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CHAPTER I

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Until recent years, there has been little or no unionization in education. In many instances, this phenomenon has been the result of real or perceived restrictions in state and local laws. Some laws clearly state that public employees cannot unionize or bargain collectively, while other laws, although not specific on this issue, are often interpreted as restricting union activities. In Ohio, the Ferguson Act is concerned with the strike activities of public employees. While this law does not prevent public employees from unionizing, it does prohibit strikes to avoid any interruption in the services of public employees. At present, this and many other laws pertaining to the union activities of public employees are being revised.

Unions are generally formed to protect the rights of the employee in conflict situations. As an equity group, unions are able to exert pressure for fairness and justice. Van Zwoll\(^1\) has stated that pressures for equity are enhanced by the collective action of the group, particularly, in exerting corrective pressures against malpractices. In education, the professional employees have organized through the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education As-

The American Federation of Teachers has been traditionally considered more militant than its counterpart because of its strike policies and labor union affiliations. At present, AFT is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor–Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO).

The National Education Association has been considered paternalistic and professional by many because of its less militant attitude in the past, and its non-labor union affiliation. At present, it is affiliated with state and local educational associations, such as the Ohio Educational Association (OEA) and the Columbus Educational Association (CEA).

These basic differences have perpetuated a long standing rivalry between AFT and NEA organizations. In fact, Zeluck claims that the NEA still actively opposes the AFT, even though the AFT is unquestionably the dominant voice of the teacher, particularly in urban America.

The non-instructional employees have moved more slowly than the professional employees in organizing into pressure groups. While the services rendered by non-instructional employees, such as clerical help and transportation workers


are important to schools, low salaries, long work hours, low job prestige and little opportunity for promotion have strongly contributed to high turnover and job dissatisfaction among these employees. Casteller\(^4\) suggests that increased turnover rates have been due to low compensation and that the entire area deserves more than cursory consideration. Weber\(^5\) has stated that high turnover rates are related to the inadequate fringe benefits, low job prestige and poor working conditions. Yeager contends that low salary and fringe benefits have raised serious questions about the school systems providing non-instructional employees with a decent standard of living.

Beaverson\(^7\) states that personnel administrators in education are being forced to give more thought to fringe benefits since they can be used as enticements for the recruitment and retention of teachers. Howard contends that school districts are realizing the value of fringe benefits in staff morale, retention and recruitment. He adds that a


good program of benefits will help to meet the employee's need for higher income while generating less public opposition.

While changes in wage and fringe benefits are occurring for instructional personnel, the programs for non-instructional personnel continue to lag behind. In fact, James Marshall⁸ of the Ohio Civil Service Employee Association has argued that the wage and other fringe benefits for public employment were far out of line with that of private employment. Knezevich and Fowlkes⁹ have recognized the need for school systems to develop the kind of working conditions, salary schedules, retirement benefits and other conditions that would enable schools to compete successfully with industry for custodial employees of a higher caliber.

Unions for non-professionals have existed in industry for many years, and consequently the wage and non-wage benefits have been higher in comparable positions. An example of this is fringe benefits which have long been a prominent part of industry. Houff¹⁰ has stated that nearly all workers in the

---

⁸James Marshall, Executive Secretary for the Ohio Civil Service Employee Association, taped interview, July 24, 1970.


nation's metropolitan area were receiving paid holidays and paid vacations by the 1960's, and the large majority were provided with health and welfare benefits including one or more types of health and life insurance and pension plans. Davis and David\textsuperscript{11} have stated that the number of benefits gained by union workers was greater than for the non-union employees. Of the firms that granted benefits, non-union establishments revised or added an average of about 1.5 to 1.6 benefits, while union plants revised or added three benefits. The suggestion here seems to be that greater benefits occur when unions exist. Ronald Handy\textsuperscript{12} of the Cleveland Public School System supports this view. In the Cleveland school system which has thirteen unions representing its personnel, the salary and fringe benefits are competitive with those of business and industry.

**Statement of the Problem**

In recent years, there has been a definite increase in the number of labor unions, organizations and associations for non-instructional school employees. It has been suggested that this phenomenon is a result of the low salaries


\textsuperscript{12}Ronald Handy, Cleveland Public School Personnel Department, personal interview, March 13, 1970.
and inadequate fringe benefits available to these employees. By organizing and developing negotiation mechanisms, non-instructional school personnel seem to feel that they can improve their economic position. The purpose of this investigation is to gain some insight into the effect of unionization in general on salaries and fringe benefits of non-instructional school personnel. This investigation is exploratory because there is little information on the salary, fringe benefits and negotiation patterns of non-instructional employees in public schools. Hopefully, from this investigation, strategies for future follow-up studies will emerge which will add knowledge concerning the role played by unionization in public education.

Specifically, this investigation will gather data on the 1970-71 salary, fringe benefits and negotiation patterns for five categories of non-instructional employees in the thirteen largest Ohio school districts. The five categories of non-instructional employees to be examined are (1) clerical service (2) food service employees (3) operational service employees (custodial) (4) transportation service employees and (5) teacher aides (para-professionals).

For the purpose of this investigation, the thirteen school districts were categorized into four "community orientation-organization affiliation" classifications. Three conditions were examined in developing the classifications:
(1) the labor or non-labor orientation of the community;
(2) the AFT or NEA representation of the instructional employees (teachers); and (3) the local labor union or the non-union Ohio Association of Public School Employees (OAPSE) representation of the non-instructional employees.

The four "community orientation-organization affiliation" classifications are as follows:

I. School districts where the community is labor-oriented, the professional employees are represented by an affiliate of the AFT and the non-instructional employees are represented by a local labor union. School districts in Ohio in this classification were Cleveland and Toledo.

II. School districts where the community is non-labor oriented, the professional employees are represented by an affiliate of the NEA and the non-instructional employees are non-union but affiliated with OAPSE. School districts in Ohio in this classification were Columbus and Kettering.

III. School districts where the community is labor-oriented, the professional employees are an affiliate of the NEA and the non-instructional employees are represented by a local union. School districts in Ohio of this type were Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown.
IV. School districts where the community is labor-oriented, the professional employees are represented by an affiliate of the NEA and the non-instructional employees are non-union but are represented by OAPSE. School districts in Ohio in this category were Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma and Springfield.

Significance of the Investigation

Justification for this investigation is provided because of the lack of information on the salary, negotiation pattern and fringe benefits of non-instructional employees in public education. Also, there is little information on the community influence, as well as that of the AFT and the OEA, on this group of employees. This investigation has significance because of the comprehensive examination of various aspects pertaining to the representative group influence. A review of the literature indicates that many states have different statutes concerning union organization among school employees and public employees, as well as the items that are negotiable and non-negotiable. This study has revealed many of these differences in state laws, especially in Ohio.

Today, many school districts have begun to revise their policies on negotiations. The material of this study has potential value for future revisions of non-instructional employee programs. In addition, this study can be useful for
even more comprehensive studies. Finally, recommendations for changes were made to the thirteen school districts, OAPSE and the Ohio State Department of Education.

Limitations of the Investigation

This survey contained a number of limitations which have been identified. First, this is a descriptive survey which cannot be generalized to cover situations other than the ones in which it was conducted. Coupled with this limitation has been the difficulty in securing adequate samples in a questionnaire survey for descriptive purposes. A third limitation of this investigation was the nature of the problem itself. Negotiation has been a sensitive area to some, and frequently calls to mind resentments. Very little research has been completed in this area because of the difference in state laws over unions and bargaining rights for non-instructional workers. A final limitation of this investigation has been the limiting of the group of employees under consideration to five selected categories. The inquiry has not been concerned with the professional employees of business, education, nor the non-instructional auxiliary employees such as health services or consultants.

This investigation dealt primarily with the non-instructional employees in the public school systems in cities in the State of Ohio with populations of approximately
73,000 or more. In order to distinguish between the professional and non-instructional positions, some limitations were necessary because of the degree of overlapping which has always existed. Professional positions other than instructional omitted from this investigation were those of superintendents, supervisors, principals, school physicians, school psychologists, nurses and other professionally licensed and certified personnel. Non-instructional personnel with minor exceptions include all other individuals employed by the school system. In Cleveland, supervisors of custodial services, food services and building services, were all considered professional personnel.

The term, non-instructional employee, was used here instead of non-certified employee because the latter term seems to be less accurate. Non-instructional employees such as plumbers, electricians, bricklayers and carpenters are represented by building trade unions and were therefore, excluded. Although some were licensed and certified, they were not included because of the specific focus of the investigation. Finally, no attempt was made to generalize beyond school districts of a size and composition similar to the cities investigated.

Methodology and Procedures

This investigation was based on a series of questionnaires, personal interviews and letters.
The questionnaire was directed to that administrator who supervises the non-instructional employees' program. The personal interviews were conducted with the Ohio State Department of Education, the Ohio Education Association, the Ohio American Federation of Teachers, the State Office of Ohio Association of Public State Employees and the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association, with follow-up when necessary. Some interviews were held with the local Chambers of Commerce to obtain additional pertinent information on the communities. The data was collected from thirteen school districts in the State of Ohio with populations of approximately 73,000 or more.

*Questionnaire Directed to the Director of Personnel of the Non-Instructional Personnel*

The questionnaire was designed to provide information as to who represents the professional personnel and on the unionization of the non-instructional personnel. In addition, data was collected on leave policies, vacation plans, salaries, fringe benefits, retirement, in-service training programs and pattern of negotiations for the 1970-71 school year.
Personal Interviews with the Ohio State Department of Education, Ohio Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, Ohio Association of School Public Employees, Ohio Civil Service Commission, and the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association and Thirteen School Districts

These personal interviews were conducted to ascertain vital information from the selected organizations. The information was partly historical and philosophical. In addition, statistical information was collected on the selected cities on the non-instructional employees and negotiation patterns. This information has been compiled in such a manner that it might be useful to a non-instructional employee program.

Definition of Terms

American Federation of Teachers:
A national organization of public school and college teachers affiliated with the AFL-CIO. The AFT permits local affiliates to decide on an individual basis whether to accept principals as members, but superintendents, deans, and college presidents are prohibited from membership by the national constitution.

Bargaining Agent:
Organization designated by an appropriate government a-
gency, or recognized voluntarily by the employer, as the exclusive representative of all employees in the negotiating unit for purposes of collective negotiations.

Clerical Personnel:
Those personnel occupying positions which have as their major responsibilities the preparing, transferring, transcribing, systematizing, or preserving of written communications and records. The primary concern is office workers.

Collective Negotiations (collective bargaining; professional negotiations):
A process whereby employees as a group and their employers make offers and counter-offers in good faith on the conditions of their employment relationship for the purpose of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement if requested by either party. Also, a process whereby a representative of the employers and their employer jointly determine their conditions of employment.

Food Service Personnel:
Those personnel who have as their purpose the preparation and serving of regular and incidental meals, lunches or snacks in the connection with school activities.
Fringe Benefits:
Generally, supplements to wages or salaries received by employees at a cost to employers. The term encompasses a host of practices (paid vacations, pensions, health and insurance plans, etc.) that usually add to something more than a "fringe," and is sometimes applied to a practice that may constitute a dubious "benefit" to workers. No agreement prevails as to the list of practices that should be called "fringe benefits." Other terms often substituted for "fringe benefits" include "wage extras," "hidden payroll," "non-wage labor costs" and "supplementary wage practices." The Bureau of Labor Statistics used the phrase "selected supplementary compensation or remuneration practices," which is then defined for survey purposes.

Labor Oriented Community:
A community that has a majority of its work force in a labor union as determined by the Chamber of Commerce.

Labor Turnover (turnover):
Movement of workers into and out of employment in a company or industry through hiring, layoffs, recall, quitting, etc. Labor turnover rates are usually expressed as the number of accessions and separations during a given period per 100 employees.

Non-instructional Personnel:
Those individuals of the non-instructional supportive
staff with some minor exceptions such as school physicians, nurses and others professionally trained or of equivalent caliber; some licensed and certified positions will be considered such as bus drivers and plumbers. Sometimes those employees are considered as non-teaching, not-certificated, non-certified and non-professional.

Non-labor Oriented Community:
A community that does not have the majority of its work force in a labor union as determined by the Chamber of Commerce.

Operational Personnel:
Personnel on the school payroll who are primarily engaged in keeping the physical plant open and ready for use. Included are individuals engaged in moving furniture, caring for grounds, operating telephone switchboards and other such work except repairing which is repeated somewhat regularly—daily, weekly, monthly or seasonally.

Professional Personnel:
Those individuals who are trained for instruction, supervision and principal purposes.

Pupil Transportation Personnel:
Those employees who have as their major responsibility the conveyance of pupils to and from school activities, either between home and school or on trips for curr-
cular or co-curricular activities.

**Strike (wildcat, outlaw, quickie, slowdown, sympathy, sit-down, general):**

Temporary stoppage of work by a group of employees (not necessarily members of a union) to express a grievance, enforce a demand for changes in the conditions of employment, obtain recognition, or resolve a dispute with management. Wildcat or outlaw strike—a strike not sanctioned by union and one which violates a collective agreement. Quickie strike—a spontaneous or unannounced strike. Slowdown—a deliberate reduction of output without an actual strike in order to force concessions from an employer. Sympathy strike—strike of employees not directly involved in a dispute, but who wish to demonstrate employee solidarity or bring additional pressure upon employer involved. Sitdown strike—strike during which employees remain in the work-place, but refuse to work or allow others to do so. General strike—strike involving all organized employees in a community or country (rare in the United States). Walkout—same as strike.

**Union:**

An organized group of individuals formed to protect and guarantee the rights of individuals: this group is allied for mutual benefits, bargains collectively and
is affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

**Unionization:**

A group of individuals operating under the influence of a union: being unionized.

**Wage:**

The money benefits which are paid in dollar value and considered salary: money paid to an employee for work performed.

**Organization of the Investigation**

Chapter two (II) was designed to review selected literature related to the study. This descriptive overview was concerned with pertinent narratives of the National labor movement as they applied to all public employees. School employee representative organizations (the NEA, AFT, OAPSE and the Unions) have also been related to the labor movement and collective bargaining. In addition, five non-instructional school employee groups have been investigated with regard to salary, fringe benefits, turnover rates, training programs and negotiation patterns.

Chapter three (III) described the methodology used in gathering the information for this study. The writer also explained the internal aspects of the instrument, the personal interviews in Ohio, the data collected and a detailed analysis of the problem.

In Chapter four (IV), the writer presented the analyzed
data which referred to the individual school districts and the four previously cited situations.

Chapter five (V) offered a summary, conclusions and recommendations relative to the situations in question.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

This chapter was designed to summarize much of the literature related to labor, public employees and education. Specific attention has been given to the national labor movement, education with legal implications, collective bargaining and negotiations involving teacher organizations, non-instructional organizations and major components of the non-instructional school employee program. It is the writer's intention in this chapter to provide the necessary background for the remaining chapters of the study.

A. Labor Movement and Public Employees

Historical Background

Although groups of individuals have combined their efforts since the medieval period to provide fairness and justice that individuals cannot provide alone, such efforts have usually been looked upon with suspicion. As early as the seventh century, individuals were persecuted for combining their efforts to bargain collectively.\(^1\) This doctrine, of individuals being guilty of a conspiracy, was enforced until the mid-eighteen hundreds when a Massachusetts statute changed the law. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts versus Hunt ended

\(^{1}\)Philadelphia Cordwainers (1806).
the conspiracy doctrine by ruling that individuals could combine into unions for collective efforts without the threat of criminal conspiracy.\(^2\)

By the late 1800's, many blue collar workers were responding to changing economic and social conditions by organizing into unions. At this same period, the United States Congress felt a need to make legislative moves to regulate and control certain aspects of business and union activities. One of these acts was the Sherman Anti-Trust Act which was to regulate and limit the conspiracy of businesses in joining each other for monopoly. Through loose wording and frequent misinterpretations of sections one and eight, it had severe limitations on union activities.\(^3\) Although individuals could organize, little or no power accompanied that right.

The next act by Congress, the Clayton Act, attempted to equalize the power of management and unions by excluding the unions completely.\(^4\) Since the Supreme Court continued to enforce the Sherman Act, union tactics were still considered illegal until the late 1930's. Also, employers reserved the

\(^2\)Commonwealth vs. Hunt, 4 Metcalf III, 1842.

\(^3\)Sherman Anti-Trust Act, Statutes at Large XXVI, sec. 1 and 8, (a). 289. (1890)

right to treat employees as they felt necessary.

In 1933 Congress tried again to equalize the employer's and employee's power by the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Here, the Federal Court was forbidden to interfere in employer-employee disputes and the employee gained new rights. Some of the rights conferred by this act were: to legalize strikes, secondary strikes, boycotts, sympathy strikes, picketing and other strike activities by non-employees. With the courts' laissez-faire attitude, the employer maintained the right to bargain by his standards and to fire any employee for any cause including union causes. Although the groundwork had been set for fair bargaining, the courts provided little support.

In another futile attempt during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, Congress passed the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) and appointed the National Labor Board (NLB). In this effort to endorse collective bargaining, Congress failed to give the NLB authority to enforce penalties. Also, the employer created company unions while the employee conducted unethical activities.

In 1935, with the passage of the Wagner Act, corruptive labor acts were minimized. After identifying weaknesses of

6 National Industrial Recovery Act, Statutes at Large, XLVII, sec. 195 (1933).
earlier acts, the Wagner Act re-instated court intervention to guarantee employee rights and collective bargaining.\textsuperscript{7} The union, having the upper hand and court protection, participated in many illegal acts until Congress was forced to pass new legislature. The Taft-Hartley Act was written to restrict unfair employee acts.\textsuperscript{8} Through all previously cited Acts, the stage for fair collective bargaining and negotiations in the United States was set. Union membership grew to a high of 17.3 million in 1957. This figure represented 32.8 per cent of the non-agriculture labor force and 24.5 per cent of the total labor force.\textsuperscript{9} Traditionally, blue collar workers were the primary membership source; however, white collar workers have been closing the gap.

\textbf{Federal Employer-Employee Relations}

Public employees in federal services have been given little attention by their employer. The Wagner Act specifically excluded public employees. Executive Order 10988 by former President John Kennedy attempted to bridge certain gaps between public and private employees.\textsuperscript{10}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7}Wagner Act, Statutes at Large XLIX sec. 7, (a) 449 (1935), U.S. Code, Vol XXIX, sec. 151 (1935).
\item \textsuperscript{8}Taft-Hartley Act, Statutes at Large LXI, sec. 301 (a). 136 (1947), U.S. Code, Vol XXIX, Sec. 185 (a)(1952).
\item \textsuperscript{9}Lieberman, Myron and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.
\item \textsuperscript{10}President John F. Kennedy, Executive Order #10988, "Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Civil Service", January 17, 1962.
\end{itemize}
right to organize and to arbitrate grievances and contracts but were restricted from participating in strikes, unethical activities and unconstitutional organizations. By 1964, thirty-five organizations had formed and twenty-one were affiliated with the AFL-CIO. Also, over twenty agreements had been negotiated.

Although Executive Order 10988 provided many of the Taft-Hartley and Wagner privileges, the postal employees still found a need to strike in 1970. The National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC) recently changed from a lobbying organization to a true collective bargaining trade union. Under Executive Order 11491 and the new Postal Reform Act of 1970, the postal unions gained bargaining rights while exposing themselves to the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Act. Attempting to get bargaining leverage and the right to legally strike, Tillery announced that every legal means would be tried before the members withheld the financial records required by the Landrum-Griffin Act. One final point in this area, the American Federation of Government Employees has become the largest government union since Executive Order 10988.

---


12 Ibid., p. 36-37

State and Local Employer-Employee Relations

While the National Labor Law has influenced the federal labor law, state labor laws been tremendously influence by both. Where laws have been established, they have generally varied because of reserved state rights. Lieberman and Moskow have stated that "Philadelphia probably became the first major city to enter into bilateral agreements with labor organizations comparable to such agreements in private employment."^14

Today, many public employees are affiliated with the Civil Service Commission and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). The latter organization is affiliated with AFL-CIO whereas the former has no professional labor ties. With public employees being basically excluded from earlier labor legislation, many states have attempted to effectively link public employer-employee relations. As early as 1965, Wisconsin developed the only comprehensive law and a review board with authority (Wisconsin Employment Relations Board.)^15 Similar to the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, the Wisconsin Act applied to all public employees including teachers and their organizations.


^15Ibid., p. 85.
Several states followed the example of Wisconsin with similar statutes that covered bargaining in "good faith" and no strike policies. These states were California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, and Washington. In recognizing the primary representative agents and legal status, Eve cited several interesting points in 1964.

1. Only one state required the public employer to recognize the majority representative group as the primary agent.

2. The public employer of twelve states recognized primary employee groups at the employer's discretion.

3. Recognizing any primary representative agent in two states was illegal.

In Ohio, public employees have been governed by the Ferguson Act. As usual, public employees could not participate in strike or work slowdown activities. With the closely knitted definitions of strikes and public employees, this law has been very difficult to manipulate. A strong feature of this Act has been the authority to enforce penalties for violations. If a public employee participates in a strike, he can be re-appointed under limited conditions; namely, his pay cannot be

---

16 Ibid., p. 48.


18 Ferguson Act, Appendix C.
increased for one year after the violation; his pay cannot exceed that received by him before the infraction; and, the individual is placed on probation for two years.\textsuperscript{19} As indicated, an employee cannot strike for a pay increase and expect to receive it, nor can he expect the regular pay increases as increments and bonuses.

