultants from the Division of Compensatory Education, California State Department of Education.

A draft of the proposed policy statement was developed from the guidelines. The statement was organized in sections under the following headings: Declaration of Policy, Definitions, Assignment of Responsibilities, Identification of Needs, Assessment, and Program Requirements.

Consultants in the Department of Education were helpful to the investigator by editing and reacting to the draft of the proposed policy statement. Responses from these persons were sought by the investigator for several reasons. First, in-service education is required in every compensatory education project, and almost every district in the State participates in this program. Secondly, the consultants were interested in in-service education. Third, because of the nature of their duties and responsibilities, these consultants were in contact with school district and
county office personnel throughout the State.

During this period for review of the draft it became clear that two changes from the guidelines were essential. First, to adhere more nearly to the purpose of the study, the term "personnel development" was deleted and "professional development" substituted. Second, colleagues almost universally indicated that "in-service" and "out-service" classifications resulted in more confusion than usefulness. These terms were therefore not included in the proposed policy.

Administration of the Survey

It was decided that a jury of school superintendents or personnel directors from larger unified school districts in California should be requested to evaluate the proposed policy statement. Eventually seven districts were chosen. Arbitrarily, Los Angeles City Unified was excluded from the study as were all unified districts with less than 25,000 average daily attendance, according to the Directory of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel of California Public Schools, 1966. Three other criteria for selection of districts were used. First, districts were selected which had evidenced interest in in-service education coordinator or supervisor positions. Second, it was determined that selection should be by geographical location in order
to have representative districts in the north, central, and southern parts of the State. Third, districts were considered eligible for selection if teacher association executive secretaries had responded to the guideline questionnaire. From the seven districts selected (Oakland, Richmond, Stockton, Fresno, Long Beach, Montebello, San Bernardino), superintendents (three) or personnel directors (four) were contacted by telephone. All agreed to participate in the survey.

The proposed policy was mailed to each of the seven jurors, all of whom completed and returned the survey form. When the arrangements for the survey were made, jurors agreed to interviews if clarification of responses was desired. One superintendent was interviewed to obtain further clarification of his comments regarding policy statements on self-development.
V. TABULATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT

Tabulation of Scaled Score Responses

Scale score responses from the seven jurors to the proposed professional development policy statements (see pages 103-106) were tabulated. With few exceptions, respondents checked 5, "strongly agree," or 4, "agree," for each of the items of the policy as shown in Table III.

Analysis of Responses and Modification of the Proposed Policy

All seven respondents (three superintendents and four personnel directors) "strongly agreed" with the declaration of policy statement (1.1), and no editorial changes or comments were made.

According to statement 1.2, professional development shall be subject to the supervision and control of the superintendent. There were four responses of "strong agreement," two respondents checked 4, "agree," and one checked "undecided." One respondent inserted the word "evaluation" after the word "supervision." While the concept of supervision includes evaluation, the investigator accepted the revision as further emphasis of the importance of evaluation in this process.
TABLE III

SCALED SCORE RESPONSES BY THREE SELECTED DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS AND FOUR PERSONNEL DIRECTORS TO THE PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STATEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 In order to build and retain a competent, permanent professional staff and in order to improve skills, increase knowledge, and better motivate teachers for performance of present and projected official duties, it is necessary and desirable that self-development and improvement by teachers be supplemented and extended by district sponsored professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 District sponsored professional development shall be continuous in nature, subject to supervision and control by the superintendent and review by the board of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 "Professional development" means the continued process of providing for and involving staff in planned and coordinated training and instruction in order to have more effective, efficient, and well-motivated personnel who are knowledgeable and skilled in the performance of present and projected official duties.

2.2 "Self-development" means training, instruction and participation in programs and activities voluntarily assumed by teachers. Self-development shall be encouraged but not supported by district resources.

