

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

STRETCHING THE SCHOOL SALARY DOLLAR

How a Re-definition of "the Teacher's Job"
Can Ease Problems for Minnesota Teachers and Taxpayers

Prepared by
Citizens League School Personnel Committee
John W. Mooty, Chairman

Approved
Citizens League Board of Directors

July 30, 1969

Citizens League
84 South 6th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: 338-0791

INTRODUCTION

Rising salaries, higher taxes, the need for improved education, and radical changes in the definition of a "teacher" demand that fundamental improvements be made in our system of determining job qualifications and pay for instructional personnel in the public schools. This is being recognized increasingly by teachers, administrators, education associations, the State Department of Education, school boards, legislators and the general public. But while there has been much talk, not enough action is taking place. We are continuing to staff most of our schools and pay most of our teachers essentially as in the past.

The way in which the public's tax dollar is spent for public education has become more important in recent years, mainly for two related reasons. First, teachers' salaries have been rising much faster than previously, producing higher taxes and an increasing concern by the public on how the school personnel dollar is spent. Second, changes in the traditional pattern of staff organization (i.e., one teacher spending his entire day in a self-contained classroom with 30 pupils) are beginning and need to be accelerated. Both, increasingly, tend to suggest the need -- not for one job and one pay scale -- but for different jobs and different pay scales.

Costs of instruction in Minnesota public schools (teachers' salaries and other expenses directly related to the classroom) increased from \$348 million to \$388 million in the 1967-68 school year over 1966-67. Of this \$40 million increase, \$25 million occurred among the school districts in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. These figures do not include increases in non-instructional school costs, such as administration, operation and maintenance of buildings and debt service.

Cost figures for the 1968-69 school year are not yet available, but, because of large salary increases, it is likely that the increase in costs of instruction over 1967-68 will be much greater than \$40 million statewide and than \$25 million within the metropolitan area. Among Twin Cities area school districts, salary increases for 1968-69 -- including incremental increases built into salary schedules -- ranged from 15 to 20 per cent.

No other local government expenditure dominates a homeowner's property tax bill or the biennial appropriations of the State Legislature as do the expenses for public schools. To raise \$25 million from the property tax in the metropolitan area would require a uniform mill rate of about 20 mills. The actual mill rate increase from school district to school district varies considerably, because some districts have a wealthier property tax base than others. In a few school districts the school mill rate dropped or increased very slightly from 1967 to 1968. But in some other districts the mill rate increase was from 50 to 90 mills, producing increases of \$100 or more in most homeowners' property taxes. About 80 to 90 per cent of the increase was directly attributable to the school mill rate increase.

Continued increases in instructional expenditures at existing or higher rates are likely. On a national basis pressures for increased expenditures, because of growth in enrollment, may be subsiding, but these pressures will continue in the seven-county Twin Cities area. The number of instructional personnel is expected to grow much beyond the current figure of about 20,000 in the Twin Cities area. One informed estimate is that the population of this area will double over the next 30 years. If this occurs, a corresponding expansion of instructional staff will be necessary. Even without pressures caused by more population, other factors will contribute to a continuing demand for additional staff throughout the state. These include the need to replace the maturing population of teachers now in the schools, to fill new teaching positions as the nature of instruction changes, to provide greater opportunities for kindergarten and pre-kindergarten children and to compensate for a declining parochial school enrollment.

Although educational costs are increasing and will continue to do so, it is important to keep this increase in perspective relative to other expenditures. For example, according to the U. S. Department of Commerce, a total of \$31 billion was spent on elementary and secondary education, both public and private, in the United States in 1967. This represents about 3.9 per cent of the gross national product or 5.6 per cent of disposable personal income. In that same year, expenditures for tobacco and alcohol were \$23.6 billion and for recreation, \$30.6 billion.

The question faced in this report is not whether more money is needed for education. The question is whether the additional dollars will be spent in the same way as in the past. The national Committee for Economic Development, in a statement issued July, 1968, titled "Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School," stated as follows:

Our concern is with the way these increasing sums will be spent -- whether they will be spent effectively in raising educational productivity and in raising the quality of instruction. If past trends continue, and the money is expended on the conventional format of education, we are concerned lest these sums be absorbed in large part in across-the-board raises to teachers under seniority-based salary schedules and in small and indiscriminate -- though costly -- reductions in class size . . . In our view, if the quality of schooling is to be raised at a cost that is acceptable in terms of present school expenditures, a breakthrough is required in instructional procedures and instructional organization of the nature described in this statement.

Our goal is similar. *We urgently need to get a better return from the school tax dollar, not simply try to hold down the overall increase in costs.*

Unfortunately, tensions between school boards and teachers appear greater today than ever before. Serious discussions about strikes are under way in school districts where such discussion previously never had been considered. Working essentially within the traditional salary schedule, which emphasizes longevity and college training as a basis for determining compensation, school boards and teachers are finding it increasingly difficult to reach settlements. Teachers are demanding substantial improvements in salaries for their own economic benefit and to attract and retain highly qualified personnel. School boards, faced with increasing opposition from concerned taxpayers, are resisting pressures to give large salary increases to all teachers, regardless of their individual job responsibilities or performance.

We are convinced that unless the basic system for allocating the instructional dollar is changed, the confrontation between teachers and school boards will continue and become even more serious.

Changes in allocation of the tax dollar for instruction will not succeed unless they meet the following criteria:

- They must complement and encourage, not hinder, changes in the organization of instruction which are designed to improve education of youth.
- They must be developed with the full cooperation and participation of instructional personnel and must serve to upgrade the profession.
- They must provide taxpayers with assurance that schools are making better use of the tax dollar.

Despite the apparent divergent interests of teachers and school boards, as evidenced by today's negotiations, we find a real opportunity to unite these parties in a system which will meet the above criteria and be satisfactory to both. We have found a surprising degree of common interest which can unite teachers and school boards. Representatives of both groups have supported -- in fact, suggested -- many of the ideas in this report. Teachers and school boards need to step back, so to speak, from the tensions of present negotiations over specific salaries and work jointly to improve the entire system to their mutual advantage. Our recommendations are a suggested course for unification.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

We direct our recommendations first to each local school board, its administrative and instructional staff, and to the State Board of Education and its staff. They are responsible for the policy decisions on the operation of the public schools. We also direct these recommendations to the various educational associations at the local, state and national level, teacher training institutions, our state legislators and the general public.

Two central goals of this report -- to improve the allocation of the tax dollar and to increase the productivity of the teacher -- reinforce each other and lead to our major recommendation: *Differentiate the teaching assignment and the compensation schedule.*

The recommendations are summarized here in the same categories as are used for organization of the report.

1. Auxiliary Personnel -- Employ teacher aides -- persons without a professional teaching certificate -- to perform those classroom and classroom-related responsibilities which do not require a four-year college degree. Review the number of professional teachers needed in a school accordingly.

2. Compensation -- Establish a differentiated staffing plan for the instructional staff in the public schools, by which personnel are classified according to their different jobs and levels of responsibility and compensated accordingly. Establish a systematic method of evaluating the performance of personnel in various types of jobs to provide an acceptable basis for determining promotions and for granting tenure according to the caliber of performance. After establishment of differentiated staffing, use the techniques of supervision and evaluation which were developed for the differentiated plan to determine the extent to which -- within a given job classification -- some compensation can be based on caliber of performance. Abolish arbitrary salary levels for personnel who transfer from other school systems. Provide a mechanism outside the framework of the teachers' council which negotiates salaries, whereby teachers can have a continuing, meaningful participation in the decision-making process on educational matters.