Through the growth of public employee organizations, the increased number of illegal strikes and the inadequate state legislation, a new phase of public employer-employee labor relations is possible.\textsuperscript{20} In reflecting on the future of labor and the public employee, Bakke has made several predictions:

"1. Unionization in the public sector is going to increase rapidly and extensively.

2. Union action in the foreseeable future is going to be militant.

3. The achievement of collective power is going to become the major objective of union leaders for a considerable period.

4. The combination of political and economic bargaining strategies and tactics will disturb for some time the pattern of collective bargaining between public management and public management and public employee unions and associations.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., Appendix C

5. The civil service concept of personnel policy and arrangements is going to suffer and be severely modified.

6. The public is going to pay a big price for what public employees gain.

7. Despite this, nothing is going to stop the introduction of and spread of collective bargaining in the public sector.²¹

A review of the literature on the national labor movement, the federal employee labor movement and the state and local employee labor movement, makes obvious what many of Bakke's suggestions will be focused upon in the near future.

In further explaining State statutes as they relate to public employees, interesting facts were found by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. The assertions were based on the twenty-one states with comprehensive statutes.²²

1. Nineteen states required public employers to deal with employee organizations.

2. Fourteen states required mandatory collective bargaining between public employer and employee.

3. Although no contracts were written, all states executed binding agreements.


²²Goldberg, p. 10-14.
4. All states of no. 2 considered exclusive recognition on the basis of majority representation.

5. Eight of the states in no. 2 had a detailed description of unfair labor practices.

6. The eight states of no. 5 had general provisions for mediation of unresolved negotiations.

7. Eleven of the remaining states had provisions for fact finding.

Of the twenty-one states with comprehensive state statutes on public employee relations, Ohio was not included and this may have interesting effects on the entire public sector.

Through the state statutes other pertinent components of the public employer-employee framework have developed namely, collective bargaining and negotiations, the legality of collective agreements and the legality of strikes.

Lieberman and Moskow observed a difference between negotiation and collective bargaining. The NEA and the AFT have advocated a set of procedures labeled "professional negotiation" and "collective bargaining" respectively. There has been some concern as to whether collective negotiations can be an alternative to professional negotiations and collective bargaining. Arguments over semantics in connection with labels have long been a problem. For instance, collective bargaining and

---

23 Lieberman and Moskow, p. 325.
professional negotiations have been constantly subjected to persuasive definitions that are intended to resolve policy questions instead of making it possible to analyze the phrases more objectively. The NEA and the AFT have been guilty of using those terms to develop prejudice against certain issues resulting in opposition to these issues. Another semantics problem has added to the difficulty in negotiations and bargaining in public and private sectors. Public education and private business have generally had a distinct philosophical basis and this had been frequently misinterpreted. Public education does not operate on a profit and the cost of strikes for pay increases has always come out of the taxpayer's pocket. In privately owned businesses, where profits have been the organizations' pockets who desired that business's service or product. As previously noted, state statutes have limited the collective bargaining of such public sectors as education while the private concerns have flourished. Another outstanding difference between negotiations and bargaining in education and business has been in items negotiable. In December of 1970, the NEA conducted a research survey in which 46.1 percent of the school districts had negotiated agreements that had provisions directly or indirectly affecting the curriculum decision making process.24

Lieberman and Moskow have summarized three approaches to collective negotiations used in education.\textsuperscript{25}

1. The Market Approach: collective negotiations are characterized by the teachers selling their services for the maximum possible return while the school boards are characterized as purchasing the services of the teachers for as little as possible.

2. The Professional Approach: collective negotiations have emphasis on the professional rationale that teachers have a legitimate interest in curriculum, methods, in-service and instructional supplies.

3. The Problem-Solving Approach: collective negotiations have been used as an avenue to attack inherent difficulties in education. This approach has also emphasized the method of a means to the end.

Although these approaches to collective negotiations have been listed as somewhat mutually exclusive, the approaches have been listed by purpose, overall function and consequence, they should not be generalized out of perspective.

\textbf{Legality of Public Employee Collective Agreements}

4. Collective negotiations have been established as an agreement making process whereby the agreement is in writing and

\footnote{\textsuperscript{25}Lieberman and Moskow, p. 7-9.}
agreed upon by both parties. In recent years, much attention has been given to the legality of agreements between public employees and school boards. In some instances, written agreements have been considered contracts depending upon the agreements' content, state laws, and court decisions. Lieberman and Moskow have suggested a more accurate phrase for public employee contracts would be "collective agreement" rather than "collective contract" and they have cited several differences between ordinary contracts and teacher organization contracts.

1. The teacher organization does not supply the school board with the service.
2. It does not contract to supply the board with personnel.
3. It receives no compensation from the school board.
4. It could not force teachers to work.
5. It does not pay the teachers for services rendered.
6. The school board does not pay the teacher through the organization.

26 Hardy, personal interview, March 1970, Cleveland, Ohio.

27 Lieberman and Moskow, p. 325.
With little existing legislation, collective agreements by teacher organizations and boards of education in the past have not been enforceable. Today many state legislatures have begun to bridge this gap and courts now challenge the legality of collective agreements in the public sectors. Lieberman and Moskow have summarized the major arguments in this area.

1. The fixing of conditions of employment in the public service is a legislative function.

2. Neither the executive nor the legislative branch of government may delegate such functions to an outside group.

3. Unless specifically authorized by law, a government agency must not enter into a collective negotiation agreement.

4. The legislature, or the executive branch of government, must be free to change the conditions of employment at any time. Therefore, it cannot set terms for a fixed period of time or bind a subsequent executive or legislative body by his own actions.

This argument has represented a misconception on collective negotiations in public services. The reason for this is that while a government agency is required to bargain in good faith it is not required to reach an agreement and the final authority for decision making resides in the governmental agency rather


29 Lieberman and Moskow, p. 326.
than the employee organization. In business, unlike public
service, collective agreements have been ratified in the final
stage by all parties concerned. The same premise should exist
in collective negotiations in education and the Columbia Law
Review has summarized this assumption.

"Assuming then, as a few courts do, that the
administrator does have some authority and
discretion to establish by regulation wages
and conditions in certain areas, he does not
relinquish this authority solely by choosing
a different medium - a collective bargaining
agreement - in which they are to be embodied.
It is therefore unrealistic to hold the making
of a collective bargaining agreement to be an
illegal delegation of authority. As for the
surrender of discretion, the courts, in areas
other than collective bargaining, find implied
in the usual legislative grants of power of
government agencies and political subdivisions
the power for an administrator to bind him-
self contractually. It would appear that
similar authorization can easily be found to
support the making of a collective bargaining
agreement, in which case any abdication of
continuing discretion made by entering into
a collective bargaining agreement would not
be illegal. Thus public employment collec-
tive bargaining agreements can be found valid
as a matter of legal theory."30

Frequently threats of strikes have been associated with
collective negotiations. To protect the public interest, public
authorities have slighted public employees by not providing
them with the privileges given to employees in private sectors.31

---

30 "Union Activity in Public Employment," Columbia Law

31 James Marshall, personal interview at the Ohio Association
of Civil Service Employees Office in July 1970, Columbus,
Ohio.
"Even without restrictive state laws," said Spero, "the fact that the labor legislation of recent years has left the employing authorities free to restrict organization action on the part of employees."\textsuperscript{32}Hart has concluded the government's attitude on collective bargaining in the government as "Do as I say, and not as I do."\textsuperscript{33}Neyer has pointed out that public employees receive more protection and consideration than industrial employees.\textsuperscript{34}Wildman has concluded that historically, governmental agencies have been increasingly creating pressure at the state level to provide organizations and bargaining rights for teachers in California.\textsuperscript{35}Similar acts in other states are the Taylor Act in New York and the Ferguson Act in Ohio.

Spero has summarized extra-legal collective actions engaged by public employees.

"There is a gap between government claims on employer and the employment relations which exist in the public service. Government employees are organized and affiliated with the general labor movement. They...substantial influence over legislation affecting their interests. They engage

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32}Spero, Sterling C., \textit{Government as Employer}, New York, Remsen Press, 1948 p. 36
\item \textsuperscript{34}Neyer, Charles A., "The DETroit Employee-Relations Story," \textit{Management Relations with Organized Public Employees}, Chicago, Public Personnel Association. p. 99
\end{itemize}
in negotiations akin to collective bargaining. They have at times resorted to strikes. Yet their rights to do all these things is severely challenged as running counter to the nature of the state."36 Zander has stated the public employee problem as a responsibility the government continues to dodge on the grounds of sovereignty. "If it (the government negates the problem) does so, public employees are then faced with extreme lobbying to secure piece-meal relief...under conditions autocratically and arbitrarily imposed. Until they become demoralized and either leave the service, they lose all incentive for efficiency, and strike."37

Legality of Public Employee Strikes

It is commonly assumed that all public employee strikes have been illegal.38 An often used argument has been that public services are essential and should not be interrupted. Eve stated that the uses of strikes by public employees have been restricted at the federal level since 1912 by the Lloyd-La Follette Act.39 This act excluded from its protection employee groups engaging in strike activities against the government. The Taft-Hartley Act took this notion in its provision that

36Spero, p. 1.
38Robert Taylor, personal interview at the Ohio Association of Public School Employees Office in July 1970, Columbus, Ohio.
39Eve, p. 44.
government employees could not participate in strikes or strike activities. Executive Order 10988 of 1962 also restricted government employee strikes. In 1955, Public Law 330 declared that a strike against the government was a felony punishable by a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment for a year and a day, or both. Executive Order 11491 of 1970 prohibited strikes by federal employees also.

Anti-strike legislation at the state level has progressed similarly to the federal level. Eve stated that only twelve states had anti-strike legislation in 1946. Taylor asserts that all states have anti-strike legislation today. A major argument against public employee strikes has been in some areas of survival (police, fire fighters, and servicemen) since any interruption of their services would threaten the welfare and security of the public. Yet, some public employees are not employed in survival areas (school employees, sanitarium, and park employees) and any interruptions in their services would not threaten that welfare and security and they generally cannot strike either.

---

40Taft-Hartley Act, 1947, section 301 (A).


42Executive Order 11491 (1970).

43Eve, p. 45.

44Taylor, personal interview, July 1970.
Supportive information has been summarized as follows:

"...the public welfare or safety is hardly threatened by strikes of gardeners in public parks. Inconsistently, employees of a privately owned utility, providing the same service, cannot strike...if the public welfare or security is a criterion, either both groups or neither should be permitted to close the schools this way." 

When teachers strike, the public has considered it harmful to the children and all of the blame has been placed on the teachers. It has been forgotten that a strike represents a disagreement of two groups rather than one. Lieberman and Moskow stated:

"...theoretically and practically, there is little merit in assuming that the teachers are at fault in every teacher strike. Teaching under certain conditions may hurt the children worse than no teaching at all...Closing of the schools for two days in order to secure additional funds might be more conducive to the public interest than acquiescence to the status quo. It would be unrealistic to advocate teacher strikes as the best means to cure the ills of public education, but a teacher strike may not always be detrimental to the public interest." 

Since the federal government has not banned strikes in private employment as it has in public employment even when the national welfare and security have been threatened, injustice seems apparent. Although the President can delay a strike for eighty days, in the private sector,

---

45 Lieberman and Moskow, p. 298.
46 Ibid., p. 299.
no authority has been granted to prohibit them.

It has been demonstrated often, recently, that laws prohibiting strikes by public employees have not necessarily prevented them. Many anti-strike laws have heavy penalties which breed strikes and hinder employer actions. Lieberman and Moskow stated:

"...they (the penalties) so weaken the power of the employees that the public employers perpetuate extremely inequitable conditions of employment. Eventually, the employees may strike anyway in desperation. Second, penalties against strikes by public employees may be so severe that public officials are afraid to impose them. Realizing this, public employees may be encouraged to strike." 47

The city of New York possibly has had more public employee strikes than any other city. The heavy penalty has placed severe restrictions on the public officials who could not realistically enforce them. In 1966, the New York law stated that public employees could not receive a pay raise for three years if they had a strike; however, the possibility of a second strike prevented the state from taking actions.

In San Diego, where the municipal employees recently struck, the California Superior Court ruled that public employees have a constitutional right to strike.

47 ibid., p. 300.
"The court based its decision on the fact that the California legislature had specifically outlawed strikes by firemen and policemen, but had left the issue of whether other public employees could legally strike open."

In November of 1969, the California Court of Appeals upheld that a 1967 dismissal of 127 Sacramento County Social Workers who engaged in a work stoppage was valid.

"The court ruled provisions of the County charter, supplemented by the rules of the Civil Service Commission, authorized the removal of an employee who is absent without leave... if no right to strike exists, the absence is without leave, and the appointing authority had the right to discharge...."

In February of 1970, 1500 members of the AFSCME of Cincinnati, Ohio, went on strike for a wage hike. A pay increase was negotiated in a settlement after a month long strike. The strikers' checks were withheld in July by order of the Court of Appeals.

"In a June 22 ruling, the court held that city officials could not choose to ignore the punitive provisions of the state's no strike Ferguson Act, and ordered that the pay hike be withheld for one year... The court's order... does not require the city to collect wage increases paid since February...."
Robert Taylor, Representative to the Ohio Legislature and the Ohio Association of Public School Employees (OAPSE), declared that this case is a "Taxpayers suit" and functional legislation should develop from it.\textsuperscript{51} At no time before has a taxpayer challenged the constitutionality of a public employees dispute; yet, this case had threefold ramifications: (1) to test the punitive provisions; (2) to test the non-test provision; and (3) to test whether taxpayers' money can be collected and spent for this purpose.

Strikes are still considered illegal although they are happening everyday. Legislation affecting this provision must become more functional to maintain continuity between the public employer-employee relations.

Madden had voiced the following conclusion.

"If the postal strike and the air traffic controllers' 'sick out' which followed in its wake tell us anything, it is that the constantly recurring problems of teachers' 'professional days', 'blue flu', etc., are intolerable and it is imperative that we should do something more than 'just stand there'. The problem won't go away by passing punitive laws or insisting that public strikes are illegal."\textsuperscript{52}

Whether a business policy has success or failure has little reference to its success or failure in education. The com-

\textsuperscript{51} Taylor, Robert. Personal interview at the Ohio Association of Public School Employees Office in July 1970, Columbus, Ohio.

\textsuperscript{52} Madden, p. 315
position of the policy, the conditions of the institution, the timing and the receptivity of the people have the greatest influence on the success or failure of a policy. Four abstract possibilities usually encountered in actual practices are listed:

1. Policies effective in private employment would also be effective in public education because the factors which determine success or failure in private employment are present in education.

2. Policies effective in private employment would be ineffective in public education because the factors responsible for ineffectiveness in public education are not present in the public sector.

3. Policies ineffective in private employment would be effective in public education because the factors responsible for ineffectiveness in the private sector are not present in education.

4. Policies ineffective in private employment would also be ineffective in education because the factors responsible for ineffectiveness in the private sector are also present in education. 53

Broad generalizations must be avoided because of the diversity of public education's environment. Although the environment has not been uniquely different from that of business, ignorance has prevailed partly because of the complexity of educational policy making and personal receptivity.

B. Negotiations and Education

1. The Relevance of Labor in Education

Frequently, reference has been made to negotiation

53 Ibid., p. 11.
policy in private business in regard to public education. Lieberman and Moskow have made several assertions in this area. Private business policy can be desirable in education if the policy is appropriate to the conditions that exist. An analysis of this premise has suggested the following:

1. Some policies characteristic of private employment can and should be followed in public education.

2. Other policies accepted in the private sector cannot or should not be so incorporated.

3. The jury is still out with respect to still another group of policies which are effective in private employment.

2. The NEA and its State Affiliates OEA

One of the equity organizations of the instructional employees had been the NEA and its state and local affiliates. The NEA Handbook has stated that the Association is an independent, voluntary, non-governmental organization available to all professional teachers. It believes that all educators regardless of position, rank, or authority are engaged in a common cause. Chartered by the United States Congress in 1906 to represent instructional employees, the NEA has been by far the largest professional educational association and

54 Lieberman and Moskow, p. 10-12.

dominate voice for teachers in the United States.

Being a "grass roots" organization, its dominant voice has come from the individual members through a Representative Assembly. Representing approximately sixty state affiliates, 8,700 local affiliates and two million members, the NEA has offered many direct services to members. The Research Division has carried out important research on nearly every school problem and supplied information to state and local affiliates. The Division of Affiliates and its members have assisted local affiliates and individual members with complex organizational problems. The Association of Classroom Teachers (ACT) has coordinated a program of leadership training in cooperation with the NTL Institute of Applied Behavioral Science. In addition, the ACT has improved teacher involvement in the decision making process. Other services provided are the DuShare Fund, and legal and defense services. Recently, a new service – the Special Services Division – has provided such services as life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance; a mutual fund; a tax-sheltered annuity program; and, in selected states, an automobile-leasing program.

Below the national level have existed the state and local affiliates of the NEA. Since no prescribed patterns of local requirements exist, state and local communities decided which type or types of organizations best met the local needs. The NEA Handbook has stated that some commun-
ities prefer an all-inclusive organization; others prefer departments of classroom teachers, principals, etc., within the all-inclusive organization; still others prefer separate organizations for administrators and classroom teachers.56

In Ohio the state affiliate to the NEA has been the OEA. The administrators recently pulled out to form an independent organization. This has paved the way for separate negotiations at the bargaining table. The OEA has represented the teachers and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) has represented the principals. In Columbus, the state capitol, the Columbus Education Association (CEA) has represented the teachers. In some instances the OEA and the CEA have worked jointly to solve problems.

Historically, the OEA was a dream of eighteen educators to improve the control of education left to the state by the United States Constitution. The OEA has grown steadily in membership to a powerful 89,000 Ohio educators in the 639 school districts. The dominant voice for professional educators in Ohio, it has been heard frequently on critical issues in regard to instruction, rights, salary and fringe benefits. Unlike the AFT, the OEA has an affiliated relationship. This means the OEA has no power over the local school districts

56 Ibid., p. 23
and the local school districts remain independent. The OEA acts only in an advisory capacity while supplying special services. Services rendered by the OEA are:

1. Field service
2. Research services
3. Instructional services
4. Legal services
5. Legislative affairs
6. Publications
7. Economic services

As a legislative agent, the OEA has power in the government.

"OEA has fought for and achieved such laws as a statewide minimum teacher salary schedule, school-board-paid hospitalization insurance, insurance, teacher tenure provisions, permanent school levies and the funding of billions of dollars into the School Foundation Program Formula." 57

This sets the OEA as a watch dog over legislative actions which would improve or damage the Ohio Schools.

In reference to negotiation, Hindman and Darr of the OEA have stated that little difference exists between their association and the AFT. The major difference, in their opinion, is in services and programs. 58 The OEA takes a professional approach by providing twenty-six field agents for local support.

---

58 Hindman and Darr, personal interview, July 1970, OEA Office, Columbus, Ohio.
The field agents provide many sources of information including data on other city school district's negotiation packages. In regard to strikes, the OEA will not call a strike because of its affiliated relationship. However, if the local organization which is affiliated with the OEA calls a strike, the OEA would consider it a professional study day. This protects the instructional employee under the provisions of the Ferguson Act and allows him to participate in professional studies or the picket line.

Hindman and Darr have stated that there are no laws inhibiting negotiation. The inhibitory factor has been silence.59

In summary, the NEA and its affiliates the OEA and CEA, have acted to provide equity for the instructional employees. Through their legislative efforts many positive contributions have been made to improve the professional educators position.

3. Policy Differences Between the NEA and AFT

Without question, organizational rivalry has existed between the NEA and its affiliates, and the AFT and its affiliates. A review of the literature had indicated similarities and differences between the two organizations on a philosophical, service, and membership characteristic basis. Lieberman has defined two major historical differences which divide the

---

59Hindman and Darr, personal interview, July 1970.
divide the NEA and AFT. One, the fact that local, state, and national education associations typically permitted all-inclusive membership; i.e., these associations enrolled administrators and supervisors as well as teachers. The second point at issue was the affiliation of the AFT with the AFL-CIO. At present, these two issues do not divide the NEA and the AFT as they did in the past. The state affiliate in Ohio, OEA, has a separate relationship with the teachers and administrators. The administrators have affiliations with NASSP, American Association of School Administrators, the Department of Elementary School Principals, and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; while the teachers are affiliated with the OEA. Lieberman has stated that a number of teacher negotiation laws and state administrative agencies have settled the issue of administrator membership substantially along the lines advocated by the AFT.