*Reduction Scale: 5-strongly agree; 4-agree; 3-undecided; 2-disagree; 1-strongly disagree.
### TABLE III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Policy Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> 4 2 0 0</td>
<td>3.1 The district is responsible for providing professional development required for performance of official duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> 3 0 0 0</td>
<td>3.2 Every teacher is responsible to himself, to the district, and to his profession for professional competence through self-development and participation in professional development sponsored by the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>3.3 Principals and supervisors shall assist in and be responsible for encouraging professional development, creating an environment wherein development does occur, and providing reasonable resources to enable teachers to meet present and projected duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> 4 1 0 0</td>
<td>3.4 The superintendent is directed and authorized to establish needed in-service education, to establish adequate administrative controls to assure attainment of goals, to encourage self-development, and to submit an assessment of professional development to the board of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> 2 1 1 0</td>
<td>3.5 The superintendent shall issue regulations governing fiscal management of professional development including acceptance of awards and payments from non-district sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> 3 0 0 1</td>
<td>4.1 A complete review of professional development needs shall be conducted at least once every three years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Policy Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 2 0 0 0</td>
<td>4.2 A complete inventory of immediate and long range needs shall be identified in the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3 1 0 0</td>
<td>4.3 An assessment of the performance of teachers shall be included in the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 0 0 0</td>
<td>5.1 Administrative procedures shall be established by the superintendent to enable annual assessment of the effectiveness of professional development in meeting specified needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 0 0 0</td>
<td>5.2 Annual reports of professional development shall be prepared by the superintendent and transmitted to the board of education for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 1 0 0</td>
<td>6.1 Professional development shall be coordinated with other personnel management functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3 2 0 0</td>
<td>6.2 Employee associations and organizations shall be consulted when professional development is being planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3 0 0 0</td>
<td>6.3 All qualified personnel shall have equal opportunity to participate in professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 3 2 1</td>
<td>6.4 Professional development requiring use of non-district resources shall be authorized only when no adequate or reasonable facility exists within the district to meet specified needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 4 3 0 0</td>
<td>6.5 Leaves of absence for approved professional development shall not exceed one year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Policy Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 3 2 0 0 0</td>
<td>6.6 Professional development costs authorized for payment include but are not limited to: salary, tuition, travel expenses, library and laboratory fees, and essential supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>6.7 After expiration of a professional development leave of absence, the employee shall serve the district for a period of time equal to twice the length of such leave. Failure to fulfill such service agreement shall require repayment of additional costs to the district of such leave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2 1 0 1 1</td>
<td>6.8 Waiver of repayment in whole or part of professional development leave costs may be authorized by the superintendent if judged to have basis in equity, good conscience, or the public interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>6.9 In selection of persons or facilities for professional development there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One respondent checked a rating of 2, "disagree," on the definition of professional development (statement 2.1). Wording of the statement is almost identical with the declaration of policy but was interpreted by the respondent to mean that the professional development program was planned by top staff rather than being developed cooperatively by teachers and administrators. No change in the definition was made since three jurors checked 5, "strongly agree," and three other jurors checked 4, "agree."

One superintendent "strongly disagreed" with the definition of self-development, item 2.2 of the policy draft. Self-development is defined to mean training, instruction, and other activities of self-improvement. Such activities are to be encouraged but not supported by the district. This statement was considered by the respondent to be part of the salary schedule and an activity which would require careful control and supervision by the district. While two respondents "strongly agreed" with the statement, four others were "undecided."

One of these persons commented, "A district which maintains, as most do, a preparation type salary schedule gives financial support to self-development as defined in the first sentence." Having previously deleted "in-service" and "out-service" types of professional development, it seemed prudent to also delete reference to "self-development" and eliminate evident confusion regarding
this statement. Reference to self-development in items 3.2 and 3.4 were not deleted since it is possible for the district to provide support and encouragement for such activity and still not be in conflict with the policy. Deletion of classifications "in-service," out-service," and "self-development" for types of activities does not affect the policy, and these terms may be added to the policy when needed.

In the third section of the proposed policy, "Assignment of Responsibilities for Professional Development to the District," the teachers, the principals and supervisors, and the superintendent are given responsibility for professional development.

Only one respondent "strongly agreed" with statement 3.1 that the district is responsible for providing professional development required for performance of official duties. Four respondents "agreed," and two were "undecided" about this statement.

Four respondents "strongly agreed," and three "agreed" with statement 3.2 (page 104), which assigned responsibility to the teacher for self-development and participation in district professional development activities in order to maintain professional competence. In order to reflect continuing comments by educators that teachers must participate in planning for professional development, and that
colleges and universities have historically been involved in development activities, statement 3.2 was edited specifically to refer to self-development "opportunities at colleges, universities, and elsewhere."

Except for one respondent who checked 4, "agree," all other respondents to the draft policy "strongly agreed" with statement 3.3, which declares responsibility of principals and supervisors to provide and encourage professional development to meet present and projected duties.

Statement 3.4 was edited by one superintendent to delete the words "and authorized" as these were deemed unnecessary if the superintendent was "directed" by the policy to establish needed professional development.