3. Term of Teacher Employment -- Adopt 12-month salary schedules for teachers and adjust salaries for fewer months of employment. Provide opportunities for 12-month teacher employment. Experiment with ways to make better use of the 12-month period, including staggered nine-month terms, particularly for high school students.

4. Business Management of the Schools -- Give greater emphasis to separating the roles of the professional educators from the business administrators in the public schools. Develop improved budget-fiscal information systems to make possible the identification of program costs and the extent to which program objectives are achieved. Provide for continuing, formal contact and areawide planning among school boards in the Twin Cities metropolitan area on matters of mutual concern.

AUXILIARY PERSONNEL

Auxiliary personnel, or teacher aides, are non-certified persons who perform classroom-related duties which don't require a college degree. Use of teacher aides frees the professional teacher to devote more of his time to teaching.

I. Findings and Conclusions

A. Use of teacher aides is limited in public schools today. The traditional practice of having a certificated teacher responsible for all the duties related to classroom instruction continues to be the prevailing pattern.

B. A substantial part of the average teacher's time, from 1/5 to 2/3, according to one estimate*, is spent with duties which do not require professional training -- duties which could be handled by persons who are not being paid professional salaries. These duties include such things as typing, keeping records of grades, taking attendance, checking objective tests, handling audio-visual equipment, supervising lunch periods and study halls, chaperoning field trips and helping children with their coats and overshoes in the winter.

C. Management consultants point to a waste of valuable resources when professionally-trained personnel occupy large amounts of their time on duties which could be handled by others at lower salaries.

D. Teachers are demanding more and more that they be given adequate time for professional duties. This has not been possible because they have had to occupy so much of their time in work which is not related to their professional training.

E. The State Board of Education has adopted a position paper which indicates how teacher aides may be used, but the statement falls short of recommending that school districts employ aides. State Board regulations are silent on the use of teacher aides. One regulation calls for at least one teacher for every 30 pupils, but no mention is made whether this ratio can be changed if aides are employed.

F. With the help of federal aid, the Minneapolis Public Schools have embarked on one of the most extensive uses of teacher aides in the nation. Only two school districts, Minneapolis and New York, have fulltime administrative staffs for teacher aides. Response from teachers has been so great that the demand exceeds funds available to supply all the aides requested. Teacher aides have been used primarily in schools with disadvantaged children in Minneapolis and have generally represented a net addition to the staff, and have not been accompanied by adjustment of the number of certificated personnel.

G. Limited research available on the use of aides in Minnesota has revealed an improvement in the quality of education.

II. Recommendations

Employ teacher aides -- persons without a professional teaching certificate -- to perform those classroom and classroom-related responsibilities which do not require a four-year college degree. Review the number of professional teachers needed in a school accordingly.

* By Fredrick V. Hayen, consultant in teacher aides for the Minneapolis Public Schools, a national authority on teacher aides.

Public schools of Minnesota should move immediately to expand substantially the number of teacher aides. This will require a commitment by school boards, school superintendents and administrators and teachers. Leadership is needed by all parties. It cannot be left to any single group. However, each local school board, as the policy-making body, bears a particular responsibility to provide leadership. Specifically, we recommend as follows:

A. Local School Boards -- Each individual school board should undertake a program to expand substantially the use of teacher aides. Meaningful participation by teachers in development of the program will be key to its success. The number of new certificated personnel to replace those who leave or to accommodate increasing enrollment needs to be evaluated in the light of the number of aides which will be hired. School boards should adopt clear job qualifications, including previous educational training and work experience, for the different types of aides to be employed.

B. Education Associations -- Regional and state associations of administrators, teachers and school boards should indicate their support for expanded employment of teacher aides if they have not already done so.

C. State Board of Education -- We recommend strong, positive leadership by the State Board of Education in encouraging use of teacher aides. Specifically, the State Board should do as follows:

- Endorse the use of teacher aides, show how they can be effectively used, and encourage individual school districts to employ them.
- Make it clear that State Board regulations requiring one teacher for every 30 pupils in the classroom are for situations where teacher aides are not necessarily employed, and that the ratio need not be maintained under an effective teacher aide program.
- Make funds available for experiments in broader use of teacher aides by school districts. School districts may be reluctant to undertake a teacher aide program unless they see the results from a pilot project nearby.
- Consult with officials in other professional fields similarly beset by shortages of increasingly expensive manpower, for example, medicine and engineering, for guidelines on the utilization of auxiliary personnel to assist professionals.
- Encourage employment as a teacher aide as part of training for eventual entry into the teaching profession.
- Develop cost/benefit data to indicate to school boards how the use of teacher aides makes possible the more effective use of limited resources.

D. Teacher-training -- Prospective teachers should be trained in the supervision and utilization of auxiliary personnel. In-service training should be provided for teachers already employed. Persons unaccustomed to working with assistants will have to be shown how to make the best use of them.

III. Discussion

Use of teacher aides may be the best opportunity now available for making better use of the school personnel dollar. There probably is no single area of instruction where the mutual interests of teachers and taxpayers will be more in common. With aides, teachers can be free to fulfill their professional responsibilities and not be forced to spend valuable time on classroom-related duties which do not require professional training. The taxpayer will not be forced to pay professional-level salaries for work which does not require professional training. A professional educator should not have to spend a considerable amount of his time helping students take off overshoes, monitoring lunchrooms, taking attendance, correcting objective papers, chaperoning field trips, and so forth.

We see many advantages in moving to the teacher aides. They include:

- With broader use of teacher aides the need to maintain a specific pupil-teacher ratio will be less important. A school district, rather than seeking to reach a certain pupil-teacher ratio, will emphasize getting a greater amount of professional teaching time from each teacher. Reduction in the size of a class per professional educator is a very expensive effort. Several questions have been raised as to whether the extra expense is worth the effort. The question is not whether students would benefit if the class size were lowered, but whether the benefits would be greater if the same amount of money were spent in other ways. It is most important that the State Board of Education make it clear that its recommendation of one professional per 30 students is not inflexible, and that with the use of teacher aides this ratio can be greater than one to 30.
- We have been informed of a critical manpower shortage in education, as reported in February 1969 by the U. S. Office of Education. Teacher aides are a vehicle for easing the shortage, because the demand for fully certificated personnel will not be as great if non-certificated persons can be used effectively in the classroom. Ever-increasing demands on education, including the movement toward individualized instruction, early childhood education, increased guidance and counseling services, growth of community colleges, improved vocational programs, expansion of opportunities for the handicapped and special efforts to meet the needs of the disadvantaged, will contribute to increased pressures for education manpower, the report states.
- Teachers have long maintained the importance of upgrading their profession and have urged that entrance requirements into the profession be tightened. This has been difficult to accomplish to date, at least partially because of a fear there won't be enough teachers. Even with an expansion of teacher aides, a substantial demand for certificated personnel will continue, as indicated by the manpower shortage outlined above. Nevertheless, the use of teacher aides will keep the demand from becoming even greater, and enable entrance requirements into the teaching profession to be stricter than they otherwise could be.
- The teaching profession, through the broader use of teacher aides, would be following a pattern which has been well established in other professions. Hospitals have very effectively used nurses aides and licensed practical

nurses to perform many duties which do not require a higher-paid registered nurse. We can imagine how prohibitive medical costs would be if only registered nurses were allowed to work with patients. In public safety work, policemen long opposed proposals to use meter maids for writing parking tickets. Yet their use has proved to be very successful and has freed police for work for which they were trained. The engineering profession makes extensive use of engineering aides and engineering technicians to provide assistance to professional engineers.