"...a few states such as Connecticut, Washington, and Maryland, the states legislation permits or even mandates the inclusion of administrative personnel in a teacher bargaining unit; but this aspect of the statutes is either ignored in practice or is creating too many practical difficulties for all parties. In any event, the Michigan experience is likely to be the predominate pattern. In that state, many superintendents withdrew from, or did not join local associations after passage of the Michigan negotiations statute in 1965. In 1966, the Michigan

---

Association of School Administrators withdrew from the Michigan Education Association and joined with the Michigan School Boards Association and Michigan School Businesses Officials to form a new organization. In 1967, the state organizations of elementary and secondary school principals pulled out of the Michigan Education Association."

This statement by Lieberman implies that administrative membership in the teacher organization has dangerous connotations for the school board as well as for the teacher organization. In addition, administrator membership could jeopardize both the rights of the organization to represent teachers and the legitimacy of the approach used by the board in teacher bargaining. "Sweetheart" contracts are feared here. This is when contract is exceptionally favorable to one particular party. This implies less favorable conditions of employment than could be obtained under legitimate bargaining relationships.

Typically speaking, organizations which have affiliated with the AFL-CIO such as the AFT, have not permitted management personnel to join the union. This has been based upon the belief that, in collective bargaining, the same organization cannot represent both employer and employee.

In regard to the OEA and the AFT objectives, both organizations have strived toward similar ends, but through different means. The overall philosophy of the AFT and its affiliates is oriented toward achieving collective bargaining status for the teachers. The philosophy of the NEA and its affiliates are

61Ibid., p. 140.
oriented toward an elevation of the character, and an advancement of the interest of the teacher as well as the promotion of the professional cause of education.

Although services provided by the AFT and the NEA have been similar, the NEA services have been more extensive than the AFT. Beitz has listed services offered by the AFT and its affiliates and the NEA and its affiliates. Beitz has other assertions stated. Services offered by the AFT and its affiliates:

1. To promote increased financial support for school at every level of government.
2. To provide valuable research and legislative services.
3. To provide opportunity for leadership outside the educational system.
4. To promote collective bargaining status.
5. To provide a broad social program.
6. To provide the opportunity to determine AFL-CIO policy and action.
7. To support American teachers

Services offered by the NEA and its affiliates are as follows:

1. The NEA Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities which provides a systematic

---

professional defense of educational personnel unjustly treated.

2. Direct assistance to school boards in setting up salary schedules and to teachers in presenting their positions.

3. The Educational Policies Commission which speaks for education in the United States by outlining what should be the purposes of the school.

4. Representation in World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession which facilitates contact between American teachers and those in other countries.

5. Research.

6. Radio, TV and film services.

7. NEA Journal and NEA Reporter.

8. School system investigations.

9. Promoting professional sanctions.

10. Teacher retirement.

11. Travel service.

12. NEA insurance

13. Investment program.

It is obvious from a comparison between these tests that some major similarities and differences exist between the services of the NEA and the AFT.

Both groups have been very progressive in recent years.
By setting high goals of achievement, the NEA and AFT have attempted to become the dominant voice of all teachers in the world. Beitz has briefly stated a few of the NEA's goals of the future. A major NEA objective has been to gain Federal and State governmental support in financial aid for any state or local educational problem. Obviously, the NEA is attempting to become the predominant voice of teachers in the Nation in addition to the up-grading of teacher rights, powers, policy and decision process, and wage and non-wage benefits.

Beitz has also outlined areas of AFT concentration of the AFT for the future. A major AFT interest has also been to gain support of new federal aid programs. Through financial support, the AFT has hoped to improve classroom size, school construction, teacher shortage and teacher improvement. In considering the teacher situation alone, the AFT has set goals to utilize the part-time teacher, raise teacher's salaries, improve teacher learning, and give the teacher more time to teach and strive toward the achievement of "the Great Society."

Although many differences as well as similarities have been noted, Beitz has summarized areas in which the policies of the NEA and AFT coincide. Both organizations have strived supported an increase in federal aid for parochial and private schools. Both the NEA and AFT have made positive strides for equality and integration rather than separation among the people. With regard to the economic situation of teachers, their combined efforts, albeit painful, for higher wages and non-wage
benefits have resulted in improvement. Traditionally speaking, the AFT has always been considered more militant and a supporter of strikes for teachers. In recent years, the NEA and its affiliates have responded in much the same militant manner. The Indiana State Teachers Association called a statewide strike in March of 1969. The purpose of the strike was to demonstrate their belief that the state legislature had provided inadequate state aid to education.

Perhaps the most significant factor about the power invested in the two organizations has been that the NEA is extremely sensitive to the wishes of the southern, rural and suburban communities. Because of the liberal policies of the AFT and the union affiliations, a high concentration of support has been found in large cities and by minority groups.

Beitz has summarized a survey conducted by Dr. Haakon Andresen of Northern Illinois University in 1969. The survey has pertinent information on over one thousand full-time teachers in one Iowa School district and their affiliations to the state and local NEA and AFT. Some of the relationships of significance pertained to personal and preference information. For instance, AFT members had a tendency to be older, more males than females, higher salaries, married with more dependents than the NEA members. Because of the lesser number of dependents and younger average age, the NEA members held fewer part-time, moon lighting jobs whereas the AFT did the opposite. Teachers who joined the AFT more than likely had union members in their paternal family who were skilled.
or unskilled and the teachers themselves had a permanent teacher's certificate and a degree beyond the baccalaureate degree. In addition, the AFT members tended to have had a greater number of different teaching positions within the school system and to have taught in more school systems than the NEA members.

4. **Mergers Possibilities of NEA-AFT**

As previously mentioned, rivalry has existed between the NEA and AFT. Although the collective negotiations movement has intensified this rivalry, Lieberman and Moskow prophesied, "It may also have set in motion the charges essential to end it, most likely through a merger of the two organizations." Many pressures have been placed on teachers for membership and representative elections. Frequently, one organization has pressed for a representative election when it felt strong enough to win while the other organization postponed it until it could gain enough strength. During these periods little or no progress was made for the teachers.

The competition between the two organizations has had some positive impact on the entire educational process. The stereotyped assumptions about competition as it exists in business has been that the underdog had to try harder to provide

---

Lieberman and Moskow, p. 401.
more and better services to become number one. The other side
to this assumption is that the organization with the upper
hand has tried even harder to remain number one. Lieberman and
Moskow have taken a realistic attitude toward the rivalry.

"The AFT's strong antipathy to programs in pro-
fessional ethics is due largely to AFT identifi-
cation of such programs with the associations. Similarly, the NEA has been hostile to 'labor
tactics', even where such tactics are clearly appro-
priate in an educational situation. If there were
no organizational rival affiliated with the AFL-CIO,
this intense association hostility to 'labor tactics'
might disappear, Associations might then feel
sufficiently secure to evaluate strategy and tactics
in terms of their effectiveness in achieving teacher
objectives instead of their impact on organizational
competition.64

In some instances, a merger has taken place. This gave
the teacher more thorough coverage, but Hindman and Darr de-
clared in July of 1970, that in these situations, the merger
killed the AFT as in Flint, Michigan and Los Angeles, Califor-
ia.65 Lieberman prophesied in July of 1969, that the merger
would take place nationally in the next few years at the most.66

In that same month, Dewing made several assertions on merger
possibilities.67 The assertions were on the competition between

64 Ibid., p. 402
65 Hindman and Darr, personal interview.
66 Lieberman, Implication of Coming NEA-AFT Merger,
p. 140.
67 Dewing, Rolland, "Is the NEA-AFT Merger Imminent?
the conservative, professionally-oriented NEA and the union-affiliated, classroom-teacher-oriented AFT providing a contest for teacher loyalty that could have been considered wholesome; however, since the NEA has endorsed collective "negotiations" and changed its internal structure to guarantee classroom teacher control of the organization in the future, the weakest existing dichotomy should be abolished through consolidation by a substantial group. When David Selden became president of the AFT in August of 1968, he immediately invited the NEA to start merger talks. Selden said:

"None of the obstacles which now stand in the way of building one united, militant, autonomous teacher-only organization are insuperable...All can be worked out if there is goodwill on the part of NEA leaders." 68

Dewing has observed that the statement by Selden placed the burden on the NEA while not compromising on the two main obstacles:

1. High demands for a merger did not initiate at the national level.

2. His merger demands did not exclude the union affiliation.

At a later date, the NEA Executive Committee flatly rejected the merger proposal by the AFT. Dewing has summarized a statement by Lyle Ashby, Deputy Secretary of the NEA on the refusal

68 Ibid., p. 44.
to merge.

"A great majority of teachers want complete freedom and independence for the teaching profession. They want no part of an organization mixture involving any other segment of society."[69]

Ashby has listed further causes for the disassociation, which Dewing states, represent the old school of the NEA.

1. The AFT is suffering from internal conflict.
2. Departure of the United Auto Workers from the AFL-CIO and the subsequent founding of the Alliance for Labor ACT (ALA) splits the AFT.
3. With a $500,000 deficit and a drought of union funds from the defunct Industrial Union Department, formerly headed by Walter Reuther, the AFT offers a merger dowry.
4. A substantial proportion of the AFT's membership opposes the merger.
5. The NEA philosophy that all educators should belong to a comprehensive organization would be shattered.
6. The AFT has little or nothing at the state level; and its national program, the NEA, boasts strong organization at these levels.

In addition, a good percentage of the hard-core teacher-unionists would disdain membership and establish a union-affiliated body if the merger occurred. Since the AFT could not deliver

---

69 Ibid., p. 46.
more than one-half to two-thirds of its current membership, the basic goal of the NEA would not be accomplished and a threat would still exist through another teacher-labor organization. The Nation's schools conducted a recent representative poll among administrators on the possibility of a merger. Only one percent of the administrators felt that the merger would occur in two years; yet, forty-four percent felt that a merger would occur within the next five years while forty-seven percent felt it would never occur. With regard to administrators' support of a merger, the response was that eighty-four percent would not support it.

In summary, it is evident that a merger between the NEA and AFT does not look possible for the near future. Although the membership of the AFT has increased tremendously, Dewing has said that strength is so concentrated in a few urban areas that it can claim a truly representative state organization in less than a dozen states, whereas the NEA have affiliated state and local relationships in all fifty states.70 Since the AFT is debt-ridden, lacks internal stability and holds its strength in volatile inner city areas, it is logical for the NEA to be little interested in a merger.

---

70 Ibid., p. 46.
5. Causal Factors For Collective Negotiations in Public Education

Although much information has been voiced on the emergence of collective negotiations in education, major causal factors exist. Lieberman and Moskow have identified six such factors.

1. The need for effective teacher representation at the local level; a need has grown out of the inefficiency and ineffectiveness in dealing with local school boards and administrators.

2. Changes in teacher attitudes; teachers are becoming less tolerant of the inadequate representation of teacher interest at the local level. The sporadic and intermittent protest has not been enough to satisfy the teacher.

3. Organizational rivalry: The NEA and AFT has always been under pressure to demonstrate that each could do more than the other. Perhaps it has been the most important single factor underlying the rapid spread of collective negotiations.

4. Larger school districts: the larger an employee group becomes, the fewer members have taken aggressive action in behalf of the group. Collective negotiations have emerged first in large systems characterized by slum areas, heavy teacher mobility, hierarchical administration, and other phenomena which tend to make teachers more receptive to collective mechanisms for solving problems.

5. The "snowball" effect: Every time a teacher organization and a school board negotiate, it has become more difficult for other teacher organizations and school boards to justify their refusal to do so.

6. Developments outside of education: teacher attitude toward collective negotiations have changed, but progress and development in such areas as public and private employment have called for more change.

71 Lieberman and Moskow, p. 55.
C. The Non-Instructional Employees Overview

Moore and Walters have stated that educational literature gives little attention to the nearly one-half million public school employees. This limited consideration has been entirely out of proportion to that given to the professional employees.

"The non-teaching personnel warrants careful attention for two reasons: first, because of the important service they render, and second, their importance in relation to the efficient functioning of the school organization itself.\(^7^2\)

The use of terminology in this area is somewhat conflicting and confusing. The term used in this study has been 'non-instructional employees.' Other names given to this area have been non-professional, non-certificated, paraprofessional, non-licensed and classified employees. Five types of services have been used as the basis for categorizing various roles within the study; namely, the clerical service employees, the transportation service employees, and the teacher assistant employees.

Davis has stated that more than a hundred years ago, most of the school employees were those with teaching capacity; however, the diversity of change, technology, curriculum and educational innovations have caused a turnabout of the entire school organization.

Davis stated:

"As the community has made new social demands on the schools, as the schools have seen new opportunities for services, and as the concepts of the teacher's function has clarified, the school personnel has increased both in actual numbers and in variety of occupations represented."\(^73\)

The basis of Davis's assumption has been that competent assistance from non-teaching employees has assisted the teachers in rendering competent services. The frequent non-teaching, employee-pupil contact has the potential to be helpful or harmful to the pupil. This has depended on the personal qualities of the school employee. The physical plants have been built, repaired, cleaned and kept operable for actual teaching and learning by this group of employees. Records have been kept, pupils and materials have been transported, teachers have been freed of menial tasks and good wholesome food has been served to facilitate the pupil and school needs by non-teaching employees. Davis, Moore, Walters and Yeager suggested that little consideration and guidance can be found in the literature and research on non-teaching employees or administration concern for the group collectively. Less emphasis has been given to the non-instructional personnel even though the services and number of employees have increased. Through the increased quality of education and increased reorganization and

\(^73\) Hazel Davis, Personnel Administration, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1939, p. 2.
and consolidation, greater significance has been attached to the services. However, little attention has been given to the employees. Yeager further stated that the professionalism of the non-instructional employees has not kept pace with that of the professionalism of the instructional employees except in the health areas.

As an outcome, efforts have been made by some groups, such as associations and labor unions, to resolve problems and exercise certain forms of control over their activities. In other instances, problems have either not been met or have been given scant attention.74

Weber stated that enormous problems surround the non-instructional employees. Communication between the administrator, teacher, pupil and community needs stronger consideration. Job prestige, work loads, in-service training, embedded attitudes, pre-job training, salary, fringe benefits, and proper supervision have been necessities toward the building of a comprehensive workable relationship.75 The major points by Weber have been summarized below.

(1) Every school administrator realizes that janitors are very important people in the public schools. Their attitudes toward teachers, pupils, parents, and the adminis-


Disputes between teachers and janitors cause service difficulties:...

There is a movement in most schools to change the title of "janitor" to "custodian" because so many people have thought of janitors in terms of disrespect:...

Administrators should remember that custodians are human beings and should be treated as such.

Teachers should be directed to send their complaints about custodians to the principal of building and grounds.

Custodians should be selected in much the same manner as teachers.

Custodians should be responsible to the principal, then the superintendents to the board.

Administrators and custodians should work together in building inspections to improve building maintenance.

In-service education programs have proven to be beneficial and worth-while.

Work load and work conditions should be regulated to a human proportion.

More attention should be given to the development of plans of action for educating personnel in the areas of educational understanding.

Job description should be made crystal clear.

Consideration should be given to salary and fringe benefits.
Although Weber has limited many of the comments to custodians, it is generally applied, as well, to the other non-instructional personnel.

Castetter feels that the non-instructional employees have been those employees that rendered supportive services to the instructional employees. He stated:

Despite emergence of refined (formula) approaches to determining custodial personnel requirements, certain factors have precluded universal acceptance by school districts including in-attention to standards of custodial performance, lack of funds, and unsuitability of any formula to all school districts under all circumstances.  

Castetter has also enumerated ten factors that influence the non-instructional employees and their staff size.

1. Standards of service established for building, secretarial, clerical, food service, transportation, and safety personnel.
2. Plans for personnel utilization.
4. Extent to which certain services are performed on contractual basis by non-school agencies; such as, catering of food service, cleaning and snow removal.
5. Availability of labor saving devices.
6. Union Relationships.

---

(7) Number and capacity of units in the school plants.
(8) Use of non-school agents for school functions.
(9) Use of part-time and temporary personnel.
(10) Variable building factors.

Many of the factors have varied in different school districts and only through careful consideration can reasonable changes be facilitated. In making decisions, Castetter has established two important premises.

(1) Expenditures for non-instructional personnel should not be increased at the expense of the educational program. Every dollar expended for non-instructional services beyond minimum need is now diverted from instruction purposes. Two separate budgets are needed.

(2) Non-instructional services should be sufficient to meet the requirements of the education program and to provide for the health, comfort and safety of pupil and staff personnel.

Frequently, these two premises have been inflated out of proportion and have led to little or no consideration of the non-instructional employee. Nevertheless, the non-instructional employees program has needed critical examination regarding the essential amount and kinds of services necessary and the amount of funds to support them in order to meet the needs of the educational program.

The school of an earlier day utilized services of few people other than teachers. Pupils usually performed the
janitorial work; board members maintained the buildings; and outside administrative and supervisory services were almost wholly absent. The importance of an effective and efficient non-instructional employee program has been recognized. The first step in strengthening a program has been to recognize its needs. Suggested areas of program improvement have been public relations, program integration, salary improvement and administration. The importance of non-instructional employee involvement in a good-will program has been proven. A cognizance of the position of non-instructional employees in public relations should cause the administrator to direct part of his induction and in-service education programs for these people toward the improvement of their public relations techniques. Program integration has been directed with reference to a total personnel administration. The administration of the non-instructional personnel program too, is now moving in the same direction. An objective that should not be in the too remote future is a complete personnel program in each school system, representing the maximum possible integration between what are now two separate personnel programs.

The third area of program improvement has been salary. Non-instructional employee selection and retention has been severely hindered in this area. Because salaries have not been large enough to attract the better fitted individuals, and because of faulty concepts of the custodian's position by many boards of education, some school systems have contented
themselves with inferior custodial services rendered by incompetent custodians.

1. Salary, Fringe Benefits and Turnover

It has been a well known fact for many years that high turnover rates have existed among non-instructional employees. Castetter, Moore, Weber, Jarvis and others,77 have made various assertions about the typical characteristics of high turnover rates among non-instructional employees. Although causes have varied, the turnover rate has been increasingly high among non-instructional employees and the increased turnover rate has been traced to low compensation levels. High turnover is related to inadequate fringe benefits, prestige and work conditions; but changes in wages, hours, sanitary conditions, retirement and sick leave benefits have been of little avail in developing high morale among non-instructional workers. A noticeable change is needed in the social recognition given to these workers. While suggestions for needed salary and fringe benefit reforms are well-taken, another great need has been to improve the respect given to the non-instructional position. The only salary regulation generally used has been the federal government's minimum wage law. Johns

and Morphet have stated that salary has generally been based on the community average and good competent employees have been difficult to retain. 78 Mitchell has stated that the non-instructional employees deserve the same salary and fringe benefit considerations as the professional (instructional) employees. 79 Yeager, Linn, Jarvis, Gentry, Stephens, Moore and Walters 80 have made further suggestions on turnover, low salaries, fringe benefits and morale. Transportation workers have a high turnover rate because of part-time employment and little job respect. Increased turnover rates among food service employees has a reflection on the school officials' attempts to keep wages too low. Actually, they end up paying a greater cost through loss of efficient employees. With regard to operational service employees, high turnover rates have been due to competition with governmental and private enterprise; plus, school administrators' desire to employ with little expense and few fringe benefits. Low salary and fringe benefits have raised serious questions. Yeager stated:

"Although great strides have been made in advancing minimum salaries of all school employees, with attractive increments, it can hardly be said that such compensation is commensurate with maintenance of a decent standard of living in the educational field or that it is sufficient to attract and retain

high quality personnel to serve our school children.\(^{81}\)

Most of the food service employees have received lower salaries and fringe benefits than those employed by commercial concerns. The experience factor for school clerical employees has not been as important as in business areas but competition still has existed for competent employees. Satisfaction is usually gained through promotion and more job responsibility along with increased salaries and fringe benefits.

"In competing with business and industry, school systems have found that working conditions, length of work day and work week, vacations, job security, retirement plans, and insurance protection are valuable factors."\(^{82}\)

Castetter stated that methods employed such as point systems, conversion factors, formulas, and rating schemes cannot justify poor salaries. "The concern at the moment is to raise salary levels to the point where they will secure executive talent needed in public education. Numbers not related to this concept generally lead to delusion rather than to problem solving."\(^{83}\) The concept with regard to fringe benefits has become acceptable and is used as recruitment tool. Usually, fringe benefits have been kept separate from salary and some have been

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{81}{Yeager, p. 114.}
\footnote{82}{Moore and Walters, p. 148.}
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regulated by state statutes. In some instances the benefits have pertained to either instructional or non-instructional employees and paid for in total by school boards or on a contribution plan between employer-employee. Many of these fringe benefits have been divided into three categories:

A. Time off with pay
   1. vacation
   2. holidays
   3. military training
   4. personal absences
   5. expense allowances

B. Protection
   1. life insurance
   2. health and accident insurance
   3. hospital and medical insurance
   4. liability insurance
   5. retirement
   6. social security
   7. severance allowance

C. Incentive and Improvement
   1. tuition refunds
   2. tuition payments
   3. scholarships
   4. incentive increments
   5. self improvement
   6. non-instructional training programs
   7. expense allowances
   8. professional affiliations
   9. non-instructional affiliations

Although these fringe benefits provided security and protection, they have been considered somewhat less important than salary. This has especially been true with younger unmarried non-instructional employees. The fringe benefit's package in education cannot compete with that of business because of state laws in some cases. From the employee standpoint, protection
is provided for illness, disability, retirement, death, absences and improvement. This has provided a more stable, efficient staff. Advantages of fringe benefit programs have been:

1. tax exemptions
2. mass-purchasing is economical
3. fringe benefits are more readily accepted than salary increases to the public
4. staff security and stability
5. better competitive positions to attract competent employees.