One respondent to the survey checked 2, "disagree," and suggested editing of statement 3.5 to have the superintendent meet with staff to develop "policies" and establish procedures for fiscal management of professional development. This suggestion was rejected as the statement was intended to refer only to the fact that regulations would be necessary for fiscal management, not that a committee was essential for development of such regulations. Development of policy is considered a function of the board of education and not a responsibility of other positions in the district.
Provisions regarding identification of professional development needs are included in the fourth part of the proposed policy. Except for two responses, each of the three items in this part were checked "strongly agree" or "agree."

One personnel director "strongly disagreed" with the statement (4.1) which requires a complete review of professional development needs every three years. An annual review was recommended. No change was made in the statement since other jurors did not disagree and, as a proposed policy, this item is subject to reasonable interpretation by school districts.

There were five responses of "strong agreement" to statement 4.2 that immediate and long range needs should be identified in the review of professional development needs.

Only one superintendent questioned the meaning of statement 4.3 regarding assessment of teacher performance. It was not clear to him whether the statement referred to performance of teachers in development activities or performance of teachers in classroom and other official duties. There were three evaluators who "agreed" and three who "strongly agreed" with this statement. The statement was reworded by the investigator so that it would be
clear that professional development needs would be identified through an assessment of teacher performance of official duties. Assessment of teacher performance in development activities is required by the policy in another item.

The same superintendent suggested that it would be sufficient to report to the board of trustees every three years rather than every year on the effectiveness of professional development as required by statement 5.2. This statement was not changed since other jurors were in "agreement."

One superintendent checked "undecided" and suggested that other personnel management functions referred to in statement 6.1 be identified. While this was the only comment on this statement, it seemed reasonable, for purposes of clarity, to identify functions such as selection, assignment, and evaluation with which professional development should be coordinated.

Only two respondents "strongly agreed," three "agreed," and two were "undecided" regarding statement 6.2 that employee organizations and associations should be consulted in planning professional development. Therefore the investigator changed the statement to read that these organizations and associations would be officially involved in planning professional development. While the editorial change was suggested by only one superintendent, it is
consistent with statements in the literature and comments expressed by educators to the investigator during the course of the study. There is apparently a real concern that development activities be cooperatively planned.

As reflected in the guideline survey, respondents were in "agreement" with the policy that all qualified persons should have equal opportunity to participate in professional development as stated in item 6.3.

There was a lack of agreement regarding the requirement in statement 6.4 that non-district resources be used only when no adequate or reasonable facility exists in the district for development. Since three respondents were "undecided," two "disagreed," one "disagreed strongly," and only one checked "agree," it was considered necessary to reword this statement. While Federal and State of California employee training policies distinguish between in-service and out-service or specialized training, no such distinction is evident in school district policies. Teachers have traditionally taken college and university courses or out-service training as part of the in-service education. One respondent interpreted the word "facility" to be limited to buildings only. He noted that outside consultants could be considered "facilities" and are frequently employed to train staff. Therefore, the word "resource" was substituted for "facility" to preclude an interpretation limited to buildings only.
Items 6.5 through 6.8 are all related to professional development leaves of absence. At the suggestion of one superintendent, statement 6.5 was changed to read so that leaves of absence would not exceed one year at a time. It was pointed out that in some cases one year was not adequate and this editorial change would permit necessary extensions. While this situation currently arises in relation to the completion of academic degrees, it is possible that even under the new policy it might happen that training for performance of official duties could take longer than a year. Three respondents were "undecided" about this statement, and four "agreed" with it.

Item 6.6 lists expenses for professional development for which payment may be made. Item 6.7 requires the employee to serve the district for twice the length of time of the leave or repay district costs for such leave. There were only two responses of "strong agreement," and two responses checked "undecided" regarding items for which payment may be authorized. However, five respondents checked 5, "strong agreement," for the requirement that employees must return and serve the district after a leave of absence.

Waiver of repayment for professional development leave costs, if in the public interest, item 6.8, was viewed by one superintendent as an unreasonable extension of the power of the position and he "strongly disagreed."
Three other superintendents "strongly agreed," and two "agreed" with the statement; one was "undecided."

All respondents "strongly agreed" with statement 6.9, which prohibits discrimination because of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin in selection of persons or facilities for professional development.

Responses to Questions

Three questions were added to the proposed policy questionnaire to determine the scope of applicability and feasibility of adoption of the proposed policy.