- A major untapped manpower resource can be utilized through employment of teacher aides. Undoubtedly, there are many housewives and others who would work very well with children but can only work part-time and do not have a full teaching certificate. The experience in Minneapolis indicates that some of the best results with teacher aides have come from those who live in the same neighborhood as the children and can relate closely to them. This is particularly important in schools with a large percentage of disadvantaged youth. In such situations, the teacher aid program can serve as a source of employment for low-income people. The teacher aide can use his job as a training ground for upgrading his own employment status.
- An experimental study by the Minneapolis Public Schools has revealed that in kindergarten classes where teacher aides were used the reading readiness scores of children were higher than in classrooms where the aides were not used.

Although a few aides are employed in many suburban districts, the teacher aide movement received a major push in Minneapolis because of the availability of federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. About 90 per cent of the cost of the aides has been financed through federal dollars. Some four years ago, when the teacher aide program began in Minneapolis, teachers were somewhat skeptical about the program. Now, school officials say the demand is so great that it cannot be filled. There are some 800 aides, and an additional 1,600 could be placed. Success is evident elsewhere. A recent survey of 82 of the largest school districts in Wisconsin by the School of Education, Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh, revealed that all districts but one were reacting favorably to their teacher aide program.

A position statement by the State Board of Education on the use of teacher aides states that aides may perform any duties in the classroom that the professional teacher may assign. In Minneapolis there are three classifications of teacher aides, and a fourth is planned for the future. Aide I has the following responsibilities: Take attendance, greet pupils and encourage pupil participation, correct objective-type papers, prepare materials for teacher, operate machines, arrange picture files, arrange interest centers, make and use flash cards, supervise small groups of children, and listen to pupils read. The hourly rate of pay was \$2.00 for 1968-69.

Aide II is assigned to the following types of functions: Help students both individually and in groups, help children develop independent skills, such as reading and writing, arrange bulletin boards, make work sheets, make overhead transparencies, transfer marks to report cards, correct workbooks, collect lunch money and prepare reports for office, compile resource materials for the teacher, set up appointments and conferences for the teacher, telephone parents for the teacher. The rate of pay for an Aide II was \$2.46 an hour, for 1968-69.

An Aide III is assigned the following functions: Perform instructional activities as prescribed by the teacher, carry out directed tasks in the limited absence of the teacher, assist the teacher in making daily plans, work with children who have special problems, work with small groups while the teacher is working with the larger class group, prepare monthly attendance reports, participate in parent-teacher conferences, plan bulletin board arrangements and keep them current, assist the teacher in all areas of work, and plan projects and help children carry them out. The rate of pay for an Aide III was \$3.25 an hour for 1968-69.

Job responsibilities for an Aide IV have not yet been outlined. Such a person will have at least two years of college and will be in training to become a fully certificated teacher.

A teacher aide needs the opportunity to make a career out of his job, at whatever level of aide he happens to be. Programs should be made available to allow aides to receive further training, with the prospect of advancement.

It must be clearly understood that the full potential of the teacher aide program will not be realized unless the traditional idea of having one professional teacher for every 30 pupils is modified. The extra costs of adding teacher aides to the school system cannot be accomplished without a reduction in the number of professionals which otherwise would be needed. It must be recognized that the dollars available for public instruction are limited. The teacher aide program is a way to make better use of these dollars. Looking to the future, it will be cheaper to provide a quality program with a mixture of auxiliary and professional staff than with professionals exclusively.

Employment of teacher aides will not involve any replacement of teachers now on school staffs. But, as professional teachers retire or resign, and as additional personnel are needed to serve increasing enrollment, a combination of aides and certificated personnel can be hired.

Finally, we recognize the opportunity to use volunteers to assist in many ways in the school. For example, Minneapolis has a community resource volunteer program in which individuals trained in many fields come into the classroom to enrich the curriculum. Also some schools have mothers who serve, unpaid, in such capacities as monitoring hallways.

COMPENSATION

The current method of determining teachers' base salaries takes two factors into consideration: Length of service in the school system and the amount of college training. This is known as the single salary schedule. Lowest pay on the salary schedule is for first-year teachers with no more than a bachelor's degree. Some teachers with less than a bachelor's degree still are on the payroll. They were "grandfathered" in when regulations of the State Board of Education were changed to require at least a bachelor's degree for a teaching certificate.

A salary schedule usually provides for annual increases, called "increments," year by year for 9-12 years, depending upon the school district. A school board has the authority to withhold increments, but this is rarely done. The salary schedule provides for higher salaries at each year of experience, depending upon the number of additional college credits, or other approved training, beyond the

bachelor's degree. Some school districts encourage teachers to obtain additional training by allowing only very limited salary increases for teachers who choose to remain at the bachelor's degree level.

The specific compensation level at each step in the salary schedule historically has been revised upward annually by each school board. A teacher who is at the maximum salary in experience, and who does not qualify for higher pay because of additional training, will still receive an annual increase in pay based on the changes in the salary schedule.

It is possible for a teacher, depending upon his experience and training, to obtain, in effect, three increases in pay from one year to the next: His regular increment for his experience, the increase because of advancement in college training, and the increase because the entire salary schedule was upgraded. About 75 per cent of the teachers in the metropolitan area have not yet reached maximum salary for experience. Therefore, they are receiving each year an increase based on the regular increment for experience, plus the increase because the entire salary schedule is upgraded. Many school districts with a large number of teachers who have not yet reached the maximum salary have yet to feel the full impact of their salary schedules in their budgets. As more and more teachers reach the maximum, overall costs to the school system increase.

The base salary schedule does not relate compensation levels to such factors as individual initiative, classroom performance, or supply and demand for teachers in different subject areas. Teachers with the same experience in the school system and the same amount of training are paid the same base salary.

Many teachers receive additional compensation beyond the basic salary schedule for additional duties. This additional compensation covers a wide variety of responsibilities, such as department chairman, teaching summer school, driver training, coaching athletics or dramatics, chaperoning, ticket-taking, and teaching adult evening school.

I. Findings and Conclusions

A. Advantages of the single salary schedule -- We explored in detail the pros and cons of the single salary schedule in our meetings with leaders of teachers' organizations, school boards, administrators, state education officials, and others. Some persons argued that, while the single salary schedule has its faults, the faults have been exaggerated, and further there is no acceptable alternative at this time. Among the advantages cited were:

1. Ease of administration -- Once the salary schedule is agreed upon, school administrators have no trouble determining how much compensation to pay each teacher. All that is necessary is to know a teacher's length of service and the extent of his training. Administrators are not required to make value judgments on the ability of teachers to perform their tasks. Because each administrator may have 30 or more teachers working directly under him, it would be very difficult to make such value judgments.

2. Equality between elementary and secondary -- Years ago, elementary teachers were paid less than secondary teachers. The single salary schedule is credited with helping to end this discriminatory practice.

3. Equality between men and women -- Although wage discrimination on the basis of sex is now prohibited by federal law, the single salary schedule is credited with helping to end this discriminatory practice before the passage of the federal law.