A major contribution of the fringe benefits program has been an increase in staff motivation, respect and morale.

In summary, a major handicap to the non-instructional employees program has been poor salary and fringe benefits. It has been clearly demonstrated in this section that high turnover rates have been a reflection of this oversight. Securing and maintaining qualified staffing has become a highly skilled act whereby everyone benefits if it is performed correctly. States will have to enact laws to encumber funds for non-instructional employees; and salary regulations will have to be more than the minimum amount required by the federal government. Salaries and fringe benefits for non-instructional employees will have to be more competitive with those of business and industry in addition to the national average for that particular job. Finally, more humane consideration is required to improve work relations and conditions. This will help meet the employees' satisfaction and limit their need to affiliate with equity groups such as local labor unions and organizations.
In the past this has been the trend out of necessity.

2. **Staff Development and Growth In-Service Training**

In addition to the inadequate salary and fringe benefit compensations, school districts have been guilty of providing little or no staff development and growth in-service for non-instructional employees. Frequently, failures in this area have resulted in high turnover, job dissatisfaction, inefficient service and increased building depreciation. The privilege of each employee to grow while in-service, to learn new things and to become more aware of his responsibilities should be guaranteed as it has been for instructional employees. With the technology and new facilities, in-service training has become a necessity for clerical, food service and operational employees. Moore, and Yeager\(^\text{84}\) have asserted that these methods of attainment can be short term or long term and that they facilitate a needed program. Quality in-service programs for all school employees have various components; health and vitality, better environmental and general working conditions, two-way communication, work relations, individual growth, knowledge and creativity and advancement.

The constant hiring of new employees has required additional or refresher training. The training has involved the

---

\(^{84}\)Moore, p. 149 and Yeager, p. 78.
improvement in skills, special training in respect to the job to be done and general familiarity with the practice and policies of the school system.

Various types of training have been feasible as pre-service, on-the-job and in-service training within school districts; yet, very little takes place. Jarvis, Gentry and Stephens saw that many school districts have let the experience of the custodian be the teacher and it has been costly and troublesome. "While actual working experience is of course necessary, the school system should provide some form of pre-service training and a continuous program of in-service education.\(^{85}\) Other forms of in-growth training have been:

1. work conferences
2. work shops
3. consultant services
4. informal meeting
5. apprenticeships
6. department meetings
7. local, statewide, and regional meetings

Weber stated that custodial in-service has proven to worthwhile since personnel have often been poorly selected and inefficient.\(^{86}\) He suggested that more attention be devoted to developing plans of action to educate the operational employees on cleaning, maintaining supplies and equipment, working with fellow school employees and understanding the educational process.

---

\(^{85}\) Jarvis, p. 226.

\(^{86}\) Weber, p. 228-229.
Some responsibilities and potentialities of the custodian have been listed.

1. care of costly property
2. safety
3. health
4. standards of cleanliness
5. better teaching and learning environment
6. creating good will
7. effecting economics

It is obvious at this point that the above accomplishments are attained through some form of in-service.

Since in-service training has primarily been designed for instructional employees, it has been a new innovation for non-instructional employees. Castetter has listed five arguments for training non-instructional employees. 87

1. Training of non-instructional personnel is inevitable in every school system, whether by formal or informal means, by plan or by chance, and whether effective or ineffective. The newcomer must learn what to do and how to do it. The experienced employee must learn to do better the work for which he is responsible.

2. Training makes the difference between operating efficiency and inefficiency.

3. Non-instructional personnel contribute to full realization of the educational program.

4. Machines, tools, and building equipment operated by non-instructional personnel are becoming increasingly numerous and complicated, and require more extensive training.

5. Personnel incompetency is a violation of the principle that full value should be received for each tax dollar expended. Money wasted on incompetent per-

---

87 Castetter, p. 269.
sonnel reduces the funds available for the support of the educational program.

This has necessitated some degree of planning and leadership for the non-instructional employees. Establishing standards and levels of services appropriated for the effectiveness and efficiency of the educational enterprise are developed here. Davis stated that in-service training is rarely an actual practice in most schools and the employee needs it to reach his highest level of achievement.

"Through a carefully planned program of induction into service, employees should find opportunity to learn the program and aims of public education in the community, to understand the relation of their own work to the total program, and to grow in individual skills." 88

The training process should start at induction and end at retirement. When quality programs have existed, the goal has been to fully seek to develop the potentialities of each employee and to utilize them in planning and carrying out the work of the school.

Yet, there still seems to be a lack of in-service growth for the non-instructional employees. In a study conducted by Davis in 1939, on twelve school districts, nothing was found which could be called a program of training for employee in-service. Linn stated in 1955 that the majority of school custodial employees had little or no experience or training and he suggested that strong attention be devoted to this

area.  

Thirty-two years later in 1971, the writer could find only limited research on in-service training for this group. In summary, the in-service growth portion of the non-instructional service employees program has to be reformed. Obviously, everyone loses when there is poor training or no training. The taxpayer has suffered because the money he pays does not receive full or proper use. School buildings have depreciated and poor usage of the supplies have added up to waste. The instructional employees have not been able to fully use an improperly maintained building. When the environmental situation has been non-supportive for teaching, very little teaching took place. Where very little teaching occurred, very little learning occurred. Although poor in-service training for non-instructional employees has been a minor facet to students not learning, it has positive implications. When training has occurred, better attitudes developed and better work was performed. In addition, training helps to close the gap between the instructional and non-instructional employees. By making the non-instructional services an integral part of the total school organization, Moore and Walter stated that its effect can be seen in several areas, namely:

1. understanding of the educational enterprise
2. technical skill in areas of concern
3. the sense of belonging
4. job prestige

Footnote: Linn, p. 399.
D. Representative Organizations for Non-Instructional School Employees

Traditionally, employees of the Ohio educational systems have been divided into two categories — those with professional and instructional purpose and those with non-professional and non-instructional purpose. At times the first group has been considered licensed, certificated, administrative and teaching. The latter group has been considered non-certificated, non-certified, classified, non-teaching and non-licensed. For purposes of this research, the total group of employees of major concern are the non-instructional employees. Specifically, the portion of non-instructional employees being covered are those employees who perform the services of building, operations, food service, secretarial, teacher aides and transportation. Taylor has said that both instructional and non-instructional employees have played significant roles in the educational process. However, in the past years, the professional employees have been placed into the background.90

Robert Whisman, Consultant to the Ohio School Bus Driver Education, asserts that today the role of the non-instructional classified school employee is being brought to the forefront.

90Taylor, personal interview, July 1970.
and demands are being made for recognition and compensation for efforts.\textsuperscript{91} He also maintains that the schools could not function without this group of employees. In the days of the one room school house, the teacher was expected to perform all functions of the school -- teaching and janitorial. As time passed, with more educational sophistication and specialization, the role and responsibility of the teacher changed. The non-instructional responsibilities for cleaning, repairing and heating were passed on to the appropriately classified employees. Insufficient attention was directed at this group of employees. Lack of organization, lack of training, inadequate recognition and compensation have been the result. Knezevich and Fowlkes, have stated that high turnover and job dissatisfaction have plagued the classified employees program because of inadequate wage, non-wage, work hours and promotions.\textsuperscript{92} Wisman stated the role of the non-instructional classified employee has changed; just as the role of the teacher requires more sophistication, specialization in this field has become paramount. The person who sweeps the floor, cleans the laboratory, washes the windows, and keeps coal in the furnace,


used to be the janitor. Today he is the custodian, maintenance, sanitation and operations engineer. Although this person still is required to serve as a school bus driver in some schools in Ohio, by necessity, the majority of Ohio schools have adopted the supportive services as a specialization with a limited range of responsibilities. The days of considering the non-instructional classified employee as a "jack of all trades" is rapidly vanishing.

As of January 1, 1970, in Ohio, 62,000 non-instructional classified employees filled the vital roles of supportive services to the educational program. Whisman has listed the job categories as:

1. Cafeteria workers
2. Custodian (sweeping and cleaning)
3. Building maintenance
4. Pupil transportation
5. School bus drivers
6. Mechanics
7. School nurses
8. Teacher aides
9. Secretaries

---

93 Whisman, p. 8.

"As can be seen from this list, the non-certified (classified) school personnel have a wide range of jobs and responsibilities, and specialized skills are required for the performance of these tasks. A custodian can no longer just 'throw a little more coal' in the furnace to fulfill the heating requirements of a building. Instead, he must be a skilled and knowledgeable person to regulate the electronically controlled furnace. At one time secretaries and other office personnel had to be concerned only with a typewriter and perhaps an adding machine. Today they must be able to operate many types of business machines."\(^{94}\)

Demands for attention and recognition have received some support.

In the State of Ohio, public school employees have been organized since 1934, by the OAPSE. Chartered in 1941, it became the first non-teaching school employee's association for the representation of non-teaching personnel who desired to have a retirement system. Later, through OAPSE, a retirement plan became a reality, School Employees Retirement Association. Although OAPSE represents the non-instructional personnel, the organization performs very professional services for its members' equity. The code of ethics clarifies this point.

"School employees all hold positions of great responsibility and as such must be persons whose conduct is above reproach. We are members of the school team and must sincerely believe in the betterment of the educational program as well as the improvement of working conditions."\(^{95}\)

\(^{94}\)Whisman, p. 10.

\(^{95}\)OAPSE Handbook, Ohio Association of Public School Employees, Columbus, Ohio, published annually, p. 2.
Other assertions have been made about the OAPSE Constitution. The purpose of the Association has been stated to promote the interest of public education -- to advance the standards of the non-teaching school personnel -- to help secure conditions necessary for the greatest efficiency of non-teaching school employees and the schools. Nine objectives have been stated by the Association to further explicate their sincerity.

1. To create public opinion which will demand increasingly better public schools.
2. To help promote personal growth and to develop professional attitudes on the part of its members.
3. To work for equitable salaries for all non-teachers.
4. To provide secure tenure for workers of proven ability.
5. To constantly review retirement allowances, survivor benefits, and disability pensions.
6. To exert strength to secure adequate financial support for our schools.
7. To create a better understanding between teaching and non-teaching school employees.
8. To secure proper recognition for all non-teaching school employees.
9. To always be aware of the "OAPSE Yard Stick," (all our proposals must be good for our people and for the public schools.)

In thirty-five years of dedicated services, OAPSE has en
all time high membership of 27,000 which is approximately fifty percent of all Ohio non-instructional employees. In addition, through dynamic leadership, many services have been provided for the members. The OAPSE offers the following services to the membership:

1. Publishes five informative journals a year for members.
2. Provides speakers and programs for local meetings.
3. Conducts annual surveys on salary and financial data.
4. Assists by providing legal service to members victimized by a violation of state law.
5. Holds annual district meetings and delegate conferences.
6. Provides $100,000 personal liability insurance free with membership in OAPSE.
7. Sponsors annual negotiation workshops and assistance.
8. Cooperates with other interested groups on matters of mutual concern and benefit.
9. OAPSE works for, and will assist in, promotion of school bonds and levies.
10. Co-sponsors school bus driving contest.
11. Research activities.

Even though the above items are important considerations, the major contribution of OAPSE to the membership has been the activity in the state legislature. The following is a list of bills passed that are of benefit to the non-certified school
employees:

**SICK LEAVE AND VACATIONS**

**H.B. 109 (1949)** - Sick leave accumulation for all employees up to 90 days.

**H.B. 241 (1959)** - Two weeks vacation with full pay after one calendar year. Three weeks minimum vacation after 15 calendar years. To qualify employee must work eleven months in each calendar year.

**H.B. 113 (1965)** - Unused vacation leave to the surviving spouse or dependent.

**RETIREMENT**

**S.B. 96 (1951)** - Minimum allowances and survivor benefits.

**H.B. 551 (1965)** - Allowances liberalized by an average of 35%; increased survivor and disability benefits; guaranteed return of employee contributions.

**H.B. 337 (1957)** - Increased benefits for all who had retired prior to June 30, 1965.

**H.B. 397 (1959)** - Increased benefits by 12½% for prior to June 20, 1955, retirees.

**S.B. 100 (1959)** - Increased future minimum allowances by 14%; increased all allowances by at least 10%; raised and liberalized survivor benefits; eliminated annual $3.00 administrative fee.


**H.B. 907 (1967)** - Provides for surviving spouse if mentally or physically incompetent.

**H.B. 402 (1967)** - Provides Medicare coverage for retirees.
JOB PROTECTION

H.B. 200 (1955) - Established the contract law for all non-teaching school employees

H.B. 50 (1959) - Established June 1, as the rehiring date; July 1, as the salary notification date; automatically rehire if not notified.

H.B. 413 (1961) - City boards of education to retain personnel without examination whenever civil service is extended in new classifications; and in newly formed city school districts.

H.B. 572 (1961) - Guaranteed the clerk-treasurer a four year contract after two year probationary period.

H.B. 223 (1963) - Military leave guarantee for job and seniority placement on the salary schedule.

S.B. 56 (1967) - Requires boards of education to prepare and submit job classification and salary schedules for non-teaching employees.

S.B. 92 (1967) - Increases from 2 to 4 years leave of absence for military duty.

H.B. 116 (1967) - Provides continuing contract status for non-teaching employees with 3 years of service.

INSURANCE

S.B. 31 (1965) - Permits boards of education to pay all or part of hospitalization, surgical, and major medical insurance for the employee.

S.B. 94 (1967) - Adds term life insurance and extends coverage to include non-teaching employee and family.
STANDARD WORK WEEK

H.B. 131 (1963) - Mandates a forty hour work week for base pay. All time over forty hours, or working on a school holiday, shall be paid for at not less than the regular rate of pay or be granted compensatory time off.

Fair Labor Standard Act (1965) provides time and one-half for hours in excess of forty hours in one week. Establishes minimum salary.

HOLIDAY PAY

H.B. 91 (1965) - A minimum of six paid holidays for all non-teaching employees, if they occur within the working year.

SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

H.B. 91 (1965) - (1) Salary increases for school employees.
(2) Other operating expense increased from $1,700 to $1,910 and non-certified employees named in the School Foundation Program for the first time.

S.B. 350 (1967) - Provides additional salary increases for non-teaching personnel, 10c per hour, maximum $200, minimum $100, and increased operating expenses from $1,910 to $2,415.

OTHER LEGISLATION

H.B. 123 (1949) - The board may pay any employee his salary and expenses for the purpose of attending professional meetings.

S.B. 99 (1955) - Permitted boards of education to purchase liability insurance for operators of board owned vehicles.

H.B. 212 (1955) - Made it mandatory for all school lunch room employees to receive those benefits being enjoyed by other employees; permitted boards of education to use general funds, if needed, to supplement
lunchroom funds; provided for separate accounting of lunchroom funds.

H.B. 46 (1959) - Boards of education permitted to pay an employee while on jury duty.

H.B. 268 (1963) - Permits boards to purchase as much as $500,000 liability insurance for each school bus.

S.B. 297 (1969) - Increases sick leave from 90 to 120 days.

A.M.-H.B. 531 (1969) - Foundation program increased $40.00 per classroom unit for non-teaching salaries.

S.B. 92 (1969) - Provides employment protection in event of transfer or consolidation.


Although all the legislation has been of great significance to the non-instructional (classified) employee, Taylor has pointed out House Bill 116 as being the most important. He said that this piece of legislation has relieved many petty problems while it guaranteed employment tenure. Whisman has stated that the House Bill 116 gives the greatest service by providing for a continuing contract status for non-professional classified employees with three years of service.

John Brown, OAPSE attorney, has explained the great significance of House Bill 116 and OAPSE.

"Not very many years ago public employees in Ohio would take almost anything without complaint. Public employers twisted the Ohio

96 Taylor, personal interview, July 1970.

97 Whisman, p. 15.
public employee laws to suit themselves. The situation has changed drastically. OAPSE has shown over the last few years that if and when a state statute is violated that they will go to court quickly on the employee's behalf. Other private employee organizations have done the same. Organized labor has not. Organized labor has not seemed to regard courts as an ally in their efforts to represent public employees.

A perfect example of what can and would be done by public employees is the case brought by OAPSE on behalf of a cafeteria employee in Medina County. This woman had accumulated a substantial amount of sick leave. Her husband suffered a heart attack and she was required to stay home and nurse him. Her board of education employer denied her any more than three days payment. The statute says nothing about any public employer in Ohio limiting the use of sick leave to three days in the event of the illness of a member of the employee's immediate family. OAPSE sued on her behalf. We won in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas and have defended our win in the Medina County Court of Appeals. This was a case that probably the employees could not have afforded to maintain without the support and backing of a large association.98

At one time, the non-professional classified employee was taken for granted. He endured many injustices and inequities within the school and community. His role and responsibility had been minimized and neglected. However, through OAPSE, the non-professional classified employee has begun to gain recognition. Positive strides have been made to improve inequities in wage and non-wage benefits. Through programs coordinated by OAPSE such as work shops and in-service train-

---

98 John Brown (Legal Advisor to OAPSE), personal interview, July 1970, Columbus, Ohio.
ing, the non-classified employee program has been up-graded, the employees are taking a greater interest in politics and political issues and the community.

Policy Difference Between OAPSE and the Labor Unions

In July of 1970, OAPSE represented more than four hundred local school districts with regard to non-instructional (classified) employees. This constitutes approximately twenty-seven thousand of the sixty-two thousand non-instructional (classified) employees in the State of Ohio public school system. With an affiliated relationship, OAPSE has the capacity only to advise and the local school district acts as an autonomy. Basically, CAPSE is a "grass roots" organization and is very sensitive to the wishes of each member. The state organization has a constitution and by-laws. The fundamental organizational unit of the Association is the local chapter. The chapters are usually formed in a school district, or in a combination of school districts, in a manner which is specified within the state constitution. The OAPSE Officer Handbook has stated that each chapter functions as an individual unit, within the State Association, and may adopt additional by-laws. The by-laws may not conflict with the State OAPSE constitution and by-laws. The Ferguson Act has provisions regarding public employees. Many of the non-instructional (classified) employees have been considered.

public employees and they can organize. The restrictions have stemmed from the prohibition of strikes. OAPSE has upheld the Ferguson Act. As previously stated, OAPSE approaches problems through the legal channels of the legislature. Another approach by OAPSE in the employer-employee relation is in identifying and training people in leadership skills and negotiation procedures. As a service, OAPSE is sponsoring conferences on leadership development which includes sessions on negotiations. Although OAPSE has some mennerisms of a labor union, it considers itself an Association without National affiliations and such labor affiliations as the AFL-CIO. Similarities and differences exist between OAPSE and a labor union. A major difference which existed is the relationship to a local school district. OAPSE has the affiliated relation whereas the local school employees act autonomously with a local constitution and by-laws. Quite differently, a union has a chartered relationship to the local school employees. This had led to the local school employees having very little voice and power to act autonomously. Another major difference between OAPSE and a union is that the OAPSE has never called a strike. Under the provisions of the Ferguson Act and the local autonomy affiliation, OAPSE has permitted the local school employees to call strikes rather than call strikes themselves. Typically, a labor union has struck because it is not governed by the Ferguson Act. In some instances, they disregard its existence. A third difference has been in the services provided by OAPSE.
and the concern for all non-teaching employees working for the Board of Education in Ohio. Generally, unions are primarily concerned with the custodial employees. Since OAPSE does not consider itself a union, it has the capacity to represent both employer and employee. A union cannot represent management or the employer. In some instances, representing both groups becomes very complicated and unethical. As previously mentioned in connection with instructional employees, the administrators pulled out of the OEA because of problems of representation.

A fourth difference has been that OAPSE has no place at a negotiation table unless this is requested by the members. A union has the right to negotiate for the non-instructional (classified) employees. A fifth but not final difference between OAPSE and the union has been the approach to gaining equity. OAPSE has sought through legislation benefits whereas the union has traditionally acted through collective bargaining.

Summary.

Just as differences exist between OAPSE and union, so do similarities. A major similarity between them has been the strides taken for equity among non-instructional (classified) employees. Although it has been understood that OAPSE will not call a strike, usually they are aware of the total situation prompting the local affiliation to call the strike. In addition, after a strike, OAPSE has helped the members in maintaining employment. A union will have the same foreknowledge, call
a strike and support its members in maintaining their employment. Taylor has stated differences between OAPSE and the union. In the past three years, OAPSE has set up negotiation work shops and model negotiation agreements for its members. Another similarity has been that both organizations have membership fees paid by the individuals. A difference here has been that the fee required by OAPSE is as small as one dollar per month and the fee requirement of a union has been substantially higher. The larger fee requirement has been a major reason for small communities not affiliating with a labor union. Both the OAPSE and the union have provided the local employees with methods of picking a negotiation committee, and supplied information on other school systems regarding salaries and fringe benefits for non-instructional (classified) employees. In some instances, members of OAPSE have been members of a local union. There have been no restrictions on member affiliations and in some instances, a more rounded program has been provided. Cincinnati and Cleveland have both affiliations. OAPSE has provided needed legislative pull and the union has instituted the collective bargaining.