There was general agreement to these three questions by all seven respondents. First, with necessary editing, the policy can be applied to all district personnel. Second, county superintendents of schools may be required to assist the very smallest school districts in implementing the policy, but according to the judgments of the experts, the policy is applicable to all districts regardless of size. Third, before recommending the policy for adoption by the board of education, there was concern by four respondents that additional funds would have to be available for anticipated increases in costs. One superintendent would refer the policy to a special committee for review and recommendation. Another would refer it to the negotiating council. One would begin with a review of personnel records, then meet with professional associations,
community representatives, board members, and, if funds were available, would officially present the policy to the board of education for review. None of the respondents referred to use of an established policy for presenting new policies.

VI. SUMMARY

The purposes of this chapter were: (1) to describe development of guidelines for in-service education; (2) to describe development of an in-service education or professional development policy; and (3) to report final modifications of the policy based on judgments of selected school district superintendents and personnel directors.

In-service education guidelines were drafted by the investigator from employee training policies of the Federal government and State of California; they were then submitted to State and Federal training officers for review for completeness and accuracy. A total of eighty professional educators were selected to respond to the guidelines. The mailed survey instrument included guideline statements and questions regarding district in-service education policies, and invited comments regarding the guidelines or district plans or programs which might be of interest to the investigator in the course of the study. Scaled score responses were tabulated and converted to percents for each of the numbers on the rating scale. There was overall agreement
with the guideline statements. According to responses in part II of the survey form, districts regard in-service education as part of the salary policy. District in-service education procedures were similar to those reported in the literature.

With the results of the guideline survey as a basis, a proposed policy for in-service education was drafted and retitled "professional development." The draft policy was reviewed with consultants in the Department of Education. Final assessments were obtained through a mailed questionnaire survey of seven selected superintendents and personnel directors of larger unified school districts in California. Scaled score responses to the proposed policy statement were tabulated and analyzed, and suggested editorial changes reviewed. No substantive changes to the proposed policy were made.

To determine scope and feasibility of implementation of the proposed professional development policy, three questions were added to the questionnaire. According to respondents the policy is applicable to all school districts regardless of size; with editing it can be applied to all personnel of the district. Some respondents would recommend the policy to the board of trustees only if funds were available to meet the expected cost increase. Other respondents would submit the proposed policy to district committees for review and recommendation prior to presentation to the board.
CHAPTER V

A PROPOSED POLICY FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION
OF TEACHERS IN LARGER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICTS
IN CALIFORNIA

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter was to present a proposed in-service education policy for teachers in larger unified school districts in California, which was the objective of the study. The study began with a review of the literature including school district in-service education policies as well as employee training policies of the State of California and the Federal government. From information thus obtained, twenty-six guidelines (with three subparts to statement 1) for in-service education were developed and submitted to eighty selected educators for evaluation. Responses from these persons were interpreted and used to draft a proposed in-service education policy statement. Three superintendents and four personnel directors of larger unified school districts comprised the jury which evaluated the proposed policy. Evaluations by these experts were analyzed and interpreted; the proposed policy statement was modified accordingly and is presented below.
The format of the proposed policy may be changed to conform to the policy manual in use by each district. Prior to adoption of the proposed policy, other personnel management policies and rules or regulations should be reviewed to ensure compatibility.

According to survey responses, the proposed policy is considered appropriate not only for teachers and other certificated staff, but may, with editorial changes, be applied to all employees of the district. In this case, the title of "professional development" may be changed to "personnel development." The terms "in-service" and "out-service" are not used in the policy but may be used at a later time to identify and budget for types of development activities.

Respondents to the questionnaire regarding the proposed policy also indicated that it could be used as a model by all districts in California regardless of size. They suggested that the county superintendents of schools could assist the smallest districts in the implementation of the policy.
II. THE PROPOSED POLICY

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1.0 Declaration of Policy

1.1 In order to build and retain a competent, permanent professional staff and in order to improve skills, increase knowledge, and better motivate teachers for performance of present and projected official duties, it is necessary and desirable that self-development and improvement by teachers be supplemented and extended by district sponsored professional development.

1.2 District sponsored professional development shall be continuous in nature, subject to supervision, evaluation, and control by the superintendent and review by the board of education.

2.0 Definition

2.1 "Professional development" means the continued process of providing for and involving the staff in planned and coordinated training and instruction in order to have more effective, efficient, and well-motivated personnel who
are knowledgeable and skilled in the performance of present and projected official duties.

3.0 Assignment of Responsibilities

3.1 The district is responsible for providing professional development required for performance of official duties.

3.2 Every teacher is responsible to himself, to the district, and to his profession for professional competence by participation in professional development sponsored by the district and through participation in self-development opportunities at colleges and universities and elsewhere.

3.3 Principals and supervisors shall assist in and be responsible for encouraging professional development, creating an environment wherein development does occur, and providing reasonable resources to enable teachers to meet present and projected duties.