4. Incentive for additional training -- The single salary schedule permits a teacher who receives additional college credits or equivalent training, as allowed by the school board, to be rewarded with additional pay. This incentive serves to upgrade the overall educational level of the professional staff.

5. May help morale -- It is claimed that the single salary schedule helps teacher morale because a teacher knows his salary is not the product of some evaluation in which he has no confidence.

B. Disadvantages of the single salary schedule -- Many of the resource persons we met with said that the problems with the single salary schedule are so great that it must be revised so as to distribute the personnel dollar more equitably and more in line with educational goals and objectives. Specifically, the following disadvantages were cited:

1. Not reflective of changes in instructional practice -- The single salary schedule may have been appropriate for the day when every teacher was in a self-contained classroom, responsible for the entire instruction of a specific number of pupils. Many changes are taking place in the public schools today, involving a variety of instructors with different job responsibilities working with the same pupils. The single salary schedule does not fit these new types of instruction, such as modular scheduling, team teaching, and individualized instruction. There is no way for teachers to be placed at different salary ranges according to job responsibility. There is a possibility that retention of the single salary schedule will impede maximum development of new methods of teaching involving different job responsibilities for different instructors.

The importance of the changes in instructional practice are reflected in the design of new school buildings, where provision is made for flexibility in the size of classrooms, to serve a few pupils in small discussion groups, a large number for a lecture, and individual study. However, the system of teacher compensation has not changed.

2. Fails to recognize teacher differences -- There was almost unanimous agreement that a fundamental problem with the single salary schedule is that it recognizes *only* longevity and training for determining base compensation. A teacher's innovation, talent and enthusiasm, for example, are not factors in the single salary schedule. The use of the single salary schedule implies that differences in teacher abilities *do not* exist or, if they do, that the differences don't really matter. Because the single salary schedule is insufficient as a vehicle for compensating certain highly talented teachers, school districts, to some extent, "get around" the limitations imposed by the single salary schedule by giving some teachers additional assignments, such as curriculum-writing, with additional pay.

3. Over-emphasis on longevity -- The single salary schedule provides higher pay for each year of experience up to about the 12th year. We were informed of a number of studies which seriously questioned the benefit of additional experience beyond five to eight years.

4. Over-emphasis on college training -- The single salary schedule compensates a teacher as if his competence automatically is improved with additional training beyond the bachelor's degree. Although school districts have some control over the type of training for which additional compensation will be given, a teacher generally knows he can pursue a college training program leading to a master's degree or even a Ph. D., and be guaranteed a raise in pay as he reaches certain levels of training. A school district may be paying for training a teacher wants, rather than the training the system needs. College training is not the only vehicle, however, for a teacher to receive additional compensation. Many school districts have a program of professional growth credits, by which college-credit equivalents are given for approved study projects, related employment, travel or other outside activities.

C. Change needed -- We conclude that the disadvantages clearly outweigh the advantages and that the single salary schedule must be changed -- for improved education and for more effective use of the school personnel dollar. We cannot perpetuate a compensation system which requires a school board to pay its least qualified teachers as much as its most qualified teachers for the same job. Under such a system, the only way it would be possible to pay the most highly qualified teachers what they are worth -- or to attract such persons to the profession -- would be for the school board to give the same salary to the least qualified teachers. This cannot be justified on the basis of sound personnel practice.

D. Little movement for change -- Despite wide dissatisfaction with the single salary schedule, we could find little evidence of movement in another direction. Publications of state and national educational organizations contain many articles about the need to make changes, and individual leaders of these organizations frequently make comments to this effect. For example, Roy A. Edelfelt, associate director of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, an arm of the National Education Association, is strongly urging a differentiated teaching staff. A well-publicized effort in setting up a job classification system is in an experimental stage in Temple City, California, financed by a private foundation. But we are unaware of any study under way by the Minnesota School Boards Association, the Minnesota Department of Education, the University of Minnesota, the Minnesota Education Association or the Minnesota Federation of Teachers to come up with a specific plan for improving the system of compensation.

E. Impact on teacher mobility -- The single salary schedule does not, in and of itself, impede the mobility of teachers from school district to school district, or the ability of school boards to hire teachers from other districts. But the prevailing policy, in the Twin Cities area at least, is that school boards generally do not hire experienced teachers from other school systems, either within or outside the state and give credit for any more than six years' experience. If a teacher with more than six years' experience desires to move into another district, he may have to take a cut in pay. This policy is an outgrowth of the inflexibility of the single salary schedule.

Another factor in teacher mobility is tenure. A beginning teacher is on probation for two years (three years in Minneapolis and St. Paul) during which time a school board can decide whether to retain him. If the teacher is retained after probation expires, he achieves tenure and cannot be dismissed except for grounds specified in the law. If a teacher who already has achieved tenure transfers to a different school district, he is on probation for one year in his new job (three years in Minneapolis and St. Paul).

Rigidity in compensation policies and tenure laws should not have the effect of unduly impeding teacher mobility or the ability of a school board to develop its strongest possible teaching staff. Some mobility of staff is an asset to teachers and students because of the opportunity to be exposed to new experiences, though mobility should not be so great as to endanger the stability of the teaching staff.

F. Current level of ecompensation for teachers -- The question of whether teachers are adequately paid is a source of continuous debate. We received considerable information from teacher and school board organizations and others. This issue has been particularly acute recently because of the negotiations between school boards and teachers over the 1969-70 salary levels. Any area of agreement on this subject which both sides would be willing to acknowledge publicly is difficult to find. Following are our findings:

1. Comparison with teachers' salaries nationally -- The National Education Association reports annually on the ranking of teachers' salary schedules in school districts throughout the nation. Its reports reveal that Minnesota schedules, particularly those in the metropolitan area, are rated among the highest in the nation, according to a 10-point rating plan that compares the structure of salary schedules and specific salary levels. In the 1968 NEA report, the highest score in the nation was registered by the Hopkins, Minnesota, school district. Many other Twin Cities area districts were close behind. The 1969 NEA report reveals that, of the 18 school districts in the Twin Cities area included in the comparison, 16 ranked above the 90th percentile throughout the nation, and seven ranked above the 99th percentile. A major factor in the higher ranking of the Twin Cities area districts was that generally the structures of the salary schedules here (e.g., the spread between minimums and maximums) are better than elsewhere. The specific levels of salaries here was not as important a factor in the nationwide ranking.

For the 1968-69 school year the median salary for a teacher at the M.A. maximum (a master's degree and 12 years or more experience) among Twin Cities area school districts was just slightly less than \$13,000 (\$12,911). In the Milwaukee metropolitan area, M.A. maximums were closer to \$12,000. A salary survey conducted by a suburban Twin Cities area school district of selected suburban districts throughout the nation reveals a top M.A. maximum among western United States districts of \$13,052 in Beverly Hills, California. Among midwestern and eastern districts, some Illinois and New York school districts had M.A. maximums above \$14,000, but the maximum was not reached until after 20 years of experience in the Illinois district and 15 years in the New York districts.

The M.A. maximum is *not* the top salary on the schedule. It is a common reference point for comparing salary levels from school district to school district. Schedules in the Twin Cities area and in many other districts throughout the nation provide higher salaries for additional college training beyond the master's degree. Maximum salary possible for a teacher on the salary schedule was \$16,107 for a teacher with a Ph.D. and 12 years' experience in Bloomington, highest in the Twin Cities area, for 1968-69.