At present, OAPSE has taken the dominant role in representing non-instructional (Classified) employees on a statewide basis in Ohio. Ohio, without a mandatory negotiation

---
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statute, has suffered greatly in this area. Through the collective strength, OAPSE has assured equity, recognition and legality. Positive components have developed out of both organizations. OAPSE operates on a very legal basis for equity and the union operates on a quasi-legal basis. Consequently, the threat of schools closing due to teacher strikes confronts the public. Very seldom has it been realized that if the non-instructional (classified) employees failed to perform their duties, the schools would close just as rapidly - if not more quickly than if the teaching staff did not report for work. Since the start of OAPSE in 1934, there have been only two strikes called by OAPSE local affiliates. Both of them were called last year. Whisman has described one situation this past year where the schools remained open, because of parents and the full non-instructional (classified) employees staff, even though the teachers were off the job.101

E. Five Non-Instructional Categories Overview

As previously mentioned, this descriptive survey will be concerned with five categories of non-instructional employees: clerical employees, food service employees, operational service employees, transportation service employees, and teacher assistant employees. This section of the review of literature will cover the importance of the services pro-

101Whisman, p. 20.
vided by the aforementioned.

1. Clerical Service

By some people, efficiency in the area of clerical assistance has been considered the most essential to the operation of a good school system. The skill and finess required has usually been supplied by women. The routine and detailed responsibilities have been essential to the smoothness of the total organization. Services provided by secretaries and clerks were earlier provided by the teacher and principals. Although the terms "secretary" and "clerk" have frequently been considered synonymous in some school systems, differences do exist. Secretaries usually have performed tasks of a highly confidential nature for a professional person and have been entrusted with responsibilities of specific detail in executive functions. Clerks, on the other hand, have performed in a lesser capacity with fewer responsibilities. Depending on the nature of the assignment, clerk classifications have been clerk-typists, clerk-operators and desk clerks. In addition to the job description difference, a wage difference also exists. Clerks have been paid less than secretaries in the past. Chandler and Petty surmised that some positions bearing impressive titles may be little more than glorified clerical or bookkeeping positions. Similar assertions have been made by others, also. 102

Public school systems have been in strong competition with private businesses. Private business has an advantage because it is concentrating on a single personnel field and often offers a higher salary for comparable training. Advancement in a non-instructional position in a school system is slow and uncertain. Most clerical service employees have been selected from graduating high school classes, business schools, employment bureaus and private businesses. Usually, a person filling a clerical position has started from the lower level and advanced to higher positions by capability and skill. In other instances, clerical positions have been filled with individuals starting higher within the hierarchy. Once a potential employee is interviewed and examined, he is placed on an eligibility list. The actual acceptance of assignment depends on salary, location, conditions, difficulty and personality factors. The induction and in-service education for these employees have an importance here. Five principle purposes have been listed:

1. To improve the quality and quantity of employees' work.

2. To equip and develop employees for better salaries, higher positions, and greater responsibilities.

3. To improve employee morale.

4. To stimulate interest in the school system and its objectives.

5. To keep employees alert for new ideas and to make them flexible for changes.103

These principles have made the necessary inductions, the under-

103 Ibid., p. 494.
standing of the school's purposes and its philosophy and techniques to new employees in orientation, easier. Yeager thought that a probationary period must be taken before actual full time employment.\(^4\) During this period, the new employee should have sympathetic supervision, work to improve weaknesses and receive encouragement. Although the duties and responsibilities vary among the clerical service employees, specialization has become a necessity for effectiveness and efficiency. Depending on the size of the school district, many of the clerical positions include stenographers, bookkeepers, school treasurers, attendance clerks, and telephone operators.

Because of the nature of the school year, Yeager said that most employment in the business office is considered full time while that in the principal's office is considered part-time.\(^5\) Supplemental employment during the summer months has led some efficient employees to seek full time permanent positions elsewhere. A stop-gap to this problem has been through activities that could provide full time employment during the summer months. He has suggested record keeping activities and the preparing of various materials and information for the beginning of the school year. Other activities could be concerned with school records and reports, filing, duplicating, supply inventories and storage, internal accounting, attendance,

\(^4\) Yeager, p. 170, 181

\(^5\) Yeager, p. 162.
census and scholarship records, handbooks and similar responsibilities. In addition, vacations and in-service training might be planned for this period of time.

To summarize, these support services have been proven to be invaluable to the administration and in the effectiveness and efficiency of the school system. Although this service lacks prestige and is non-instructional, its responsibilities and duties have made it one of the more responsible services. With the work conditions and wage and non-wage benefits out of proportion, changes are necessary to lessen the turnover, as well as for the improvement in the quality and quantity of personnel.

2. Food Services

Historically, school feeding programs can be traced back to 1796, to a soup kitchen in Munich. Although they have long been an integral part of the educational system of Europe, school lunch programs were initiated in the United States three-fourths of a century later. Linn noted that the Children's Society of New York served hot meals to poor and so-called "wild children" to attract them to schools as early as 1853.\(^{106}\) Forty years later, the idea of providing nourishment to help stimulate the mind was introduced in Boston. Later a "penny lunch" program was incorporated in Philadelphia. By the

\(^{106}\) Linn, p. 465
twentieth century, many schools served hot meals. Yeager has stated that the school provided the facilities while the cost was largely covered by private sources. Parents and teachers associations prepared and served the food. During the depression, lunchroom workers were paid out of Welfare Parents Association (WPA) funds. Government surplus commodities were made available and parent–teacher associations continued to support the general program. Jarvis, Gentry, Stephens, Moore and Walters have suggested several factors accounting for increases in the food service program after the 1930's. The National School Lunch Act provided larger-scale food service as a regular auxiliary service. A new emphasis has been placed on the school lunch programs because of educational and health advantages. Careful attention must be given to the selection, qualifications, in-service training and classification of these employees.

The employment of food service employees should follow the same policy as other non-instructional employees. Careful selection and induction enhances the vital service performed. In the past, part-time employment has been the best for this job because work is planned on one-half or two-thirds day basis. Today with breakfast being served in some school systems in addition to the regular lunch, this line of employment is be-

107 Yeager, p. 331-332.

108 Jarvis, p. 475, Moore and Walters, p. 134
coming full time work. Chandler, Moore, Yeager\textsuperscript{109} have asserted that a well-planned lunchroom staff should provide full time, part-time, and student employment.

Major problems in this area have been in salary, fringe benefits, work conditions and in high turnover rates. Management attitude, environment, labor policies, housing, schedules, remuneration and welfare have been important considerations of the employee programs. In addition, appraisal and human relations were extremely important.

3. 	extit{Operations Service}

Keeping the school physical plant open and in an operable condition has been an important function. Duties of this nature have been delegated to the operation service employees. Moore and Walters stated that this body of non-instructional employees has been extremely important since health and safety were of a major concern.

"The operating personnel have charge of physical property, some of which is powered by steam and other pressure units, and this property often constitutes the community's most valued physical asset."\textsuperscript{110}

Yeager said that this service refers to the need for keeping the school facilities open and available for use as needed.


\textsuperscript{110}Moore, p. 117.
"It includes the necessary personnel for these purposes, the supplies essential to operation, and all policies, procedures, and schedules involved in the process. Linn and Weber pointed out that a problem of this group of employees has been a lack of training. In addition, the responsibilities of this group of employees were not menial. Job prestige, work load and conditions, in-service and pre-service training, salary, fringe benefits and embedded attitudes of instructional employee have long been a problem.

The custodial program has needed reforms for many years to up-grade the services. Jarvis, Gentry and Stephens inform us that in the past, custodians were hired on the basis of how low a salary they could be paid.

"School custodial personnel have been selected on the basis that they could be employed at small expense, or else, because they did not possess the necessary skills or physical strength to hold more remunerative jobs. That day is rapidly passing." Linn, Chandler and others have suggested that if efficient service must be expected then potentially capable men and women must be employed. Custodians have been the heart of the building operation program. The most generous praise cannot overstate

111 Yeager, p. 217.
113 Jarvis, p. 223
114 Linn, p. 466, and Chandler, p. 389.
the worth of a top-notch custodian while the least said about
the inept, inefficient custodian is too much.

Recruitment and selection has been a problem in this
area. Traditionally, the school board has taken few positive
steps in non-instructional employee recruitment. Jarvis,
Gentry and Stephens suggested that a recruitment program should
be pursued to some extent by economic conditions existing
within the community.

"If there is an inadequate supply of unskilled
labor and if the prevailing wage rate for such
labor is reasonably high, the school district
will need to be energetic in competing for
available manpower. Competition for labor will
also require that the school system be able to
compete with private business and governmental
agencies in terms of salaries for comparable
labor and in terms of the desirability of work-
ing conditions and fringe benefits."115

Scherer, Linn, Chandler and Yeager116 have expressed concern in
the area of custodial improvement. Salary was out of propor-
tion and more dignity and respect was needed for the position
with its responsibilities. Attracting potentially capable
individuals has been a problem. In general, half of the pro-lem of building services were solved when potentially capable
people were secured. The troubles were multiplied when incom-
petent individuals were employed. The same considerations that
have permitted the selection of incompetent persons for public
positions—favoritism, acquaintance, sympathy, friendship,
indifference, political influence and other pressures - have served to keep such persons on the payroll indefinitely. Civil service, which protected employees against unjust dismissal, also protected the undeserving.

The day of the school janitor has passed and the day of the school custodian has little longevity. The era of the operating engineer has been on the horizon for many years. Actually, all non-instructional employees have begun to approach a professional level of training to keep abreast with the modern school. Some form of certification based on appropriate training and demonstration of ability must be developed. Professional organizations of these employees should be comparable to those of teachers and administrators.

4. Transportation Services

It was recognized many years ago that student transportation was a necessary part of equal and quality education. Due to school consolidation and densely settled areas, the need was met as early as 1840 in the United States. Assertions about the historical setting of the transportation services have been made by Linn. Jarvis, and others.117 After Massachusetts Legislature passed a law permitting taxation for transportation the movement spread throughout the New England

States and by 1920 all states had student transportation. The service once cost a few pennies per student; today it costs between $17.00 and $43.00 per student each year. This service had cost Quincy, Massachusetts, $521.12 for all students between 1874 and 1875. Originally operating with horse-drawn wagons, this service has developed into big business. School buses transport more than one-third of the nation's school children every school day on regular daily runs. Field, special and athletic trips, and recent developments in bussing students for racial balance have further increased the service.

Although transportation was privately run at the outset, the growth of this service has paralleled the advance of school consolidation and the decline of the one-teacher rural school. Yeager illustrated this with seven factors he noted in the development of pupil transportation. 118

1. The remarkable development of motor transportation
2. Improved highways throughout rural areas
3. Establishment of consolidation
4. Increased demands for more adequate educational opportunities for all children
5. Statute provisions in all states
6. Availability of more funds for education, and

The quality and cost of school transportation has depended

118 Yeager, p. 245
on the driver. His responsibility covers the safety of operation and the well-being of the children. Property (bus) depreciation, promptness of children pick-up and delivery, public and community relations, and student safety and moral development have been the bus drivers' responsibility. The attitude of the driver also has a great impact on the morale of the service and the emotional security of the community. Although this service has been part-time work in some cases, the skills and competencies needed have rapidly changed it to a full time job. The brief training and experience requirement in the past has given way to more demanding standards to secure reliable and competent drivers. In rural areas, the potential supply has been limited and in urban areas, the competition with better paying jobs limits the competent supply. Frequently, individual have used this employment as a second job because of the low salary. In the past, salaries have come from funds appropriated for services rendered and in some cases, this has interfered with other programs. A continuous supply of competent drivers depends upon a clear recognition of the job dimensions for an effective utilization of the service. The salary of a bus driver must be commensurate with the number of hours worked. The salary has to be kept in line with the cost of living in a particular community and competitive with the local labor market.

Since the school bus driver actually works only three and one half to four hours a day on the road, there has been
some speculation that a dual job assignment should exist to give the driver full time employment. Other services suggested have been maintenance of buildings and grounds, custodial duties, maintenance and repair of busses, as attendance officers, clerical workers, cafeteria work, and storeroom clerks. Linn, Jarvis, and others have also pointed out the limitations to the part-time employment.\(^1\) It has been an inefficient practice to use employees of different caliber as bus drivers. The competence and special skills have been forgotten. In addition, much of the work suggested to be performed by the bus driver can best be performed during the busing hours. Part-time employment has also been an unsound practice because higher pay has been required on an hourly basis since housewives, retired men and students usually performed the duties. Because of the large turnover rate, the employees have little loyalty and dedication to part-time employment. Poor fringe benefits, inadequate in-service training, and low salaries have added to the problems. Roe declared that the problems encountered in using school employees in dual assignments have usually stemmed from failure to work out specific time schedules and to clarify job duties.\(^2\) Yeager stated part-time employees were necessary for school transportation.

\(^1\) Linn, p. 502, and Jarvis, p. 205.

"Since such employment cannot be considered full time in the sense of the salary received, it is obvious that the driver must also work in some other capacity. If the operator is employed full time by the school district, the following are some part-time school duties assigned to him: custodial work, maintenance of building and grounds, attendance officer, maintenance and repair of school buses, clerical work, cafeteria work, storeroom work, and teaching."\[121]

This statement also suggests that personnel must be placed by ability and competency. Although teachers were suggested as bus drivers, it was also suggested that it would interfere with the instructional program.

In some school districts, bus drivers have not been necessary because of ownership methods. The three most prevailing types of ownership have been: (1) public school owned, (2) private owned, and (3) joint owned. When the bus fleet has been publically owned, the school district has purchased, maintained, managed, and provided liability insurance and qualified bus drivers. In the privately owned bus fleet, the service has been contracted, and all responsibilities have been delegated to someone else in addition to funds to pay for it. In the third method, joint owned, the responsibilities are combined. In some instances, the school district provided the bus drivers and insurance, while the private company furnished the vehicles and maintenance services.

Although the school bus driver has been the most important

\[121\] Yeager, p. 359, 360.
individual in this category, some school districts have employed individuals who also work as truck drivers, delivery men, mail drivers, bus guards and garage mechanics.

In summary, effective student transportation service has contributed to an effective educational program. Securing competent employees has added considerably to a well founded program. Wage and non-wage benefits have aided in securing loyal employees. Although the student transportation service has developed considerably in the past century, it still has a long distance to go before it becomes effective and efficient.

E. Teacher Aides (Paraprofessionals)

The new breed of paraprofessionals joining the work force of the school systems are people who serve as library aides, audio-visual aides and cafeteria aides (lunchroom supervision). Other duties include grading objective tests, (at school or at home), duplicating materials, making charts, setting up bulletin board displays, recording information on records for report cards, taking attendance, etc., preparing typing tests, lesson plans and outlines. They also serve as nurses aides, materials supply clerks, recess aides, playground supervisors, reading assistants, in maintenance (housekeeping chores), sell and collect lunch tickets. In addition they assist physically handicapped children, act as mail clerks, detention room aides, perform as science lab technicians, monitors (study halls, rest rooms, tests), supervise bus duty, are music aides, field trip
aides, switchboard aides, pre-school aides, administrative aides, physical education class aides, language lab aides, and supervise the use of reference centers and so forth.

The services rendered by the paraprofessionals in a school system have been invaluable. By freeing the teacher from such menial tasks as distributing supplies, checking attendance and correcting papers, the teacher has been able to teach. Although the terminology for paraprofessionals differs in different states, other terms in use are teacher aides, teacher helpers and teacher assistants. The writer has no reference to a substitute teacher who does temporary teaching assignments and has a certificate. Perkins and Becker have acknowledged that though this position is relatively new to the teaching field it has been very helpful.

"Recently and particularly since the Korean War, scores of school boards...have acted to provide funds to hire persons to assist classroom teachers in various ways. Teacher aide programs are now an accepted part of the school program in hundreds of school districts throughout the nation."122

Perkins and Becker further noted that the duties were primarily non-clerical such as those lunch time aides and aides who worked directly with children either in group situations or individually as well as in other supportive non-instructional tasks. Perkins and Becker have urged the use of the phrase

"teacher aide" rather than paraprofessional.

"The group of persons assisting teachers by performing various functions will be referred to as teacher aides, a term that is far more suitable than paraprofessional."\(^\text{129}\)

The activities performed by the teacher aides have required special competencies and have varied according to the legal requirements. A list has been compiled of the activities performed in various cities today.

1. Take roll call and report attendance to the principal.
3. Help in physical education periods.
4. Assemble, prepare, distribute, and replace surplus materials.
5. Check papers, record grades, return papers.
6. Rearrange desks to group reading levels.
7. Make lists of library books in room.
8. Help individual pupils with problems.
9. Do general housekeeping tasks.
10. Change room decorations.
11. Supervise relief time and recess periods.
12. Help substitute teacher plan for day's work.
14. Telephone reports to Board of Education Building.
15. Operate movie projector.

The problem that has arisen in the teaching profession today in regard to paraprofessionals is that few educators have expressed concern over the need to establish criteria to distinguish between tasks that are professional and paraprofes-

\(^{129}\)bid., p. 34-35.
In examining the tasks performed, Wills defined paraprofessionals as non-instructional employees brought into the school to assist the instructional process and individualize the learning opportunity.

The impetus that prompted the hiring of paraprofessionals recently passed federal legislation that provided the financial means for their employment. Tanner and Tanner commented that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, and the Educational Professions Development Act of 1967, were instrumental in supplying the financial means.

The Educational Research Service of the NEA observed that forty percent of all teacher aide programs started in the 1965-66 school year and one-half of the programs operating in large public schools have existed no more than three years.

The reasons teachers welcome paraprofessionals into the schools are many. The paramount reason as observed by Wills has been the support to the staff in the instructional envi-


onment through the improvement of individualized learning opportunities. Other reasons are the alleviation of a manpower shortage by putting the non-instructionals on the job and freeing the instructional specialist from menial jobs.

As indicated earlier, there has been no basis for determining the kinds of tasks that paraprofessionals should or should not perform. Tanner and Tanner have stated,

"While the function of such personnel is, ostensibly, to relieve teachers of non-teaching duties, the literature indicates growing confusion as to their legal role in the school and classroom, and what constitutes an act of teaching or instruction as contrasted with a non-teaching act."

One has only to review the literature to find that there is little taxonomy among members of the profession as to agreement about the organization and classification of paraprofessionals as applied to education.

Recently, a study was undertaken to determine the role and function of teacher aides and to analyze the legally stated functions of aides in contrast to the functions generally regarded as being in the domain of teaching. The response of the chief state school officers in each of the fifty states to a questionnaire showed that:

---
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A. Teacher aides have been employed in virtually all of the states.

B. Laws pertaining to their employment and functions were in effect in only ten states.

C. Eleven states had developed policies or guidelines.

D. Twenty-nine states reported having no statutory provisions and no policies or guidelines for teacher aides.

E. Seven states reported that statutes or guidelines are in the process of being developed.

Laws regarding duties of aides
California, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon and Vermont.

Policy statements or guidelines regarding duties of aides
Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Maine, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

No laws, policy statements, or guidelines regarding duties of aides.
Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Utah, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia.13

It is obvious that some states do little more than shed further confusion on an already confusing issue by the language used for clarification purposes on the difference between instructional and non-instructional tasks. Using Nevada as an example, the statute has granted the local boards the power to employ non-instructional employees. These non-instructional employees must be supervised by certified personnel when performing instructional tasks but if not engaged in instruction,
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then supervision is not required. The statute goes on to state that each local board employing aides established its own policies regarding the duties of such personnel.

Other assertions made in the Tanner study indicated that problems existed in twenty-three states with the function of aides. The problems primarily existed because of extreme difficulty in differentiating between what constitutes teaching and non-teaching functions.

The confusion can be further illustrated by citing as an example the supervision of study halls. Aides or para-professionals in Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, South Dakota and Virginia are not permitted to supervise study halls; but in Connecticut and Montana, aides may perform this function. In Oregon and Maine aides may perform this function if "independent study" is taking place.

In Delaware, aides are required to have a permit which is categorized as a sub-standard certificate. In Florida, the statutes prohibit aides from serving in an instructional capacity unless they possess a valid teaching certificate. In Illinois, the legislature passed a bill permitting school boards to employ non-certificated personnel to assist in the instruction of pupils under the immediate supervision of a certified teacher.

It is interesting to note that in California the legislature made provisions in 1966, for the employment of para-

---
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professionals. The Instructional Aide Act of 1968 followed. This act authorizes the employment of aides to be used in instruction in regular education programs.