3.4 The superintendent shall provide for needed professional development, establish adequate administrative controls to assure attainment of goals, encourage self-development, and submit an assessment of professional development to the board of education.
3.5 The superintendent shall issue regulations governing fiscal management of professional development including acceptance of awards and payments from non-district sources.

4.0 Identification of Professional Development Needs

4.1 A complete review of professional development needs shall be conducted at least once every three years.

4.2 A complete inventory of immediate and long-range needs of the district shall be identified in the review.

4.3 Professional development needs identified through an assessment of teacher performance shall be included in the review.

5.0 Assessment of Professional Development

5.1 Administrative procedures shall be established by the superintendent to enable annual assessment of the effectiveness of professional development in meeting specified needs.

5.2 Annual reports of professional development shall be prepared by the superintendent and transmitted to the board of education for review.

6.0 Professional Development Programs

6.1 Professional development shall be coordinated
with other personnel management functions such as selection, assignment, and evaluation.

6.2 Employee associations and organizations shall be officially involved when professional development is being planned.

6.3 All qualified personnel shall have equal opportunity to participate in professional development.

6.4 Professional development requiring use of non-district resources shall be utilized when no adequate or reasonable resource exists within the district to meet specified needs.

6.5 Authorized professional development costs may include but are not limited to salary, tuition, travel expenses, library and laboratory fees, and essential supplies.

6.6 Leaves of absence for approved professional development shall not exceed one year at a time.

6.7 At the completion of a professional development leave of absence, the employee shall serve the district for a period of time equal to twice the length of such leave. Failure to fulfill such service agreement shall require repayment of cost to the district of such leave.
6.8 Waiver of repayment in whole or part of professional development leave costs may be authorized by the superintendent if judged to have basis in equity, good conscience, or the public interest.

6.9 In selection of persons or facilities for professional development there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to develop a proposed policy for in-service education of teachers in larger unified school districts in California.

The specific purposes of this study were: (1) to report the nature and scope of written, in-service education policies of California school districts; (2) to report the nature and scope of employee training policies of the State of California and the United States government; (3) to summarize in-service education policy changes recommended in the literature; and (4) to develop a proposed policy for in-service education of teachers in larger unified school districts in California.

There were four reasons for conducting the study. First, in-service education is an important aspect of school personnel management. Second, there is evidence of extensive dissatisfaction regarding in-service education. Third, because of the dissatisfaction with in-service education, there is justification for a study of the policies which govern this area of school personnel management.
Fourth, although recommended in a previous study, there is no evidence in the available literature of a study to develop an in-service education policy which reflects study of similar policies of other government agencies.

A review of the literature disclosed that, while the Federal government and the State of California have adopted written employee training and development policies and regulations, school districts do not have a separate written in-service education policy but have included in-service education as part of the salary policy.

Federal and State of California employee training policies were used by the investigator as a basis from which to develop guidelines for in-service education of teachers. After review by experts in the State and Federal government, guidelines were submitted for evaluation to eighty selected educators. Responses obtained by this survey indicated that educators agreed with guidelines based on Federal and State policies.

A proposed professional development policy was then drafted by the investigator. The term "professional development" had been substituted for the term "in-service education." The investigator discussed the proposed policy with many persons in the field of education and many changes in wording of the policy statement were considered. Finally, a proposed policy was submitted to three selected super-
intendents and four personnel directors of larger unified school districts in California. Minor modifications of the proposed policy statement were recommended and appropriate changes were made.

The proposed professional development policy includes a declaration of policy, definition of terms, assignment of responsibilities, requirement for identification of professional development needs, requirement for assessment of effectiveness, and statements regarding implementation of development programs. The policy is independent of the other personnel management functions but does require coordination with these functions. According to the proposed policy, it is necessary and desirable that self-development and improvement by teachers be supplemented and extended by professional development in order to build and retain a competent, permanent professional staff and in order to improve skills, increase knowledge, and better motivate teachers for performance of present and projected official duties.
II. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

It was concluded that school districts in California do not have a separate policy for developing and maintaining competence of professional staff; in-service education is part of the salary policy. As a result of this study it was evident that employee training and development policies of the State of California and the Federal government can be used to develop a proposed professional development policy for use by school districts.

The proposed professional development policy is appropriate for all school districts regardless of size and may, with proper changes in terminology, be applied to all school district personnel.

If the proposed policy is adopted only for professional staff, the term "professional development" should be used. The term "personnel development" may be used if the proposed policy is applied to all of the employees of the district.