The minimum salary in the Twin Cities area for a teacher with a bachelor's degree ranks some \$200 to \$600 lower than beginning teachers' salaries in some other metropolitan areas. In the Twin Cities area the beginning salary for the 1968-69 school year was about \$6,300-\$6,400; in the Milwaukee metropolitan area, \$6,600-\$6,700; suburban New York City, \$6,800-\$7,000; California, \$6,400-\$6,700; Cleveland, \$6,000-\$6,300.

In general it appears as if the spread between the minimum and maximum salaries is greater in Twin Cities area school districts than elsewhere in the nation.

2. Comparison with salaries in other occupations -- The most widely used sources for salaries in private business are those collected by Frank S. Endicott, Director of Placement, Northwestern University, in his annual study, "Trends in Employment of College and University Graduates in Business and Industry."

Endicott's latest report, published in December, 1968, includes current average salaries for men only who were in the college graduating class of 1958 and have been employed for 10 years. Fields covered were engineering, accounting, sales and general business. The survey revealed that the current average salary for these men ranged from \$13,716 in engineering to \$14,544 in sales. We have attempted to compare these salaries with those of teachers in some selected Twin Cities area school districts who had been employed by the school system for 10 years (and were on the 11th step of the salary schedule) but had not yet reached maximum. The averages ranged from \$10,620 in St. Paul to \$13,075 in Edina. All figures included salaries for men and women, except the Edina figure, which covered men only. Approximately 60 per cent of the teachers in the Twin Cities area are women. The salary comparison covered only base salaries. It did not include pay to teachers for extra school activities or such compensation as non-contributory pension plans or stock options for the other occupations.

A complicating factor, of course, is that teachers have a shorter work year. In an attempt to compare monthly salaries, we divided the annual salary for teachers by 9½ months and the annual salaries for other occupations by 12 months. On this basis the current average salary for employees from the college graduating class of 1958 in the Endicott survey ranged from \$1,143 monthly to \$1,212 monthly, as compared with a range of \$1,148 to \$1,413 for teachers in the Twin Cities area. A problem in comparing monthly salaries this way, of course, is that teachers must find additional employment during the summer, within or outside the school system, or live for 12 months on 9½ months' pay.

Because of the relatively large percentage of teachers who are women, meaningful salary comparisons also can be made with certain other occupations which employ a high percentage of college-trained women. For example, the 12-month salary range for social workers in Hennepin County government in 1969 is from a \$7,728 minimum, for a beginning social worker, to \$12,576 maximum, for a principal social worker.

Beginning salaries for persons in private business rank substantially above those of teachers on an annual basis. For example, the average annual starting wage for all liberal arts male graduates from the University of Minnesota in the spring of 1968 was \$7,608. The average salary for beginning teachers who graduated from the University of Minnesota was \$6,378 for secondary teachers and \$6,131 for elementary teachers. Again, this is comparing annual salaries. When the annual salaries are divided by 12 for private business and 9½ months for teachers, the monthly salaries ranked higher for teachers.

3. Additional compensation -- In addition to base salaries, many teachers receive additional compensation for extra-curricular activities, such as coaching athletics and dramatics, driver education, party and bus chaperoning, ticket taking and teaching summer school. Some teachers will not receive any extra-

curricular pay and others will receive substantial amounts. We were able to obtain limited information for a few school districts in the Twin Cities area.

-- West St. Paul -- Of 268 teachers, some 178 of them received extra compensation beyond the base salary during the 1968-69 school year, ranging from \$63 to \$4,172. The average amount of extra pay for these 178 teachers was \$962. A greater percentage of junior and senior high teachers than elementary received extra pay, with the amounts also greater for junior and senior high teachers. For the elementary teachers, 71 of 134 received extra pay, averaging \$694; junior high, 59 of 71, averaging \$992; and senior high, 48 of 63, averaging \$1,320.

-- Burnsville -- According to a limited survey, for junior high school teachers only, some 65 of 83 junior high school teachers received extra pay ranging from \$16 to 2,155. Of these 65 teachers, the extra pay was less than \$250 for 15 of them; \$250-\$500 for 27 teachers; \$500-\$1,000 for 9 teachers; and \$1,000 or more for 14 teachers.

-- Edina -- Pay for extra curricular duties and extra service during the regular school year itself, *exclusive* of summer school and driver education, was given to 128 of 444 teachers, in amounts ranging from \$130 to \$2,898. Of the 128 teachers receiving extra pay, 111 of them were in junior and senior high. The extra pay was less than \$250 for 27 teachers; \$250 to \$500 for 46 teachers; \$501 to \$1,000 for 25 teachers; and more than \$1,000 for 30 of them.

-- North St. Paul -- The average extra pay for *all* teachers was \$344.

-- Roseville -- The average married male teacher received \$461 in extra pay.

Some teachers also receive additional compensation from non-school jobs. A survey by the National Education Association revealed that in 1965-66 about 10.1 per cent of all teachers, men and women, had an outside job during the regular school year, and 18.4 per cent during the summer. The survey revealed that 22.1 per cent of the men teachers had an outside job during the regular school year and 38.2 per cent during the summer.

4. Fringe benefits -- We did not examine the question of fringe benefits in detail. Fringes are very difficult to compare, but it has been claimed that fringe benefits in private business are much better than those in the teaching profession. On the other hand, teachers are eligible for tax-sheltered annuities, but persons in private business are not. Teachers, who receive tenure, after two or three years of employment, have greater job security.

We were informed it would be possible, if present state laws relating to pension plans were changed, to increase a teacher's spendable income -- and that of other public employees in Minnesota -- without an increase in total salary. Under this approach, the public employee would not make any contribution to a pension plan from his regular salary. The employer would make the contribution directly to the pension fund in lieu of an equivalent amount in salary. The employee's taxable income would be less, requiring him to pay less income tax, but he'd get the same retirement benefits as if he had made the pension contribution himself and his spendable income would be no less.

II. Recommendations

A. Establish a differentiated staffing plan for the instructional staff in the public schools, by which personnel are classified according to their different jobs and levels of responsibility and compensated accordingly.

The responsibilities of public school teachers in Minnesota are beginning to change. No longer do all teachers have the same job -- being responsible for 100 per cent of the education of 30 pupils in a self-contained classroom for the entire year. As responsibilities change, the compensation system must change, too. Differentiated staffing is consistent with widely-accepted personnel practices in public and private employment. Job descriptions would be written for the different job responsibilities connected with the instruction of youth. Teachers performing similar jobs would be placed in the same category and be in the same salary range. This type of job classification is known as "differentiated staffing." A job classification system does not necessarily involve merit pay. With merit pay, a teacher is judged on the basis of his performance in a specific job, and is paid accordingly. Specifically, we recommend as follows:

1. State leadership -- Leadership at the state level in setting up job classification systems among school districts is most important. The State Board of Education should:
 - Take the initiative in the establishment of selective pilot projects in differentiated staffing in perhaps no more than three school districts and provide financial support for these projects using either state or federal funds. The State Board should notify all school districts of its interest in and receptivity for pilot projects in this field. The State Board should instruct its staff to report back with specific suggestions on districts to select, the availability of funds, and an outline of a work program on differentiated staffing.
 - Adopt a strong statement noting the problems with the existing salary schedule and the urgency for school districts to try new approaches.
 - Offer technical assistance and advice to school districts considering the establishment of job classification systems.
 - Make certain that certification requirements will not prevent differentiated staffing.
2. Local school districts -- As far as we know, there is nothing which legally can prevent a local school district from setting up its own job classification system. A district need not await action by the State Board. Financing might be arranged through regional associations of school districts, such as the Educational Research and Development Council, through private foundations, or perhaps by direct application for federal or state funds. An innovative school district might well decide, on balance, to use its own funds to set up such a project.
3. Education associations -- Regional and state associations of teachers, school boards and administrators should give formal endorsement to differentiated staffing, if they have not already done so.
4. Principles to follow -- No school district should experiment with or adopt a job classification system without the full participation of the instruc-

tional staff. This means that the staff must be involved in formulation of the specific project from the beginning. The development of a system will require the assistance of professional management consultants who have set up job classification systems in other fields. Job classification systems should be set up in an atmosphere separate from the negotiations over present salary levels.