The qualifications of aides differs from state to state. In Iowa, a regulation has required that applicants for non-teaching positions with supervisory duties complete sixty semester hours of college preparation; whereas aides in Oregon and Maine have needed only a high school degree, to be eighteen years of age and a citizen of the United States.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER II

This chapter has been devoted to reviewing and analyzing literature related to public employees at the Federal, State and local level. In addition, the following pertinent factors of the study have been examined: (1) the National labor movement, (2) negotiations and education, (3) non-instructional school employees and education, (4) non-instructional school employee representative organizations, and (5) five non-instructional school employee categories.

Section One (I)

The National labor movement covered pertinent literature on the historical setting of labor and unions in the United States. Major labor acts, their strengths and weaknesses, and their relationship to public employees at the Federal level were investigated. Legislation at the state level concerning public employees was reviewed and related to all public employee groups including teachers and non-instructional school
employees. Negotiations and collective bargaining at many public levels were discussed in addition to the legality of collective agreements and the legality of public employee strikes.

Section Two (II)

In this section, the relevance of labor in education was related to section one and private enterprise. Also, the NEA and its affiliates and the AFT and its affiliates were discussed as well as the possibility of future mergers between the two. A final discussion in this section was centered on the causal factors for collective negotiations in public education.

Section Three (III)

Section three consisted of a detailed overview of the non-instructional school employees as public employees. Also, major components of a personnel program were investigated such as: salary, fringe benefits, turnover rates, staff development, and in-service training programs.

Section Four (IV)

The representative organizations for non-instructional employees were covered in great detail in this section. Policy differences between OAPSE and labor unions were also discussed.

Section Five (V)

The final section in the review of the literature was
devoted to a detailed description of the five non-instructional school employee groups of this study; namely, clerical service employees, food service employees, operation service employees, transportation service employees and teacher aide employees.

The writer found it necessary to investigate the five sections and to point out various ties as they related to public employees and laws. In addition, similarities existed between the organization representing teachers (NEA) and the organization representing the non-instructional school employees (OAPSE). Similarities also existed between the teacher organization affiliated with the AFL-CIO (AFT) and the other non-instructional school employee organizations affiliated with the AFL-CIO (the local labor unions). The writer has developed these similarities as they related to the problem of the study. The question still exists as to the influence the two teacher organizations and the two non-instructional school employee organizations have on the non-instructional employee salaries, fringe benefits and training programs. The preceding has been preparation to effectively approach the following chapters with Chapter III dealing with the methodology and procedure of the study.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Overview

Chapter II consisted of an examination of the changing legal structure of the National, Federal and State labor movements as it concerns public employees. This examination provided the necessary background information for the study. The combined analysis of the policies of the two major teacher organizations and the two major non-instructional organizations, relative to public employees and collective bargaining, has bridged important information gaps in labor and education. This chapter will attempt to describe the instrument, the data collected, the data treatment and its relationship to the entire study.

Methods and Procedures

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methods and procedures used to bring about the completion of this study. As previously stated in Chapter I, the writer used the questionnaire and the interview to collect data for analysis and from which general description of the programs involved in the study could be fashioned.

Methods of Gathering Data

Information used in this study was collected in two parts. Before collecting any information, the writer carefully reviewed the problems and major components of the study.
The problem was to ascertain various influences on the personnel programs for non-instructional school employees. Considered were the non-instructional employees program, the two teacher organizations (NEA and AFT), the labor orientation of the communities (labor or non-labor) and the two non-instructional employee organizations (OAPSE and the local labor unions). Areas of the non-instructional employees' programs examined for a determination of the effect of their influences were negotiation patterns, salaries and fringe benefits. The five non-instructional school employee groups used were clerical service employees, food service employees, operation service employees (custodial), transportation service employees and teacher aide employees.

The school districts studied were in the state of Ohio and located in the thirteen largest cities with populations of 73,000 people or more. The school districts were as follows: Akron, Canton, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Euclid, Kettering, Lorain, Parma, Springfield, Toledo and Youngstown.

Using the components of the study and the school districts, the writer has developed the following "community orientation-organization affiliation" classifications to illustrate what was happening in the selected areas of the non-instructional personnel program:

I. In the school districts of Cleveland and Toledo,
the communities were labor oriented, the teachers were represented by the AFT, and the non-instructional school employees were represented by local unions.

II. In the school districts of Columbus and Kettering, the communities were non-labor oriented, the teachers were represented by the NEA, and the non-instructional school employees were represented by OAPSE.

III. In the school districts of Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown, the communities were labor oriented, the teachers were represented by the NEA, and the non-instructional school employees were represented by local labor unions.

IV. In the school districts of Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma and Springfield, the communities were labor oriented, the teachers were represented by the NEA, and the non-instructional school employees were represented by OAPSE.

Once the problem was placed in true perspective, the first part of the needed information was collected through a series of six personal interviews. The writer visited and interviewed in the Cleveland Public School system where material about the problem was reviewed. To validate the problem, the writer visited the Ohio Civil Service Employees
Association where information was collected on public services provided by civil service employees. Visits and interviews were conducted at the Ohio Association of Public School Employees where information was collected on the majority of the non-instructional school employees in Ohio. The Ohio Education Association was the source of information on teacher organizations. Interviews with members of the Ohio State Department of Education elicited material on the salary schedules of non-instructional school employees. Lastly, interviews were conducted with the Ohio Federation of Teachers where information was collected on the AFT.

The second part of the information desired was obtained through the use of a nine page questionnaire guide and this instrument went through six months of preliminary drafts and pilot trials.

The first draft of the questionnaire was developed after the nature of the problem was determined. Through an extensive visit with the personnel department of the Cleveland Ohio Public School System and detailed looks into the existing literature on non-instructional employees, major problem areas of concern were identified and incorporated in the questionnaire.

A second draft was completed with help from a member of the Center of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Massachusetts as well as from members of the
Center of Leadership and Administration. In addition, doctoral candidates from the latter center were very helpful in criticizing and making suggestions for improving the original questionnaire guide.

The third and final draft was compiled after reviewing weaknesses indicated by the Ohio Association of Public School Employees, the Candidates Advisory Committee and after a pilot run in three Ohio school districts.

The original questionnaire guide was reduced to six pages and limited to three (3) areas of primary concern. With the pilot test and minor revisions made, this instrument was presented to the dissertation committee for final evaluation before it was submitted to the selected school districts.

Internal Aspects of the Instrument

This questionnaire guide has been designed to gather data from the individual in a school district in charge of the non-instructional school employees. In most instances, this individual has been either the director of business affairs or the director of personnel. The three primary information target areas in this six page questionnaire guide are salary, fringe benefits and patterns of negotiation for the non-instructional school employees. Sub-categories within these three primary areas are:

1. General Information on Professional School Employees
2. General Information on Non-instructional School Employees
3. Non-instructional Training Programs
4. Non-instructional Fringe Benefits such as Working Conditions, Leave Policies, Vacations and Insurance Programs
5. Negotiation Patterns of 1969-70
6. Future Problems and Fringe Benefits

In using the term non-instructional, the writer is referring to five selected categories of non-teaching school employees, namely:

1. Clerical (secretaries, typists, clerks, receptionists)
2. Food Service (servers, preparers)
3. Operations (custodians, matrons, laborers)
4. Transportation (bus drivers, truck drivers, delivery men)
5. Teacher Assistants (teacher aides, para-professionals)

In obtaining information on the labor orientation of the thirteen school districts, the writer received assistance from the Department of Statistics in the Ohio State Department. In addition, the writer received valuable assistance in this area from OAPSE and the OEA. The thirteen school districts (of the study) also validated the findings.
The Sample

The questionnaire guide, as ultimately developed, was used by the writer during interviews. It presented questions to the interviewee in an organized manner and served as a means of recording data systematically. (See Appendix.)

Before visiting the prospective school districts, contacts were made by telephone call followed by a letter conforming the visit. The personal interviews were conducted with personnel administrators of the five categories of non-instructional employees during the months of January and February of 1971. This primary interview followed previous interviews held during the preliminary study with Cleveland and Columbus. In each case, the writer spent approximately three to five days. For the questionnaire guide, the writer spent approximately one-half to one full day in each school district.

The major portion of the questionnaire guide was completed and recorded on tape, while a small portion was left behind to be completed and sent in by mail. In some instances, a follow-up letter was necessary to speed up the return by mail, but generally the cooperation was overwhelming.

The questionnaire letters directed to the local chambers of commerce were hand delivered and the same procedure followed as that used for the school employees. Considering the fact that only two means of communica-
Ohio.

2. Amherst College Library, Amherst, Massachusetts.

3. The University of Massachusetts Libraries, Amherst, Massachusetts.


5. The Ohio State University Library, Columbus, Ohio.

6. The Ohio State Department of Education Library, Columbus, Ohio.

7. The Ohio Association of Public School Employees Library, Columbus, Ohio.

8. The Ohio Educational Association Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Basic references used to identify studies, reports, textbooks and articles included the Educational Index; Review of Educational Research; Dissertation Abstracts; and card catalogs of the above libraries. A large number of articles, books, theses and dissertations pertinent to the writer's area of concern were read and summarized in Chapter II. Some references were also used to document certain statements in Chapter I.

In addition to using the written resources, the writer also used personal interviews to obtain additional information. In the winter, spring and summer of 1970, the writer visited several resource sites for information; namely, the
Ohio Education Association; the Ohio State Department of Education; the Ohio Association of Civil Service Employees; the Ohio Association of Public School Employees; the Ohio affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers; The Columbus Public School System; and the Cleveland Public School System. The writer wishes to add that the Ohio Association of Public School Employees who represent most of the non-instructional employees in Ohio were extremely helpful throughout the entire study.

In the summary of the literature and interviews, the writer attempted to bring together studies and philosophies that pointed up the same major issues with which the study was concerned. It was found that interest in non-instructional employee programs existed; however, little was being done and little was known about what could be done. There was also great interest in what was happening across the state with non-instructional employees and in the impact of the pattern of negotiations.

The basic study for the writer's descriptive survey clearly defined an area where there continues to be a needed up-grading to help bridge the gap between the programs of professional school employees and those of non-instructional school employees.

Data Treatment

After coding the thirteen usable survey instruments,
plans were developed for recording the data for each response. The writer also had the helpful consideration of center members and doctoral candidates. (The information provided was straight descriptive runs and percentage runs for each school district and the school districts to the four situations.) With these runs, the writer was able to construct tables needed to make further analysis of the data for this study. However, before the tables could be set up, it was necessary to do some hand tabulating from the data processing straight run and from the information an all non-instructional employees salary schedules provided by the Ohio State Department of Education.

Elaborate statistical methods were not attempted because the nature of the study does not require such measures to analyze and describe the data extracted from the survey instrument. In addition, a statistical manipulation of most of the data would be inaccurate because of the variable in the thirteen cities.

Analysis of the Data

The data collected from the survey instruments is in the tables located in Chapter IV. Analyses were made and findings were presented in Chapter IV to show evidence to support certain statements.
Procedures for Developing the Summary and Conclusions and Recommendations

In writing the summary, the writer briefly reviewed the procedures, findings, and entire scope of the problem. Since evidence from the various facets of the problem was presented in Chapter IV, the most important points are merely integrated in a summary in Chapter V.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Overview

In chapter II, it was noted that the labor movement in the private sector had advanced more rapidly than the labor movement in the public sector at the federal, state and local levels. It was also indicated that public employees at all levels have challenged public laws and that the state legislatures have begun to revise provisions of the state laws. Similarities between the teacher and non-instructional employee organizations were developed to illustrate a variety of linkages. Also, the five non-instructional school employee groups were developed to indicate their importance and relationship to the total school enterprise. Finally, the legalities of public employee strikes and collective agreements were discussed and related to the education component.

In chapter III, the design, methodology, and procedures of the study were discussed in greater detail. The development of the questionnaire guide and the personnel interview schedule was discussed in order to give an indication as to the manner in which the investigator collected and utilized the information.

Chapter IV has been designed to discuss in greater detail the data collected in chapter III. The analyzed information represented the 1970-71 school year pattern of
negotiation, salary and fringe benefit programs. The first part, pattern of negotiation, has consisted of the selection of the thirteen largest Ohio school districts, the four categories of the study as they related to the thirteen school districts and the representative affiliations, and the patterns of negotiation by the individual school district and the four categories. As some points, percentages were used to clarify various issues.

The second part, analysis of salary information, has been divided into three sections to indicate the way in which the individual school districts ranked by themselves and the manner they ranked in the four categories and the thirteen school districts composed. A series of tables and graphs are used here.

The third part, analysis of fringe benefit information, was treated similarly to part two. The individual school district rank was indicated as well as the thirteen school districts in the four categories.

**General Information**

In analyzing the information in this section, several important facts were established early. The selection of the school districts was based on the size of the cities. Table 1 clearly indicates the 1970 population figures as compiled by the United States Census Bureau.
Evolving from the statement of the problem were several relationships within each city. Of the six variables of the study, only three existed in each school district.

School districts were in either a labor or non-labor community.

Teachers were affiliated with the NEA or the AFT. Non-instructional school employees were affiliated with OAPSE or with a local labor union.

In establishing the labor orientation of the communities, the expertise of several Ohio organizations and the thirteen school districts were used. The organizations were:

1. The Ohio Association of Public School Employees
2. The Ohio Civil Service Employees Association
3. The Ohio Education Association
4. The Ohio Federation of Teachers
5. The Ohio State Department of Education
6. The Ohio State Department of Statistics

In addition, the thirteen school districts that established the labor orientation of the study have been listed in Table 1. Also, the College of Education at Ohio University and the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts assisted in establishing the labor orientation of the communities. The criteria used in this study to establish a labor oriented and non-labor oriented community were: (1) whether the community had more property tax coming from industry than from residential living quarters, (2) whether the community had more residential living quarters than industry, (3) whether the work force commuted out of the community to work and returned to sleep, and (4) whether the work force worked and lived in the same community. Not generalizing beyond this study, the thirteen school districts of this study and the four criteria listed above, it was concluded that Columbus and Kettering were non-labor oriented school districts and the remaining eleven school districts were in labor oriented communities. The eleven school districts were: Akron, Canton, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dayton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma, Springfield, Toledo, and Youngstown. The school district of Columbus has been listed as being in a non-labor community
because most of its industries and businesses are located in the suburbs. The labor orientations of the school districts have been listed in Table 2.

In establishing the primary representative organizations of the teachers, the writer used the assistance of the Ohio Education Association, the Ohio Federation of Teachers, and the personnel directors in the thirteen school districts of the study. Cleveland and Toledo were the only two school districts affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The remaining eleven school districts were affiliated with the National Education Association (NEA). The eleven school districts were Akron, Canton, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, Euclid, Kettering, Lorain, Parma, Springfield and Youngstown. The teacher representative organizations have been illustrated on Table 2.

The non-instructional school employee primary representative affiliation was obtained with the assistance of the Ohio Association of Public School Employees (OAPSE) and the personnel directors in the thirteen school districts. Five school districts were primarily affiliated with local labor unions: Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dayton, Toledo and Youngstown. The remaining eight school districts were Akron, Canton, Columbus, Euclid, Kettering, Lorain, Parma and Springfield. Table 2 has illustrated the primary affiliations of the non-instructional school employees.
TABLE 2
THIRTEEN OHIO CITIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO SIX PRIMARY VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities and School Districts</th>
<th>Community Labor Pattern</th>
<th>Instructional Employees Representation</th>
<th>Non-instructional Employees Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>OAPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>OAPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Non-Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>OAPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>OAPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Non-Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>OAPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>OAPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>OAPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>OAPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the information on Table 2, the thirteen school districts were divided into four classifications. These classifications were based upon the three variables present and information was obtained on three primary concerns in the school districts of the four categories; namely, the 1970-71 patterns of negotiation, salary and fringe benefit. By categorizing each school district according to these
classes and concerns, the writer developed the four classifications as follow:

I. School districts where the community is labor-oriented, the professional employees are represented by an affiliate of the AFT and the non-instructional employees are represented by a local labor union. School districts in Ohio in this classification were Cleveland and Toledo.

II. School districts where the community is non-labor oriented, the professional employees are represented by an affiliate of the NEA and the non-instructional employees are non-union but affiliated with OAPSE. School districts in Ohio in this classification were Columbus and Kettering.

III. School districts where the community is labor-oriented, the professional employees are an affiliate of the NEA and the non-instructional employees are represented by a local union. School districts in Ohio of this type were Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown.

IV. School districts where the community is labor-oriented, the professional employees are represented by an affiliate of the NEA and the non-instructional employees are non-union but are represented by OAPSE. School districts in Ohio in this category were Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma and Springfield.
The following table has been designed to show the organizational affiliations of the teachers and the non-instructional school employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Districts in each Classification</th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT(Teachers) Union(Non-Ins)</th>
<th>Non-Labor Oriented NEA(Teachers) OAPSE(Non-Ins)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA(Teachers) Union(Non-Ins)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA(Teachers) OAPSE(Non-Ins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Dayton, Youngstown</td>
<td>Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma, Springfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the teacher affiliations, all groups of the non-instructional school employees did not have the same representative affiliation. In other words, there existed little exclusive bargaining rights by individual organizations. Using the five non-instructional school employee component groups, the affiliation percentages by OAPSE and the local labor union have been listed on Table 4. In the clerical service area, only three school districts had primary affiliations with local labor unions and they were Cincinnati, Cleveland and Toledo. The remaining ten school districts had primary affiliations with OAPSE. In the food service area, only three school districts had primary affiliations with local labor unions: Cincinnati, Cleveland and Dayton. The
### Table 4

**Non-Instructional School Employee Representative Affiliations by School Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>Canton</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Sidney</th>
<th>Kettering</th>
<th>Lorain</th>
<th>Lima</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
<th>Youngstown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Service Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 25</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 25</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Service Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 25</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Assistant Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 25</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Service Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 25</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **U**: Union
- **O**: OAPSE
- **N**: Neither
- **B**: Both
operation service area had nine school districts affiliated with local labor unions and four school districts affiliated with OAPSE. Only Canton, Columbus, Kettering and Springfield were primarily affiliated with OAPSE in this area. The teacher assistant service area had seven school districts not affiliated with any group: Akron, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, Euclid, Kettering and Toledo. With regard to primary affiliations with OAPSE, Canton, Lorain and Springfield were listed. Local labor unions had primary affiliations for teachers assistants in the school districts of Cleveland and Youngstown. Joint bargaining existed in the school district of Parma. In the area of transportation, three school districts were not affiliated, four school districts were primarily affiliated with OAPSE and the remaining six school districts were local labor union affiliated. The non-affiliated school districts were Cincinnati, Dayton, and Lorain. The OAPSE affiliated school districts were Canton, Columbus, Parma and Springfield. Finally, the union affiliated school districts were Cleveland, Euclid, Kettering, Toledo and Youngstown.

Pattern of Negotiation

As a further means of analyzing information in this area, Table 5 has been designed to show various trends in negotiation patterns. Concerned with the labor aspects alone, eleven of the school districts were in labor oriented communities, two school districts had teachers affiliated with the AFT, and five school districts had the non-
instructional school employees affiliated with local labor unions. With regard to the existing non-labor aspects, two school districts were in non-labor oriented communities, eleven school districts had teachers affiliated with the NEA, and eight school districts had non-instructional school employees affiliated with OAPSE, which is a non-labor union.

With regard to strikes and work stoppages, the non-instructional school employees in two school districts were in labor oriented communities and the teachers had participated in strikes also. These school districts were Toledo and Youngstown. Other similarities were that both school districts non-instructional school employees were primarily affiliated with local labor unions, they had never arbitrated conflicts, neither had a closed shop membership, both permitted dues check offs, and both had negotiating teams.

The range of years that instructional employees have been negotiating was two to twenty-three years, while the range of years for negotiating by non-instructional employees was from two to nineteen years. Five of the thirteen school districts reported labor relations bureaus in the community. In addition, twelve of the thirteen school districts reported the existence of negotiating teams for the school board. Representative elections were held for non-instructional employees in nine school districts. Ar-
bitration of conflicts were held for non-instructional employees in three school districts. Because of state regulations regarding public employees, there were no closed shops.

The school districts of Cleveland and Toledo were similar. Both were located in labor oriented communities, with the instructional employees affiliated with the AFT and the non-instructional employees affiliated with local labor unions. The instructional and non-instructional employees in both districts have been bargaining four to five years. Both school districts had labor relation bureaus, non-instructional representative elections, periods of arbitration, negotiating teams and no closed shops. Another similarity existed in the number of work slow downs and stoppages in 1969-70. In both school districts the instructional employees had participated in work stoppages, while the non-instructional school employees in Cleveland had not. The non-instructional school employees in Toledo had participated in some work stoppages. (Refer to Table 5)

Only two school districts, Columbus and Kettering, were located in non-labor oriented communities. The similarities between these school districts were as follows: (1) NEA and OAPSE affiliations, (2) no instructional or non-instructional work stoppages or slowdowns, (3) bargaining with instructional or non-instructional employees had occurred for a period of three to six years, (4) there
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>Canton</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Layton</th>
<th>Euclid</th>
<th>Nutterning</th>
<th>Lorain</th>
<th>Warren</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
<th>Youngstown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Type of Community</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N-L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N-L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Primary Instructional Affiliation</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Years Negotiating</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructional Work Stoppage</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Primary Non-Instructional Affiliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of Years Negotiating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-Instructional Work Stoppage</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Labor Relations Bureau Present</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Representative Elections Non-Inst.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conflict Arbitration by Non-Inst.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Negotiating Team Non-Inst.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Closed Shop Non-Inst.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dues Check-Off Permitted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 0: OAPSE   L: Labor  U: Union  N-L: Non-Labor
were no closed shops, and (5) representative elections were held. Differences existed in that Columbus had a labor relation bureau in the community, and a negotiating team, and arbitration of conflicts.