Classification of professional or personnel development into "in-service," "out-service," and "self-development" categories is not necessary at this time. As part of the proposed policy a specific term, "professional development," is employed, and a definition used which can replace the multiplicity of terms and ambiguity related to in-service education.
Recommendations

It is recommended that studies be conducted to answer questions which are related to the proposed professional development policy.

First, what changes, if any, should be made in school district salary policies in order to reflect deletion of provisions for in-service education or professional growth which are now part of the proposed professional development policy? Although it may not be necessary to change salary schedules, requirements for completion of college course credits should be reviewed for possible conflict with the proposed policy.

Second, what is the estimated cost for implementation of the proposed policy? It was evident in the literature and in survey responses that additional costs were anticipated if the proposed policy were adopted. Therefore, a study should be conducted to ascertain as accurately as possible current costs for in-service education and estimated costs under the proposed policy. It is possible that adoption of the proposed policy may be less costly and more cost effective than the existing practice.

Third, are there other school district policies which could be modified and improved as a result of a study of Federal and State of California personnel management policies? During the course of this study it was apparent to the
investigator that experts in public administration had not communicated with their counterparts in the field of school administration. It seems probable that other school district policies and practices might be improved by such study.

Fourth, what changes should be made in Federal and State laws, regulations, and guidelines to facilitate and expedite adoption of the proposed professional development policy? Provisions for in-service education have been included in laws and regulations and should be examined for relationships to the proposed policy.

Although the purpose of the study was to develop a proposed policy for use only by larger unified school districts in California, it is recommended that all school districts in California and elsewhere in the United States use the proposed policy in an effort to eliminate dissatisfactions with in-service education which appear to be common across the nation. Along with the proposed policy, school district personnel should become familiar with employee training policies, regulations, and programs of the Federal government, State of California, and other public and private organizations. The experience of training directors in public agencies should be of help to school districts who consider adoption of the proposed professional development policy.
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APPENDIX A

THE GUIDELINE QUESTIONNAIRE

AND

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL
Need for improvement in in-service education is clearly evident. To effect constructive changes, it is most important that teachers, school districts, and higher education all be involved. On the basis of an extensive study of in-service education policies on the federal, state, county and city levels, a definition and guidelines for in-service education of teachers is proposed.

Your judgment is needed to determine if the suggested guidelines and definition are appropriate for certificated personnel in California school districts. If they are appropriate, it is assumed that in-service education could be improved.

The importance of your professional judgment is stressed by the fact that the survey is limited to a small number of persons in positions of responsibility in the field of education. This information will be included in our annual report of research in teacher training projects.

Please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire as soon as possible. An extra questionnaire and self-addressed envelope have been enclosed to expedite early return.

Sincerely,

Ernest E. Lehr

EEL:sl

Approved:
Raymond J. Pitts
Project Specialist
Research and Teacher Education
Projects for Disadvantaged Children
Office of Compensatory Education

Dr. Rollin Fox
School of Education
University of the Pacific
Mr. Ernest Lehr of my office is conducting a study to ascertain guidelines for in-service education. While the study is broad in scope and great in importance, the survey has been restricted to only a very limited number of professional educators. Your judgment as a career educator with a great deal of experience is necessary if this study is to be meaningful.

Since all ESEA, Title I projects must include in-service experience or programs, I am most interested in supporting any new, promising approaches which will benefit the causes of Compensatory Education and education as a profession. May I ask that you take time from your many duties to respond to the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Dr. Wilson C. Riles
Director, Office of Compensatory Education
A STUDY OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

This questionnaire asks for an assessment of suggested guidelines for in-service education, and seeks to obtain information about in-service education in California school districts. For the purposes of this study, the term "personnel-development" is substituted for in-service education and is defined below. This study applies only to certificated staff.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by February 25, 1967, to:

Ernest Lehr
Office of Compensatory Education
1320 K Street
Sacramento, California 95814

PART I

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate your judgment of the following statements by checking a number for each statement on the basis of 5 strongly agree; 4 agree; 3 undecided; 2 disagree; 1 strongly disagree.

5 4 3 2 1 (1) Personnel-development is defined as the continuing process of providing for and involving staff in planned and coordinated training and development programs in order to have more effective, efficient, and well-motivated personnel who are knowledgeable and skilled in the performance of present and projected official duties.

Three classes of personnel-development are:

5 4 3 2 1 A. In-service personnel-development programs are directly related to official duties, supported and controlled by the district, and attended only by district personnel.