B. Establish a systematic method of evaluating the performance of personnel in various types of jobs to provide an acceptable basis for determining promotions and for granting tenure according to the caliber of performance.

As school districts set up different job classifications, the span of supervision of a given number of teachers will not be as great as it is today. Also there will be much more interaction among staff members with different job responsibilities. This will enable far more effective evaluation at all job levels. Standards for evaluation need to be agreed upon to identify weak points and help teachers correct them, as well as to determine promotions and grant tenure according to the caliber of performance. Here again this must be done with the full participation of the instructional staff. Obviously, in-depth studies by educators and non-educators must be made of the criteria and procedures to be followed in developing the method of evaluation. Any such criteria and procedures should provide full expression of the individual teacher's creativity and initiative.

C. After establishment of differentiated staffing, use the techniques of supervision and evaluation which were developed for the differentiated plan to determine the extent to which -- within a given job classification -- some compensation can be based on caliber of performance.

In the absence of differentiated staffing, it is extremely unlikely that an acceptable program of supervision and evaluation ever can be worked out to base any compensation on caliber of performance. Implicit in differentiated staffing, however, are differential salaries based on different levels of job responsibility and kinds of work performed. Compensation will be related to caliber of performance when a teacher is promoted to a job with a higher salary. It also may be possible, using the techniques of supervision and evaluation in differentiated staffing, to base some compensation within a given job level on performance even when no promotion is involved.

D. Abolish arbitrary salary levels for personnel who transfer from other school systems, to assure freedom of mobility for instructional personnel and freedom for a school board to hire the personnel it desires.

E. Provide a mechanism, outside the framework of the teachers' council which negotiates salaries, whereby teachers can have a continuing, meaningful participation in the decision-making process on educational matters.

The teachers' council, organized pursuant to state law, is the team of teachers which negotiates economic conditions of employment with the school board. A council occasionally raises educational matters not related to compensation during negotiations, because teachers contend that they are not seriously listened to at other times.

III. Discussion

Job classification, of differentiated staffing, represents a real breakthrough in instructional compensation. For too long the issue of how teachers are paid has focused on what may not be the prime issue, merit pay. School boards have failed in

their attempts at merit pay. We see little prospect, under the existing single salary schedule, whereby any significant move in the direction of compensating people based on their performance is possible. Differentiated staffing, however, adds an entirely new dimension. Certain jobs, with higher pay ranges, will be made available to teachers who can satisfy performance requirements.

To differentiate a teaching staff means simply to separate the different roles performed by members of the instructional staff and set up different compensation levels according to the amount of responsibility and/or kind of work performed in each role. It is similar to the different job assignments set up, for example, in social work. In Hennepin County the job classification system for social workers includes case aide, social worker, senior social worker and principal social worker. Another example is in the nursing profession, with nurse aides, licensed practical nurses, staff nurses and head nurses.

The Temple City, California, school system, aided by a foundation grant, began an experiment in differentiated staffing of its teaching staff in September, 1968. There are seven levels of responsibility in the Temple City model. Four are certificated levels -- associate teacher, staff teacher, senior teacher, and master teacher. Three are non-certificated positions -- clerk, educational technician and academic assistant. For 1968-69 the salary range for an associate teacher was \$6,500 to \$9,000 for ten months; staff teacher, \$7,500 to \$11,000, ten months; senior teacher, \$14,500 to \$17,500, 11 months; and master teacher, \$15,656 to \$25,000, 12 months. The range for an academic assistant was \$6,000 to \$7,500; educational technician, \$4,000 to \$7,500; and clerks, \$5,000 to \$7,500. See appendix for a more detailed description of the different roles of instructional personnel in differentiated staffing.

We are not equipped to conclude whether the Temple City model is one which should be followed. It should be reviewed purely for illustrative purposes.

It is absolutely essential to an effective use of the differentiated teaching staff that the number of teacher aides be expanded.

In the Temple City experiment, the roles of the teachers and the administrators become mixed. A principal will even spend part of his time teaching. We find the following advantages with the differentiated teaching plan:

A. Recognizes changes in instructional practice -- No longer is education a process in which all instruction is given to 30 pupils from the same teacher in a self-contained classroom. More and more, teams of instructors, performing different job functions, are working with a large group of students. As this takes place, it is only logical that job functions will be described and different compensation levels adopted. Differentiated staffing is right in line with these new developments.

B. Teacher involvement in decision-making in the school will be much more meaningful -- Teachers are insisting on more and more involvement in decision-making in educational policies. The traditional administrative organization has concentrated the decision-making power in the hands of a few. Differentiated staffing will make the teachers' contribution to decision-making much more meaningful.

C. Career incentives in teaching -- Traditionally, the only way a teacher could really advance was to get out of the classroom and into administration. Evi-

dence has indicated that teaching as a profession has lacked career incentives. The differentiation of the teaching staff will enable highly qualified persons to continue to use their talents in the classroom as well as in administration. A report on teacher supply and demand in California by the Arthur D. Little Company pointed out that, with the present structure, there are too few opportunities for promotion, and originality, and there is dissatisfaction with paper work in teaching, personnel practices, the prestige of teaching, problems presented by the superintendent, and salaries.

C. Compensation according to qualifications -- No longer will a teacher be compensated solely on the basis of how long he has been employed by the school system and how many years he went to college. Nor will supplementary compensation beyond the salary base for additional responsibilities be necessary to the extent it is now. A teacher will apply for a certain job, knowing the duties and the qualifications. Higher salaries will go to those teachers with appropriate responsibilities, and lower salaries will go to others. This will be a much more effective use of the school personnel dollar. Furthermore, it will avoid a serious salary inequity which could develop among teachers in a school system which begins assigning teachers different types of jobs and does not, at the same time, change the method of compensation.

We are convinced that a differentiated teaching staff will not come about without a few selected school districts undertaking experiments in Minnesota first. Such experiments are urgently needed now. Planning will be necessary before experiments can be undertaken. It will not be easy to set up such a system.

TERM OF TEACHER EMPLOYMENT

The normal term of teacher employment each year is about nine months. The term of teacher employment has been closely related to state law requiring 170 days of instruction for students (which will be increased to 175 days beginning in 1970-71). Usually the term of teacher employment is expressed in the number of days a teacher is to be on duty; the median is 183 days in the metropolitan area, and 177 days throughout the state. A person employed year-round would have about 240 working days. The school year for students is less than the school year for teachers. The additional days are used for teacher training or planning.