Of the school districts with an OAPSE affiliation, none were affiliated with the AFT. Also, no work stoppages or slow downs were performed by non-instructional employees affiliated with OAPSE. However, in two of the above school districts the instructional employees had work stoppages or slow downs. Of the five school districts with the non-instructional employees affiliated with local labor unions, only two of them had teachers affiliated with the AFT--Cleveland and Toledo. In addition, Cleveland, Dayton, Toledo and Youngstown had instructional work stoppages while Toledo and Youngstown had non-instructional work stoppages. In regard to periods of arbitration, Dayton was the only one with positive response. The other four had a negative response here. All five school districts had negotiating teams for non-instructional employees and three of the five had labor relations bureaus in the community. It can also be noted that dues check-offs were permitted in all thirteen school districts.

The final part of the investigation on patterns of negotiation has been devoted to placing percentage to various issues to indicate where they stand in the four classifications.

Table 6 has been designed to illustrate the percentage
of non-instructional employees affiliated with OAPSE and the Union, the percentage of school districts to each classification, the percentage of OAPSE school districts, and the percentage of union affiliated school districts to each category.

It was illustrated that 38.5% of the school districts had non-instructional employees union affiliation while 61.5% were OAPSE affiliated. Also, it was shown that the percentage of school districts to each classification was: (I) 15.4%, (II) 15.4%, (III) 23.1%, and (IV) 46.1%. In addition, Table 6 indicated the percentage of OAPSE affiliated school districts to each classification. Finally, the percentage of union affiliated school districts to each classification was indicated.

Table 7 has been designed to illustrate the percentage of teachers by school district affiliated with the NEA and AFT, the percentages of school districts to each classification, the percentage of NEA school districts, and the percentage of AFT school districts. It was illustrated that 15.4% of the school districts were AFT affiliated while 84.6% were NEA affiliated. Also, the percentage of school districts to each classification was indicated. In addition the percentage of NEA school districts and the percentage of AFT school districts were illustrated.

Now that the teacher organization and the non-instructional employee organization has been covered, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of LTV</th>
<th>OR/NI</th>
<th>OR/LT</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**

**APPLICATON CLASSIFICATION**

**COMMUNITY ORIENTATION-OrientATION APPLICATON CLASSIFICATION**

*The Percentage of OR-Non-Instructional School Employees by School Districts*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>6'6&quot; NA</th>
<th>15'4&quot; AP</th>
<th>Total Percentage of Art and Math Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WM (Non-Inst)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM (Teachers)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM (Non-Inst)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM (Teachers)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (Non-Inst)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (Teachers)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Cant.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma, Sparta, Lexand</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- In each class, teachers are organized by school districts.

**Table:**

**Community Organization:**

The writer has given consideration to another major factor of the study—the labor orientation of the community. As previously discussed, the communities of the study were either labor or non-labor. Eleven of the communities were labor while the remaining two were non-labor. The following table has been designed to indicate these findings in percentage terms. The non-labor percentage was 15.4% and the labor percentage was 84.6%. It illustrates the percentage of school districts to each classification. The respective percentages were 15.4%, 15.4%, 23.1% and 46.1%. Also, it illustrated the percentage of school districts in labor oriented communities. In classification one, two school districts, (Cleveland and Toledo) were represented comprising 18.2% of the labor school districts. Classification two contained two school districts (Columbus and Kettering) and both of which were not labor school districts. Classification three represented three school districts (Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown) comprising 27.3% of the labor school districts. Classification four represented six school districts (Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain Parma and Springfield) which comprised 54.5% of the labor school districts.

Finally, the table illustrated the percentage of non-labor school districts. The only classification with non-labor school districts was classification two and the two
school districts were Cleveland and Toledo.

Table 8 has been designed to illustrate non-instructional employee work stoppages and work slow-downs and teacher work stoppages and work slow-downs by percentages. Moreover, the table showed the non-instructional work stoppages for each classification. The table also specified the instructional work stoppages by the four classifications.

Turnover rates have been included in this section because research has frequently referred to it in the labor portions. High turnover rates have long been a problem of the personnel administrator. The writer has taken the turnover percentages obtained in the survey and applied them to the four classifications. The following table has been designed to indicate the turnover rates in percentages by individual school districts in the classifications also. This has been performed to rank the classifications in an attempt to determine in which district the turnover rates were higher.

Table 9 has been designed to illustrate the percentage of school districts in each classification. It illustrated the percentage of turnover in each classification. The respective percentages were 16.1%, 15.6%, 24.4% and 43.8%. Also, it illustrated the average percentage of school districts in the classifications. Although these percentages do not reflect the actual turnover rates, they have served the purposes for comparative reasons. The respective percentages were 08.1%, 07.8%, 08.2% and 07.3%.
### Table 8

**School District Labor Orientation by "Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation" Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Districts in each Classification</th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Districts by Classification</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Labor Oriented Districts by Classification</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Non-Labor Oriented Districts by Classification</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentage of Labor and Non-Labor Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9
Non-Instructional Employee and Teacher Work Stoppages by Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Districts in each Classification</th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Districts by Classification</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Work-Stoppage by Classification for Non-Inst.</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Stoppage</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Non-Work Stoppage</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>Non-Work Stoppage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentage of Teacher Work-Stoppage and non-work stoppage</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts in each Classification</td>
<td>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</td>
<td>Non Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</td>
<td>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</td>
<td>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Districts by Classification</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Turnover by Classification</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Turnover percentage for each individual school by Classification</td>
<td>08.1</td>
<td>07.8</td>
<td>08.2</td>
<td>07.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average percentage of 07.3% has indicated that the school districts of classification four ranked best. The school districts were Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma and Springfield.

**Analysis of Salary Information**

This section is the second part of chapter IV and it has been treated three different ways; namely, actual salaries by individual school district divided by positions into the top, intermediate and beginning level; the ranked salaries as they apply to actual salaries; and the ranked individual salaries as they apply to the four community orientation-organization affiliation classifications.

Through the Ohio State Department of Education, salary data was obtained on the five non-instructional school employee groups. This salary information has been treated to show uniformity in salaries through a bi-weekly presentation of the minimums and maximums. The five non-instructional employee groups have been divided into sub-component groups; namely, top level, intermediate level, and beginning level positions and salaries. This has been performed to indicate the individual school districts with the higher salaries at the various levels. The bi-weekly salary schedules eliminated the inconsistency of the number of hours and months an employee worked. They were based on an eighty hour - ten day work period. Because some of the employee groups do not work this
period of time, one should not generalize these salary schedules beyond the limits of this investigation.

The first treatment, using the actual salaries, has five non-instructional employee components (clerical employees, food service employees, operation employees, transportation employees and teacher aide employees). Each of these components have been divided into three parts based on salary and positions; namely, top, intermediate and beginner. With the use of the 1970-71 salary schedules, the investigator has illustrated various salary trends through a series of tables. These tables contained salary information such as minimums, maximum and median for individual school districts, and collective averages and ranges for all school districts. This information has been illustrated on Tables 11 through 24.
Part I

Top, Intermediate and Beginner Level Salaries

For Clerical Service Employees

The clerical service employees area has been divided into three sub-components; namely, administrative, staff and school building personnel positions.

Component A.—

The administrative personnel positions area has been designed to encompass school clerical positions that enhance the administrator. Some of the positions in this area were:

1. Secretary to the superintendent
2. Secretary to the assistant superintendent
3. Secretary to the clerk-typist
4. Top level or clerk-stenographer
5. Top level secretaries
6. Top level clerks
7. Top level typist
8. Other positions of this caliber

The 1970-71 salaries for administrative personnel positions by school districts are given in Table II.

Component B.—

The staff personnel position area has been designed to encompass school clerical positions that enhance the efficiency of the board of education. Some of the positions have been grouped in an intermediate level and listed below:

1. Clerks -- stenographers II
### Table 11

**Salary Schedules for Administrative Clerical Employees 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>198.40</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>299.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>263.00</td>
<td>211.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>232.50</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>304.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>177.00</td>
<td>338.00</td>
<td>258.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>356.25</td>
<td>278.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>224.00</td>
<td>284.00</td>
<td>254.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>331.75</td>
<td>254.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>225.50</td>
<td>310.50</td>
<td>268.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>171.25</td>
<td>241.50</td>
<td>207.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>236.00</td>
<td>297.50</td>
<td>266.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>238.50</td>
<td>219.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>187.90</td>
<td>329.70</td>
<td>259.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>191.50</td>
<td>297.00</td>
<td>245.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average** 13 198.00 313.00 263.00

Range: 258 - 400
2. Clerks - typists II, III, and IV
3. Key punch operators
4. Switchboard operators
5. Receptionist
6. PBX operator
7. General administrative secretary
8. Other positions of this caliber

The 1970-71 salaries for staff personnel positions by school districts are given in Table 12.

Component C.--

The school building personnel positions area has been designed to encompass school clerical positions that enhance the efficiency of the school system at the principal and building level. Such positions used in this study were:

1. Secretary to the High School principal
2. Secretary to the junior high school principal
3. Secretary to the elementary principal
4. Stenographer clerk to the High School
5. Junior clerk-typist
6. Library clerk
7. High school receptionist
8. Other positions of this caliber

The 1970-71 salaries for school building personnel positions by school districts are given in Table 13.
TABLE 12

SALARY SCHEDULE FOR STAFF

CLERICAL EMPLOYEES 1970-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>203.50</td>
<td>295.25</td>
<td>249.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>132.60</td>
<td>211.20</td>
<td>172.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>194.00</td>
<td>245.00</td>
<td>220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>166.50</td>
<td>279.75</td>
<td>223.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>185.45</td>
<td>334.00</td>
<td>260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>198.20</td>
<td>275.20</td>
<td>238.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>144.20</td>
<td>287.30</td>
<td>216.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>266.20</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>206.25</td>
<td>176.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>162.00</td>
<td>265.50</td>
<td>214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>181.40</td>
<td>213.00</td>
<td>197.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>183.30</td>
<td>275.30</td>
<td>229.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>171.75</td>
<td>265.75</td>
<td>219.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>173.00</td>
<td>294.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 132 - 334
TABLE 13

SALARY SCHEDULES OF SCHOOL BUILDING
CLERICAL EMPLOYEES 1970-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>148.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>164.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>211.50</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>187.00</td>
<td>219.00</td>
<td>203.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>177.50</td>
<td>279.80</td>
<td>229.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>159.75</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>225.80</td>
<td>300.25</td>
<td>263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>287.75</td>
<td>231.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>188.00</td>
<td>283.75</td>
<td>236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>156.25</td>
<td>217.60</td>
<td>187.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>166.75</td>
<td>209.75</td>
<td>188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>410.39</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>185.20</td>
<td>275.75</td>
<td>230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>165.40</td>
<td>275.75</td>
<td>221.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>209.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 138 - 325
Part II

Top, Intermediate and Beginner Level Salaries

For Food Service Employees

The food service employees area has been divided into three sub-components; namely, (1) managers, (2) cooks and bakers, and (3) general workers.

Component A.—

The managers component has been designed to encompass school food service employees who have the major responsibility for that program in the school building. Such position titles used were:

1. Managers
2. Assistant managers
3. Elementary, junior high and senior high managers
4. Manager trainee

The 1970-71 salaries for manager personnel positions by school districts are given in Table 14.

Component B.—

The second component of the food service employees program, cooks and bakers, has been designed to encompass those positions with the major responsibility of preparing food by heat through cooking and baking. Some of the titles used by the school systems studied were:

1. Head cook: elementary, junior and senior high schools
2. Bakers
3. Pastry cooks
4. Assistant cooks and bakers
### Table 14

**Salary Schedule for Top Level Food Service Employees for 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>202.00</td>
<td>218.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>203.36</td>
<td>245.60</td>
<td>224.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>312.00</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>331.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>176.00</td>
<td>251.00</td>
<td>214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>242.00</td>
<td>326.00</td>
<td>284.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>216.00</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>228.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>214.75</td>
<td>219.50</td>
<td>217.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>164.40</td>
<td>201.90</td>
<td>183.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>188.80</td>
<td>321.00</td>
<td>255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>176.80</td>
<td>281.20</td>
<td>229.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>184.30</td>
<td>184.30</td>
<td>184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>212.00</td>
<td>305.00</td>
<td>259.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>193.90</td>
<td>222.10</td>
<td>208.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average         | 207.00  | 259.00  | 233.00 |

Range: 164 - 350
5. Other similar positions

The 1970-71 salaries for cooking and baking personnel positions are given in Table 15.

Component C.—

The third component of food service employees, general workers, has been designed to encompass those individuals with major responsibilities of assisting the managers, cooks and bakers. Many of these employees have not received formal training and require a minimum amount of skill. Some of the titles used by school systems in this area were:

1. General preparer
2. Salad girl
3. Counter girl
4. Porter
5. Server
6. Cook helper
7. Trainee
8. Probation worker
9. Kitchen helper
10. Food helper
11. Others in similar positions

The 1970-71 salaries for general workers positions are given by school districts in Table 16.
### Table 15

**Salary Schedules for Cook and Baker Food Service Employees 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>166.50</td>
<td>152.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>346.40</td>
<td>263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>212.00</td>
<td>178.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>126.30</td>
<td>216.00</td>
<td>171.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>205.60</td>
<td>198.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>180.50</td>
<td>219.50</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>138.60</td>
<td>138.60</td>
<td>139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>136.50</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>146.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>169.25</td>
<td>189.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>128.50</td>
<td>132.70</td>
<td>131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>179.50</td>
<td>208.00</td>
<td>194.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>177.60</td>
<td>236.80</td>
<td>207.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>157.00</td>
<td>199.00</td>
<td>174.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 126 - 346
### TABLE 16

**SALARY SCHEDULES FOR GENERAL FOOD SERVICE EMPLOYEES FOR 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>110.40</td>
<td>114.40</td>
<td>112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>166.50</td>
<td>152.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>169.00</td>
<td>194.50</td>
<td>181.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>216.00</td>
<td>174.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>148.00</td>
<td>208.00</td>
<td>178.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>189.60</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>197.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>250.75</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>169.00</td>
<td>177.00</td>
<td>173.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>132.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>167.20</td>
<td>159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>156.00</td>
<td>186.00</td>
<td>171.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>147.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>162.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 110 - 250
Part III

Top, Intermediate and Beginner Level Salaries
For Operation Service Employees

The operation service employees area has been divided into four sub-components; namely, top level custodians, intermediate level custodians, matrons and beginner custodians. This has been done to show a line of distinction between the various groups.

Component A.—

The top level custodian component has been designed to encompass those non-instructional school positions with the primary responsibility of daily building upkeep and minor repairs. The person in this position is usually in charge of a building and delegates duties. Some titles used for these positions were:

1. Head custodian: elementary, junior and high school
2. Custodian in charge
3. Custodian 1 and 2 in a five step rating
4. Head janitor

The 1970-71 salaries for top level custodian personnel positions are given by school districts in Table 17.

Component B.—

The second component, intermediate custodians, has been designed to encompass those non-instructional school personnel who are not in top positions, but are far from bottom positions and generally report to the top level custodians.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>290.00</td>
<td>338.40</td>
<td>309.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>291.75</td>
<td>317.60</td>
<td>305.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>400.50</td>
<td>480.50</td>
<td>441.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>253.60</td>
<td>371.00</td>
<td>312.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>290.40</td>
<td>322.40</td>
<td>304.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>322.40</td>
<td>370.50</td>
<td>346.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>290.40</td>
<td>322.40</td>
<td>306.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>217.00</td>
<td>327.50</td>
<td>272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>262.00</td>
<td>337.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>246.20</td>
<td>246.20</td>
<td>246.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>268.80</td>
<td>284.80</td>
<td>277.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>273.75</td>
<td>378.00</td>
<td>326.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>284.00</td>
<td>341.00</td>
<td>313.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range: 217 - 480*
Some of the titles used in this component were:

1. Assistant custodians
2. General operation workers
3. Custodians 3 and 4 in a five step rating
4. Assistant janitor
5. Intermediate custodian

The 1970-71 salaries for intermediate custodial personnel positions are given by school district in Table 18.

Component C.—

Matron positions have been designed as the third component of non-instructional school employees. This position has generally included only female workers. Some of the titles used for these positions were:

1. Matrons
2. Cleaning woman
3. Janitress

The 1970-71 salaries for matron personnel positions are given by school district in Table 19.

Component D.—

The fourth component, beginner custodians, have been designed to encompass those non-instructional school positions who are less skilled than the previously mentioned components. This group of positions have generally been responsible to the top level custodians and the assistant custodians. Some of the titles used in this area were:

1. Beginner custodians
### Table 13

**Salary Schedules for Intermediate Level Custodial Operation Employees for 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>247.00</td>
<td>280.00</td>
<td>264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>248.50</td>
<td>282.00</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>277.75</td>
<td>323.50</td>
<td>301.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>261.00</td>
<td>313.50</td>
<td>287.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>256.00</td>
<td>273.00</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>343.00</td>
<td>319.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>262.20</td>
<td>282.00</td>
<td>272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>196.50</td>
<td>215.75</td>
<td>206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>312.00</td>
<td>285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>194.75</td>
<td>240.50</td>
<td>218.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>296.00</td>
<td>356.80</td>
<td>326.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>256.50</td>
<td>243.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>252.00</td>
<td>290.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 194 - 356
TABLE 19

SALARY SCHEDULES FOR MATRON OPERATIONAL
EMPLOYEES FOR 1970-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>133.84</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>269.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>187.00</td>
<td>203.00</td>
<td>195.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>249.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>177.60</td>
<td>233.50</td>
<td>206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>236.00</td>
<td>228.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>218.00</td>
<td>218.00</td>
<td>218.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>128.80</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>156.80</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>163.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>156.00</td>
<td>167.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>218.00</td>
<td>218.00</td>
<td>218.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>165.50</td>
<td>168.50</td>
<td>169.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>176.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>189.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 128 - 249
TABLE 20

SALARY SCHEDULES FOR BEGINNING LEVEL OPERATIONAL (CUSTODIAL) EMPLOYEES FOR 1970-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>207.90</td>
<td>242.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>175.50</td>
<td>175.50</td>
<td>175.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>115.25</td>
<td>288.00</td>
<td>202.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>216.00</td>
<td>288.00</td>
<td>252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>256.50</td>
<td>273.60</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>221.00</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>248.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>208.00</td>
<td>254.00</td>
<td>231.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>261.00</td>
<td>261.00</td>
<td>261.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>208.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>257.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>232.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 115 - 288

2. Custodian worker
3. Laborer
4. Window Cleaner
5. Miscellaneous Worker

The 1970-71 salaries for beginner custodial personnel positions are given by school district in Table 20.
Top, Intermediate and Beginner Level Salaries
For Transportation Service Employees

The transportation service employee area has been divided into three major components; namely, human cargo, non-human cargo and garage workers. This division has given definite lines of distinction between the various groups.

Component A.—

The human cargo component of the transportation service has been designed to encompass those non-instructional school positions which have primary responsibility of picking up and safe delivery of pupils from one destination to another. Some titles given to these positions were:

1. Bus driver
2. Orthopedic driver
3. Station wagon driver
4. Activities driver

The 1970-71 salaries for the human cargo personnel component is given by school district in Table 21.

Component B.—

The non-human component of the transportation service has been designed to encompass the non-instructional school positions with the primary responsibility of picking up and the delivery of materials and supplies. Some of the titles used by the school system were:
TABLE 21
SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICES WHO TRANSPORT HUMAN CARGO FOR 1970-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>246.40</td>
<td>308.00</td>
<td>277.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>217.00</td>
<td>273.00</td>
<td>245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>287.20</td>
<td>297.60</td>
<td>292.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>225.60</td>
<td>326.40</td>
<td>276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>272.00</td>
<td>272.00</td>
<td>272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>290.00</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>236.00</td>
<td>292.00</td>
<td>264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>212.00</td>
<td>212.00</td>
<td>212.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>268.80</td>
<td>268.80</td>
<td>269.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>237.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>270.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 160 - 326
1. Mail truck driver
2. Truck driver
3. Truck driver helper
4. Dispatcher

The 1970-71 salaries for the non-human cargo component personnel are given by school district in Table 22.