5 4 3 2 1 B. Out-service personnel-development programs are directly related to official duties, supported but not controlled by the district nor is attendance limited to district personnel.

5 4 3 2 1 C. Self-development programs or activities are voluntarily assumed by staff members and encouraged by the district but not supported by district resources.

5 4 3 2 1 (2) Written personnel-development policies shall be adopted by the board of trustees.

5 4 3 2 1 (3) Special terms used in personnel-development policies shall be defined.

5 4 3 2 1 (4) Purposes of personnel-development shall be stated in the policies.
5 4 3 2 1 (5) The function of personnel-development is to improve skills, increase knowledge, and motivate each staff member for better performance of official duties.

5 4 3 2 1 (6) Personnel-development shall lead to the building and retention of a permanent staff of professional personnel.

5 4 3 2 1 (7) Only selected staff members shall participate in in-service or out-service personnel-development leading to promotion.

5 4 3 2 1 (8) All qualified staff members shall have equal opportunity to participate in in-service or out-service personnel-development leading to promotion.

5 4 3 2 1 (9) Responsibilities of the staff for personnel-development shall be stated in the policies.

5 4 3 2 1 (10) The district shall provide personnel-development programs required for performance of official duties.

5 4 3 2 1 (11) Each member of the certificated staff is responsible for development required for performance of official duties.

5 4 3 2 1 (12) Administrators and supervisors are responsible for encouraging development, creating an environment wherein development does occur, and providing reasonable resources to enable staff to meet present and projected duties.

5 4 3 2 1 (13) Annual reports of personnel-development shall be prepared by the personnel office, approved by the superintendent and transmitted to the board of trustees.

5 4 3 2 1 (14) Participants shall evaluate development leaders and activities.

5 4 3 2 1 (15) Employee associations shall be consulted when personnel-development programs are being planned.

5 4 3 2 1 (16) A survey of district personnel-development needs is not necessary.

5 4 3 2 1 (17) A survey of district personnel-development needs shall be conducted at least once every three years.

5 4 3 2 1 (18) The superintendent shall be required to submit a personnel-development budget to the board of trustees.

5 4 3 2 1 (19) Costs of personnel-development shall be recognized as a necessary cost of operation of the district.

5 4 3 2 1 (20) If directly related to official duties, out-service costs which may be paid by the district include salary, tuition, travel expenses, library and lab fees, essential supplies, and membership fees.
5 4 3 2 1 (21) Administrative procedures shall require evaluation of personnel-development programs.

5 4 3 2 1 (22) Assessment of the effectiveness of personnel-development shall be required by policy.

5 4 3 2 1 (23) In selection of persons or facilities for development, there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.

PART II

RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS IF YOUR DISTRICT HAS ADOPTED A WRITTEN PERSONNEL-DEVELOPMENT POLICY

1. If "personnel-development" is not used, indicate the term used in the policy of your district. ________________________________________________________________

2. Is this term specifically defined in the policy? yes no

3. What is the purpose(s) of personnel-development as stated in that policy? ________________________________________________________________

4. If the words "performance of official duties" are NOT included in the policy, would you approve of their inclusion? yes no

5. Are college credit programs regarded as in-service education? yes no

6. How frequently is a complete district survey of certificated personnel-development needs required in your district? ________________________________________________________________

7. How frequently is an assessment of personnel-development submitted to the board of trustees? ________________________________________________________________

8. How frequently are principals required to report personnel-development needs of their certificated staff? ________________________________________________________________

9. Are sabbatical leave costs reported to the board of trustees as being related to the personnel-development budget? yes no

10. Is the cost of teachers moving to the next higher class of the salary schedule reported to the board of trustees as being related to the personnel-development budget? yes no

11. What percent of the cost of certificated salaries should be budgeted for personnel-development? .5% 1% 2% 3% 5% __%
12. May certificated staff secure "professional growth points" for salary increases through activities other than college courses (i.e., committee work, writing, holding professional office, travel reports, etc.)? yes no

13. Are "professional growth points" given by another district counted for salary placement when a teacher transfers to your district? yes no

PART III

If you wish to make any additional comments about these guidelines or your in-service plans or programs, you are invited to do so below and on the other side of this sheet.

Please send a copy of the results of this questionnaire. yes no

----------------------------------------
name

----------------------------------------
position

----------------------------------------
address
APPENDIX B

THE PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY

QUESTIONNAIRE AND LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL
Superintendent

Dear Dr.: 

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a judge of the proposed in-service education policy for teachers. Your assistance in developing this model policy statement is appreciated and will contribute to resolving one of the most important problems in education today.