I. Findings and Conclusions

A. Problems in establishing salaries -- The nine-month year is a source of continuous difficulty for school boards in obtaining maximum output from the school personnel dollar and in negotiating salaries. As a general rule, school boards have hired teachers on a nine-month contract and then paid them for nine months' work. Teachers have not been given the option of working year-round, except to the extent they are hired at different pay scales, for additional work during the summer. Teachers are insisting that their base salaries be comparable with other occupations, irrespective of the nine-month versus the 12-month year. School boards are finding that, to attract and retain highly motivated, talented teachers, they must offer a salary which is competitive with private employment, despite the shorter work year. Consequently, school boards, still working within the confines of the nine-month contract, are under increasing pressure to increase salary levels to 12-month levels. Efficient use of the school personnel dollar is not possible if we pay 12 months' salaries for nine months' work.

B. Little movement beyond the nine-month year -- Rochester is the only school system of which we are aware in Minnesota to move significantly beyond the nine-month year. The regular year for teachers in Rochester is 10 months (196 days). In addition, teachers may request an 11-month contract (220 days). About 40 per cent of Rochester's 700 teachers are on the 11-month contract. The MA maximum on the 10-month contract for the 1968-69 school year was \$11,900. On the 11-month contract the MA maximum was one-tenth more -- \$1,190 -- or a total of \$13,090. During the summer the teachers may teach summer school, work on curriculum projects, do research, participate in in-service education, take additional college training, or travel, as approved by their supervisors. The cost of education per pupil unit in Rochester for the 1967-68 school year, exclusive of debt retirement, was \$545. The median for the Twin Cities area school districts was \$512. Districts in the Twin Cities area above the Rochester figure include Golden Valley, Hopkins, Mahtomedi, Minnetonka, Mound, Orono, Richfield, Stillwater and Wayzata.

Teachers and the school board in Benson, Minnesota, have reached agreement on a longer year for the 1969-70 year. The MA maximum will be \$12,606, which will be for a 215-day year. A teacher will be eligible for additional college training, as part of the 215 days, every third year. After five years in the school system, approved travel can count as part of the 215 days. If a teacher requests to work a 185-day year, his salary will be prorated by subtracting 12 per cent. The summer will be used essentially for the same purposes as in Rochester.

C. Inefficient use of school personnel and facilities -- The current nine-month year results in an inefficient use of the three summer months. Supporters of a 12-month year point out that 25 per cent of the enrollment could always be on vacation at some time during the year. This means that the same number of students could be educated with fewer teachers and fewer classrooms than otherwise would be necessary.

D. Agreement on need to change -- We found a surprising degree of agreement among teachers, administrators, school boards and others on the need to provide 12-month employment opportunity for teachers. No one argued against 12-month employment, and almost all were strongly in favor of it.

II. Recommendations

Adopt 12-month salary schedules for teachers and adjust salaries for fewer months of employment. Provide opportunities for 12-month teacher employment. Experiment with ways to make better use of the 12-month period, including staggered nine-month terms, particularly for high school students.

Specifically, we recommend as follows:

A. Adopt annual schedules -- Rather than figuring basic salaries for teachers according to a nine-month school year, steps should be taken immediately to move to 12-month salary schedules, with salaries adjusted for fewer months' service. This will not mean that any teacher will receive a cut in pay. Negotiations would just be based, from now on, on an annual salary schedule. This would serve to make comparisons with other occupations easier and also would indicate the opportunities available to teachers who will work 12 months. Teachers who are now working 12 months would be converted to an annual salary, rather than the 9-month salary plus extra compensation.

B. Retain option for nine-month year -- Teachers will not be required to work 12 months. Those who desire to continue on a nine or 10-month contract can retain this option. In the early years of 12-month contracts, there will need to be some limitations on the number who can be eligible for 12-month employment. But as the years go by, a school board should offer a 12-month contract to any teacher who desires one. There no longer would be the uncertainty attached to a person going into teaching as to whether he would be employed only for a part of the year and have to find other employment for the balance of the year. As school districts move to 12-month salaries, they can discontinue paying supplementary compensation to teachers who are now employed during the summer.

C. Use of the summer period -- The best approach for use of the summer period has not yet been clearly identified. We believe that whatever approach is taken, the opportunities for enrichment, remedial courses, experimentation, curriculum work and in-service training, now available in many summer programs, should not be reduced. We find considerable merit in an intensive look at some form of a staggered nine-month term for students, spread over the entire 12-month year. This may be particularly applicable for high school students. One approach might involve students on combination work-study programs year round who, for better employment opportunities, would be attending school part-time and working part-time. We strongly recommend experiments, similar to a 12-month-year experiment now under way in the Atlanta, Georgia, metropolitan area, be undertaken in the Twin Cities area on innovative ways to make the best use of the entire year. One possibility advanced in our committee for a four-quarter system, in which students would attend school for three quarters and have vacation for the fourth, is not to have a summer quarter *per se*, but to divide the summer between two quarters, say May, June and July, and August, September and October.

D. State leadership -- It is urgent that strong leadership come from the state to provide guidance to local school districts on the use of the entire twelve months. The State Board of Education should encourage school districts to experiment in different ways of using the 12-month period, and earmark funds for experiments. The Legislature should make sure its state aid program does not penalize any district which tries a new approach.

III. Discussion

The opportunity for teachers to be employed full time year-round is critical to making the most effective use of the school personnel dollar. We reached this conclusion for the following reasons:

- As teachers' salaries have increased rapidly in recent years, the difference between what constitutes a fair salary for nine months as against 12 months has narrowed considerably, but teachers continue to be employed for a standard nine-month period. If such a trend continues, school boards may be paying salaries approaching a 12-month level, but will not be getting a full 12-months' work from their teachers. In negotiations with school boards, teachers have repeatedly pointed out that, although they are employed for only nine months, they must live on their salary for a full twelve months. Salary comparisons are regularly made with 12-month occupations. The question no longer seems to be, therefore, whether teachers should be paid a 12-month salary. The question is, instead, how to get 12 months' work for 12 months' pay.

- We cannot justify an educational system, in this modern day, which does not provide at least the *opportunity* for a college-trained teacher to be employed year-round. Teaching no longer can be regarded as seasonal employment. If highly motivated persons are to be attracted into teaching as a career, they cannot be expected to accept employment knowing that for three months of the year they will have to find other work.

As more and more teachers are given the opportunity to work year-round, and choose to do so, school boards will be challenged to make the most effective use of the teacher resources. Some supporters of the 12-month school year contend that significant cost savings could be realized. With staggered vacations for students, they contend that fewer teachers and fewer buildings would be required than if teaching were concentrated in the traditional nine-month period. Other advantages cited were that this approach would enable beginning students to enter at different times throughout the year, rather than just in September; it would improve job opportunities during vacations for older students, because they all would not be on vacation at the same time; national parks and other recreation areas, now over-used during the summer months, would not be as heavily used during this period, because family vacations could be scheduled at other times of the year; the teacher shortage would be significantly eased and fewer replacements would have to be trained; and the amount of money needed for new buildings and equipment would be reduced. This approach would require that families choose the period during the year when they want their children on vacation, or they might be required to take vacation at certain times. On the other hand, school buildings may have to be air conditioned.