Two copies of the policy and a self-addressed envelope are enclosed. Please check the scaled items, edit, delete or add to the policy as you judge to be necessary and return one copy in the envelope provided.

After responses from the other superintendents have been analyzed, I will call for an appointment to review the findings if there have been substantive revisions of the draft. If there are no substantive changes to the policy, the interview will not be scheduled but a copy of the final form of the policy will be mailed to you.

Yours truly,

Ernest E. Lehr

Enclosures
A PROPOSED POLICY FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS

The purpose of this study is to develop a model Professional Development (In-service Education) Policy for teachers in larger unified school districts in California. This questionnaire asks for your judgment of a proposed policy which is based on employee training policies of the federal government and State of California.

The term "teacher" as used in this study applies to all persons in positions which require a credential under California laws.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope by 1970 to:

Mr. Ernest Lehr
1620 60th Avenue
Sacramento, Calif.
95822

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate your judgment of the statements by checking a number for each statement on the basis of 5 strongly approve; 4 approve; 3 undecided; 2 disapprove; or 1 strongly disapprove. Lines have been double spaced to facilitate editing; delete or add statements as necessary.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

5 4 3 2 1

1.0 DECLARATION OF POLICY

1.1 In order to build and retain a competent, permanent professional staff and in order to improve skills, increase knowledge, and better motivate teachers for performance of present and projected official duties, it is necessary and desirable that self-development and improvement by teachers
be supplemented and extended by district sponsored professional development.

1.2 District sponsored professional development shall be continuous in nature, subject to supervision and control by the superintendent and review by the board of education.

2.0 DEFINITIONS

2.1 "Professional development" means the continued process of providing for and involving staff in planned and coordinated training and instruction in order to have more effective, efficient, and well-motivated personnel who are knowledgeable and skilled in the performance of present and projected official duties.

2.2 "Self-development" means training, instruction and participation in programs and activities voluntarily assumed by teachers. Self-development shall be encouraged but not supported by district resources.
3.0 ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES

5 4 3 2 1 3.1 The district is responsible for providing professional development required for performance of official duties.

5 4 3 2 1 3.2 Every teacher is responsible to himself, to the district, and to his profession for professional competence through self-development and participation in professional development sponsored by the district.

5 4 3 2 1 3.3 Principals and supervisors shall assist in and be responsible for encouraging professional development, creating an environment wherein development does occur, and providing reasonable resources to enable teachers to meet present and projected duties.

5 4 3 2 1 3.4 The superintendent is directed and authorized to establish needed in-service education, to establish adequate administrative controls to assure attainment of goals, to encourage self-development, and to submit an assessment of professional development to the board of education.

5 4 3 2 1 3.5 The superintendent shall issue regulations governing fiscal management of professional
development including acceptance of awards and payments from non-district sources.

4.0 IDENTIFICATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

4.1 A complete review of professional development needs shall be conducted at least once every three years.

4.2 A complete inventory of immediate and long range needs shall be identified in the review.

4.3 An assessment of the performance of teachers shall be included in the review.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

5.1 Administrative procedures shall be established by the superintendent to enable annual assessment of the effectiveness of professional development in meeting specified needs.

5.2 Annual reports of professional development shall be prepared by the superintendent and transmitted to the board of education for review.
6.0 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

6.1 Professional development shall be coordinated with other personnel management functions.

6.2 Employee associations and organizations shall be consulted when professional development is being planned.

6.3 All qualified personnel shall have equal opportunity to participate in professional development.

6.4 Professional development requiring use of non-district resources shall be authorized only when no adequate or reasonable facility exists within the district to meet specified needs.

6.5 Leaves of absence for approved professional development shall not exceed one year.

6.6 Professional development costs authorized for payment include but are not limited to: salary, tuition, travel expenses, library and laboratory fees, and essential supplies.

6.7 After expiration of a professional development leave of absence, the employee shall
serve the district for a period of time equal to twice the length of such leave. Failure to fulfill such service agreement shall require repayment of additional costs to the district of such leave.

6.8 Waiver of repayment in whole or part of professional development leave costs may be authorized by the superintendent if judged to have basis in equity, good conscience, or the public interest.

6.9 In selection of persons or facilities for professional development there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.
In order to determine the maximum scope of the policy, three further questions are posed:

A. If the policy were retitled "Personnel Development" and properly edited, would the policy be desirable for all district personnel?

B. Is the policy appropriate for all California school districts regardless of size? Which districts would be excluded?

C. To determine the feasibility of implementation of the policy, what conditions must exist before you would recommend this policy to the Board of Education?