Our committee was also made aware of the extensive summer school program now under way in the public schools. Although these programs do not involve as many students as in the rest of the year, they are providing very valuable enrichment and remedial courses, experimentation, and an opportunity for curriculum work for teachers. Some educators claim that this is the most exciting part of the year and we should not, in any event, lose this feature of education.

Some committee members stressed that we should not forget that the organization of elementary and secondary education is in a state of flux. As we move more and more in the direction of team teaching and individualized instruction, the summer might be part of the regular school year, and in such a situation the school could be run year-round.

Whatever form or forms evolve on the use of the entire year for education, it is very important that school boards, teachers, administrators and the public recognize there is a two-pronged goal: The best education possible with a *limited* amount of financial resources.

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT OF THE SCHOOLS

The school administrator traditionally has had a dual responsibility -- directing the educational program and the business affairs of the school system. He has received training in both fields, but in many cases the emphasis has been greater on professional education than on business administration.

I. Findings and Conclusions

A. Importance of professional management -- School costs have increased rapidly in recent years and there is every likelihood that this will continue. This situation makes it incumbent upon local school boards and administrations that they adopt sound business procedures to obtain maximum output from limited dollars. To the extent this is accomplished, the willingness of the public to support additional spending for education will be enhanced.

B. Comparison with other public institutions -- Many other public institutions -- for example, hospitals -- have staffs trained primarily in management to handle administrative affairs. Doctors in a hospital are in charge of the medical program, leaving the business affairs for the hospital administrator and his staff.

C. Budgeting -- School boards often lack the kinds of data needed to evaluate the costs and benefits of educational programs. Traditional school budgeting has been organized to show the total cost for such items as instruction, administration, capital outlay, and so forth. It is not possible, as a general rule, for school districts to determine the total cost for specific programs, such as high school science, elementary reading, speech correction, counseling services. As costs of education rise, and there is increasing competition for tax dollars, it is essential that the costs of specific educational programs be determined so that competing demands for various programs can be weighed as objectively as possible. An experiment in changing the accounting system of school districts has begun under the auspices of the State Department of Education, using the Hopkins school district as a pilot district.

D. Inter-district planning -- School boards in the Twin Cities area are recognizing increasingly that their actions affect each other considerably. A salary settlement by one school board is likely to be the benchmark for salary settlements among all school districts in the area. Consequently, school boards have begun regular informal contacts with each other during salary negotiations. These contacts concentrate on the overall level of salaries. However, other, perhaps equally important, questions need to be thoroughly analyzed from an inter-district standpoint. Because of differences in the school population, a teaching job in one district may be more difficult than in another district. Higher salaries may be needed to attract qualified teachers to difficult assignments. Without adequate inter-district planning, every school district will feel compelled to meet the same salary levels as its neighboring districts, regardless of the differences in the difficulty of the teaching job. Many other public agencies and private businesses in the Twin Cities area recognize the importance of joint planning in areas of mutual concern.

II. Recommendations

A. Give greater emphasis to separating the roles of the professional educators from the business administrators in the public schools.

B. Develop improved budget-fiscal information systems to make possible the identification of program costs and the extent to which program objectives are achieved.

C. Provide for a continuing, formal contact and areawide planning among school boards in the Twin Cities metropolitan area on matters of mutual concern.

III. Discussion

In another part of this report we strongly emphasize the importance of a differentiated instructional staff. At the top of this staff are the educational leaders of the school system, whose prime training and responsibility is in management of the *educational program*. It follows that the educational leaders of the school staff should not have to occupy themselves with *business affairs* as well.

There are, of course, intrinsic differences between the public schools and private business. But the schools can learn much from business -- and in many cases they already have. Movement toward differentiated staffing will mean that planning and design will be carried out by skilled professionals and routine, repetitive operations, by less skilled personnel -- a well-established business practice.

In the proper business management of a school system, administrators are concerned -- and know what to do -- about systematic utilization of resources. Expensive equipment does not lie idle. Alternative spending possibilities are thoroughly analyzed.

The national Committee for Economic Development, composed of 200 businessmen and educators throughout the nation, in its July 1968 report titled "Innovations in Education: New Directions for the American School," included among its recommendations that school districts employ continuously the results of cost-benefit analysis in allocating resources. The CED report noted the importance of reviewing any spending proposal in the light of possible alternatives. For example, the CED said a proposal such as raising the starting salaries for beginning teachers could be assessed against the possibility of using the same dollars for retraining teachers. "The choice among such alternatives would involve many factors," the CED said, "as for instance the policies and bargaining power of teachers' organizations. But however difficult the cost-benefit analysis when such factors are included, it should always be in the picture."

Our committee did not review in detail the question of professional management of the public schools in the Twin Cities area. But we felt the question is central to the key message of this report: Making better use of the school personnel dollar. School administrators in previous years faced far less complicated problems of running the schools than they do today. As techniques of education change, management will change, too. New definitions of instructional personnel require new personnel policies.

BACKGROUND OF THE REPORT

The Citizens League has followed closely, over the past few years, the level of teachers' salaries among Twin Cities area school districts. The League has periodically published tables indicating the level of salaries from district to district. Until now, however, the Citizens League has not undertaken any detailed review of compensation policies of school districts. The problems of school finance have also been followed closely by the League over the years. In 1967 the Citizens League recommended to the Legislature that a new source of revenue be made available to school districts and municipalities. League studies have revealed the increase in property taxes from year to year, and the extent to which expenses for the schools dominate a taxpayer's bill.

During 1967 and 1968, the Citizens League's Board of Directors followed closely negotiations between school boards and teachers in the Twin Cities area and the problems which both sides faced. In the fall of 1968, the Board of Directors approved the establishment of a research committee to look into the question of school personnel. The specific assignment to the committee was as follows:

Study all aspects of the process for compensating public school teachers in the metropolitan area, and ways by which maximum efficiency can be achieved in the use of teachers and other certificated personnel. Specific areas of study should include salary levels, value of fringe benefits, number of teachers at each level, the system for reaching decisions on compensation, objectives and policies that should enter into decisions, adequacy of information available, and duties assigned to teachers.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

This committee was one of the most active in the history of the Citizens League. A total of 53 persons volunteered to serve on the committee, of which 42 became active members and attended meetings. The chairman was John W. Mooty, a Minneapolis lawyer. Other members were: D. W. Angland, Craig A. Beck, John Berryhill, Robert Bonine, Lorens Q. Brynstad, Donald Bussell, Mrs. Earl Colborn, Jr., Martin E. Conway, Robert D. Coursen, Rollin H. Crawford, Wallace Doerr, Charles Dolinar, Steve Dornfeld, Nicholas Duff, R. W. Faunce, Raymond K. Frellsen, Charles Frisch, Mr. & Mrs. Will Hartfeldt, Julian Hook, C. Joseph Howard, Larry IntVeld, Marvin Jacobson, Ernest Jensen, E. G. Joselyn, J. M. Leadholm, Mrs. Dean Lund, Frederick Markwardt, Jack R. Nelson, John W. Pulver, Mrs. Vernon Olsen, Mrs. Seiki Oshiro, Dr. Willard Philipson, Peter S. Popovich, F. Warren Preeshl, Roland C. Reimers, Robert Seha, Ramon L. Stave, Norman B. Stewart, John H. Stout and John Weaver. The committee was assisted by Paul A. Gilje, Citizens League Research Director.