Component C.--

The final component, garage worker, has been developed to encompass those positions in the transportation service that have been used to maintain the vehicle portion of the service. Some of the titles used by the school systems were:

1. Garage helper
2. Garage worker
3. Garage mechanic
4. Garage repairman
5. Garage repairman helper
6. Garage man
7. Automotive mechanic
8. Automotive mechanic helper
9. Vehicle mechanic
10. Vehicle mechanic helper

The 1970-71 salaries for the garage worker personnel positions are given by school district in Table 23.
### Table 22

**Salary Schedules for Transportation Service Employees Who Transport Non-Human Cargo for 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>261.60</td>
<td>308.00</td>
<td>285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>272.00</td>
<td>284.00</td>
<td>278.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>248.00</td>
<td>326.40</td>
<td>287.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>268.50</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>277.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>271.00</td>
<td>271.00</td>
<td>271.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>291.00</td>
<td>291.00</td>
<td>291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>281.00</td>
<td>281.00</td>
<td>281.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average:**

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|
|  | 270.00 | 292.00 | 282.00 |

**Range:** 248 - 326
## TABLE 23

**SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICE**

**EMPLOYEES WHO WORK AT THE**

**GARAGE FOR 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>226.00</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>242.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>314.00</td>
<td>334.00</td>
<td>324.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>329.60</td>
<td>368.00</td>
<td>349.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>245.00</td>
<td>392.00</td>
<td>319.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>246.40</td>
<td>246.40</td>
<td>246.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>242.40</td>
<td>297.00</td>
<td>270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>307.00</td>
<td>365.00</td>
<td>336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>306.00</td>
<td>341.60</td>
<td>324.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>280.00</td>
<td>301.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range: 226 - 392*
Part V

Top, Intermediate and Beginner Salaries for Teacher Aides or Assistant Employees

Component A.--

The fifth area, teacher assistant, has been developed to show those non-instructional school personnel positions that assist the instructional position in a capacity other than professional. These positions did not require a four year college degree and were semi-skilled. Some of the titles given to this area were:

1. Teacher aide
2. Classroom aide
3. Librarian clerk
4. Para-professional
5. Lay reader

The 1970-71 salaries for teacher aide positions are given by school district in Table 24.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>160.40</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>211.00</td>
<td>*175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>185.30</td>
<td>250.10</td>
<td>218.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>133.60</td>
<td>222.00</td>
<td>178.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>173.30</td>
<td>222.00</td>
<td>198.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>136.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>160.80</td>
<td>163.20</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>140.39</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>161.20</td>
<td>161.20</td>
<td>161.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>154.20</td>
<td>154.20</td>
<td>154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>155.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>170.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 128 - 250
As the preceding salary study tables have indicated, all school districts did not have salaries registered with the State Department of Education in the five categories and sub-components. However, the writer previously pointed out in Chapter Two that many school districts contract with various non-instructional services such as commercial catering, bus and vehicle, and custodial services. Some school districts have not wanted to bother with personnel program necessities such as negotiations, salaries, insurance, promotions and other employee compensation, and at times it has been proven to be more economical to pay an outside company to provide these services rather than employ school personnel to do it. In addition, the purchase of school transportation vehicles, their maintenance and up-keep, insurance, training for bus driver, and providing liability insurance can be eliminated through a commercial service. One other supportive fact for commercial contracts is that public school employees have closed many school doors recently through illegal work-stoppages and strikes. The commercial services have been a guaranteed service and the negotiations have remained outside the school building.

The second phase of analyzing the salary information has been performed by ranking the school districts individually by numbers. By ranking the school districts from one to thirteen in each of the five non-instructional areas and
their sub-components, the writer has been able to indicate the higher salaries to the lower salaries. The number one (1) has been used to represent the best possible position while thirteen (13) represents the lowest salary. In case of a tie between two or more positions, the numbers were added together and divided by the number of positions in the tie. In instances where no salaries were indicated, the writer added these positions together and treated them as if they occurred in a tie. One should refer to the actual salary section of this chapter to confirm this point. Table 25 of this section has been designed to illustrate the ranked positions of salaries for the top level positions of the study. Information in Table 25 has been taken from Tables 11, 14, 17, 21 and 24.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>CLERICAL SERVICE</th>
<th>FOOD SERVICE</th>
<th>OPERATION SERVICE</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION</th>
<th>TEACHER ASSISTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 has been designed to illustrate the ranked salaries for the intermediate level positions. Information in this table has been taken from Tables 12, 15, 18 and 22.

**TABLE 26**

**RANKED SALARIES FOR NON-INSTRUCTIONAL INTERMEDIATE LEVEL POSITIONS FOR 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>CLERICAL SERVICE</th>
<th>FOOD SERVICE</th>
<th>OPERATION SERVICE</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This means that a tie existed between two or more salaries or no salaries existed for that school district.
Table 27 has been designed to illustrate the ranked salaries for the beginning level positions. Information in this table was taken from earlier Tables 13, 16, 19, 20 and 24.

**TABLE 27**

**RANKED SALARIES FOR NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEGINNING LEVEL POSITIONS FOR 1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>CLERICAL SERVICE</th>
<th>FOOD SERVICE</th>
<th>OPERATION I**</th>
<th>OPERATION II***</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATION I** = OPERATION MATRONS  
**OPERATION II** = OPERATION BEGINNING CUSTODIANS  
*This means that no salary existed or a tie between two or more
After reviewing and ranking the actual salaries with the point system, a final ranking was possible. Table 28 has been designed to illustrate a final ranking of individual school districts by the three salary levels. Also, this table illustrated a final ranking of the combined salary levels by individual school district.

**Table 28**

**Final Ranked School District Salaries at the Top, Intermediate and Beginning Level Positions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>TOP LEVEL SALARIES</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE LEVEL SALARIES</th>
<th>BEGINNING LEVEL SALARIES</th>
<th>FINAL SCHOOL DISTRICT RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In analyzing the data from Table 28, many of the school districts have been ranked differently among the three ranked salary levels. Only the Kettering school district has been ranked consistently in all three salary levels. After combining the three salary levels and ranking them, Kettering received the same ranking of ten. Since a ranking of one is highest and thirteen is lowest, it was established that a ranking of ten is not very outstanding. Other school districts that held most constant were Canton, Columbus, Columbus, Lorain and Springfield. Of the top five ranking positions, only the Columbus school district held one of these positions. Although the Columbus school district ended in the top overall final ranked position, Cincinnati, Toledo and Dayton school districts held top rankings among the individually top, intermediate and beginner salary level positions.

The third part of the salary treatment has been designed to illustrate the manner in which the salary positions rank in the four classifications. Without the numerical ranking of the school districts individually, this would not have been possible. By distributing the thirteen school districts into the respective classifications, one can indicate how the salaries ranked while keeping in mind the labor orientation of the community, the teacher organization, and the non-instructional employees organization. By totalling each individual ranked number in the four classifications
and dividing that number by the number of school districts in that category, the writer arrived at totals which were ranked from one, the highest, to four, the lowest. The next three Tables (29, 30 and 31) have been designed to illustrate the manner the top, intermediate and beginner level positions ranked in the four classifications respectively.

In Table 29, school districts with the higher top level salaries were located in classification one and two. Columbus and Kettering which were located in non-labor oriented communities where the NEA represented the teachers and OAPSE represented the non-instructional employees had the higher clerical salary in this area. These two cities also had the highest operation service salaries. With regard to the highest food service, transportation service and teacher aide salaries, Cleveland and Toledo held these positions. These school districts were located in labor oriented communities where the teachers were AFT affiliated and the non-instructional employees were union affiliated. Most of the lower salaries were located in school districts where the communities were labor oriented, the teachers were NEA affiliated and the non-instructional employees were OAPSE affiliated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non-Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) GAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) GAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Dayton, Youngstown</td>
<td>Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain Parma, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30 illustrates the intermediate level salaries. Columbus and Kettering had the best intermediate level salaries. These districts were non-labor oriented communities with the teachers affiliated with the NEA and the non-instructional employees affiliated with the OAPSE. Cleveland and Toledo had the best operation and transportation intermediate position level salaries. They were labor oriented communities with the teachers affiliated and the non-instructional employees union affiliated. The second best intermediate position level salaries were located in classifications one and two.

Table 31 has been designed to illustrate the salary ranking for beginner level non-instructional employees. Cleveland and Toledo had the best beginner-level salaries for operation service I and transportation services. As previously mentioned, they are located in labor oriented communities where the teachers are AFT affiliated and the non-instructional employees are union affiliated. The best clerical salaries at this level were found in Columbus and Kettering. These districts were non-labor oriented communities where the teachers were NEA affiliated and the non-instructional employees were OAPSE affiliated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY ORIENTATION-ORGANIZATION AFFILIATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non-Labor Oriented MEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented MEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented MEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clueveland, Toledao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union(Non-Inst)</td>
<td>Non-Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE(Non-Inst)</td>
<td>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union(Non-Inst)</td>
<td>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE(Non-Inst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation Classification</td>
<td>Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma, Springfield</td>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Dayton, Youngstown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation I (Matrons)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation II (Beginning Custodians)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32 has illustrated the three salary levels combined. The best overall salary level for clerical employees were found in Columbus and Kettering. In these school districts, the communities were non-labor oriented, the teachers were NEA affiliated, and the non-instructional employees were OAPSE affiliated. The best overall food service and teacher aide salaries were found in the school districts of Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown. In these situations, the communities were labor oriented, the teachers were NEA affiliated and the non-instructional employees were union affiliated. Cleveland and Toledo had the best overall salaries for operation and transportation services. They were located in labor oriented communities with the teachers affiliated with the AFT and the non-instructional employees affiliated with local labor unions. Most of the lower overall salary rankings were located in the fourth classification. In these situations, the communities were labor oriented, the teachers were NEA affiliated and the non-instructional employees were OAPSE affiliated.

The second best overall salaries for clerical service, food service and teacher aides were found in the school districts of Cleveland and Toledo. The second best operation service salaries were found in a tie between school districts of classification two and three. The second best transportation service salary was found in the school districts of Columbus and Kettering.
### TABLE 32

**Final Rank Salary Levels by "Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation" Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation Classification</th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union(Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE(Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union(Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE(Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Service</td>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Dayton, Youngstown</td>
<td>Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the writer has presented salary information by the individual school district and the four classifications by the community orientation based on its' organization affiliation. The salaries of the five non-instructional school employee groups were divided into three salary levels--top, intermediate and beginner. First, these salaries were illustrated through an actual bi-weekly presentation that indicated the minimum, maximum and median. Second, these salaries were illustrated by a ranked order method by which the numbers one through thirteen were assigned to the school districts top, intermediate and beginner salaries. Third, the ranked salaries of the school districts were combined and applied to the four classifications by the community orientation based on its' organization affiliation.

This salary information indicated that the best overall salaries for the five non-instructional school employee groups were found in the school districts of classification one; namely, Cleveland and Toledo. These school districts were located in labor-oriented communities where the teachers were represented by the AFT and the non-instructional school employees were primarily represented by local labor unions. The second best salaries were found in classification three where the school districts of Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown were located. In these situations, the communities were labor-oriented, the teachers were affiliated with the NEA and
the non-instructional school employees were primarily affiliated with local labor unions. This information strongly supports the notion that better salaries exist for non-instructional school employees when this group of employees are represented by local labor unions and the school districts are located in labor-oriented communities. There is little support that the teacher organizations have a strong influence on the non-instructional school employee's salaries; however, the AFT school districts did have the top salaries where the NEA school districts ranked second, third and fourth.

The third and fourth best salaries were respectively found in classifications two and four. Similarities between the organization affiliations were the teacher organization which was the NEA and the non-instructional school employees organization which was the OAPSE. The major difference between the two classifications was the community orientation. The school districts of classification two were located in non-labor-oriented communities and the school districts of classification four were located in labor-oriented communities.

Analysis of Fringe Benefit Information

Of the three selected aspects of the non-instructional employee program, fringe benefits have been considered as the third. The presentation of information in this section
the non-instructional school employees were primarily affiliated with local labor unions. This information strongly supports the notion that better salaries exist for non-instructional school employees when this group of employees are represented by local labor unions and the school districts are located in labor-oriented communities. There is little support that the teacher organizations have a strong influence on the non-instructional school employee's salaries; however, the AFT school districts did have the top salaries where the NEA school districts ranked second, third and fourth.

The third and fourth best salaries were respectively found in classifications two and four. Similarities between the organization affiliations were the teacher organization which was the NEA and the non-instructional school employees organization which was the OAPSE. The major difference between the two classifications was the community orientation. The school districts of classification two were located in non-labor-oriented communities and the school districts of classification four were located in labor-oriented communities.

Analysis of Fringe Benefit Information

Of the three selected aspects of the non-instructional employee program, fringe benefits have been considered as the third. The presentation of information in this section
the non-instructional school employees were primarily affiliated with local labor unions. This information strongly supports the notion that better salaries exist for non-instructional school employees when this group of employees are represented by local labor unions and the school districts are located in labor-oriented communities. There is little support that the teacher organizations have a strong influence on the non-instructional school employee's salaries; however, the AFT school districts did have the top salaries where the NEA school districts ranked second, third and fourth.

The third and fourth best salaries were respectively found in classifications two and four. Similarities between the organization affiliations were the teacher organization which was the NEA and the non-instructional school employees organization which was the OAPSE. The major difference between the two classifications was the community orientation. The school districts of classification two were located in non-labor-oriented communities and the school districts of classification four were located in labor-oriented communities.

**Analysis of Fringe Benefit Information**

Of the three selected aspects of the non-instructional employee program, fringe benefits have been considered as the third. The presentation of information in this section
the non-instructional school employees were primarily affiliated with local labor unions. This information strongly supports the notion that better salaries exist for non-instructional school employees when this group of employees are represented by local labor unions and the school districts are located in labor-oriented communities. There is little support that the teacher organizations have a strong influence on the non-instructional school employee's salaries; however, the AFT school districts did have the top salaries where the NEA school districts ranked second, third and fourth.

The third and fourth best salaries were respectively found in classifications two and four. Similarities between the organization affiliations were the teacher organization which was the NEA and the non-instructional school employees organization which was the OAPSE. The major difference between the two classifications was the community orientation. The school districts of classification two were located in non-labor-oriented communities and the school districts of classification four were located in labor-oriented communities.

**Analysis of Fringe Benefit Information**

Of the three selected aspects of the non-instructional employee program, fringe benefits have been considered as the third. The presentation of information in this section
the non-instructional school employees were primarily affiliated with local labor unions. This information strongly supports the notion that better salaries exist for non-instructional school employees when this group of employees are represented by local labor unions and the school districts are located in labor-oriented communities. There is little support that the teacher organizations have a strong influence on the non-instructional school employee's salaries; however, the AFT school districts did have the top salaries where the NEA school districts ranked second, third and fourth.

The third and fourth best salaries were respectively found in classifications two and four. Similarities between the organization affiliations were the teacher organization which was the NEA and the non-instructional school employees organization which was the OAPSE. The major difference between the two classifications was the community orientation. The school districts of classification two were located in non-labor-oriented communities and the school districts of classification four were located in labor-oriented communities.

Analysis of Fringe Benefit Information

Of the three selected aspects of the non-instructional employee program, fringe benefits have been considered as the third. The presentation of information in this section
the non-instructional school employees were primarily affiliated with local labor unions. This information strongly supports the notion that better salaries exist for non-instructional school employees when this group of employees are represented by local labor unions and the school districts are located in labor-oriented communities. There is little support that the teacher organizations have a strong influence on the non-instructional school employee's salaries; however, the AFT school districts did have the top salaries where the NEA school districts ranked second, third and fourth.

The third and fourth best salaries were respectively found in classifications two and four. Similarities between the organization affiliations were the teacher organization which was the NEA and the non-instructional school employees organization which was the OAPSE. The major difference between the two classifications was the community orientation. The school districts of classification two were located in non-labor-oriented communities and the school districts of classification four were located in labor-oriented communities.

Analysis of Fringe Benefit Information

Of the three selected aspects of the non-instructional employee program, fringe benefits have been considered as the third. The presentation of information in this section
of Chapter IV has been divided into two parts. The first part has treated fringe benefits individually by the school districts while the second part has treated the fringe benefits by the classifications.

Through the uses of individual school districts, the writer has indicated the individual standing position of the school districts. In most states, public funds cannot be paid for time not worked unless the law specifically indicates it. Of the thirteen school districts investigated, all of them permitted fifteen days sick leave, eight legal holidays, and vacation days. The vacation days were based on one day for each month of work, or a certain number of days after working one year.

Since the school districts have reserved the rights on the accumulation of sick leave days, the number of days granted by the school districts varied from 120 days to an unlimited number of days.

Personal leave has been granted in twelve of the thirteen school districts and it has ranged from one to three days. Personal leave has differed from sick leave because of its short term, emergency and business by nature. Only in one school district did personal leave not exist. Unfortunately, cuts in the total school operating budget have forced school officials to eliminate it for six months. However, the non-instructional employees could discretely use sick leave for personal purposes. Short
term medical, dental and court appointments have been granted with pay in all thirteen school districts. Since all schools have different city codes for educational spending, eleven school districts have deducted medical, dental and court appointments from sick leave. Only one school district deducted short term leaves of this nature from personal leave. The remaining school districts did not deduct this leave from either of the leaves.

Another short term leave, voting rights, were granted with pay in five of the school districts. Seven school districts responded with negative responses; however, this did not necessarily mean that a person could not leave school to vote. The argument here has been on the amount of pay received while voting. The following table has been designed to illustrate these points. (See Table 33)

With regard to retirement benefits, the state mandated minimums of 11.4 percent of the base salary to be paid by the school board and 7.9 percent of the base salary paid for by the employee. All school districts had to participate. The severance pay has been paid somewhat differently. In eleven school districts, no severance pay was granted unless vacation pay had been earned on a monthly basis. The remaining two school districts did not pay any severance benefits for an employee existing unless it was done through retirement.

All school districts provided some form of insurance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>Canton</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Swid</th>
<th>Kettering</th>
<th>Lorain</th>
<th>Farma</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
<th>Youngstown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sick Leave Per-Year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accumulation of Sick Leave</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal Leave Per Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is #3 Deducted from #1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Medical Appointments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dental Appointments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Voting Rights</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Court Appearances</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is #5, #6, #7 or #8 deducted from #1 or #3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Eight Legal Holidays</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vacation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: * = Unlimited number of sick leave days
S = Sick Leave
P = Personal Leave
A = No deduction if less than two hours
Hospitalization, surgical and major medical has been paid for by the school board and it has covered the employee and his family in nine school districts. The Columbus and Parma school districts provided the above insurance for the employees alone and not their families. In the remaining two school districts, hospitalization and surgical insurance were provided for employees and their family. No major medical protection was provided for the employees or their families in this area.

Life insurance protection was provided in only five of the thirteen school districts. Although no income protection insurance was provided, workmen's compensation was provided by the school boards by state law.

Package programs have cost less money. Of the thirteen school districts investigated, eight had package programs and the remaining few were employee enrolled programs.

Data collected on the training programs have thrown some light on the non-instructional employee work improvement programs. It has long been a well known fact that quality training programs usually generated qualified employees. Top caliber employees also have much to do with the better use of school supplies, public relations and school building equipment longevity. Of the thirteen school districts surveyed, only Cleveland charged a small enrollment fee. None of the thirteen school districts encumbered funds for self-improvement toward a high degree. However,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>Canton</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Euclid</th>
<th>Kettering</th>
<th>Lorain</th>
<th>Parma</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
<th>Youngstown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hospitalization Provided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Board Pays for Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surgical Provided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Board Pays for Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Major Medical Provided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Board Pays for Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Life Insurance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Income Protection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Insurance Check Offs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employees May Enroll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Package Program</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Workmen's Compensation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
funds were provided for work shops and over-night conferences in five school districts. The remaining school districts listed no provisions in this area.

By using the five employee component area, the writer has designed a chart to illustrate the pre-service, in-service, and probationary training programs for the thirteen school districts. The transportation component had seven pre-service training programs. The second, third and fourth related non-instructional components were teacher assistants, operation employees and food service employees. The clerical employees had only one such program. With regard to the second training areas, in-service, the teacher assistants and operations component areas had eleven programs each. The clerical and transportation component areas had nine programs each. The food service component had eight such programs that had little difference from the other four. Probationary work periods were used in most of the school districts. The clerical, food service and operation components had thirteen positive responses each. The transportation component listed ten programs while the teacher assistants component listed only six programs of this nature.

The next section of this analysis has been handled somewhat differently. The writer has treated each school district separately on the number of training programs. Normally, a school district should have a maximum of fifteen responses of training programs provided; however, in some
### TABLE 35

**NON-INSTRUCTIONAL EMPLOYEE IMPROVEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>Canton</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Piqua</th>
<th>Lorain</th>
<th>Parma</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
<th>Youngstown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerical Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Service Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truck Assistants</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Programs</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-existing Programs</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instances, school districts did not provide services in the five employee component areas such as Cincinnati, Columbus and Lorain school districts. The school district with the most training programs was Parma. The next six with the higher number of training programs were Canton, Springfield, Akron, Dayton, Kettering and Toledo respectively.

The final part of this investigation on fringe benefits has been related to each of the four classifications. The same fringe benefits have been treated here as in the first part of the fringe benefits section of this section.

The first fringe benefit studied here was the accumulated sick leave days. Table 36 has been designed to illustrate the percentage of school districts to each of the four classifications and it also illustrated the rank percentage of accumulative sick leave days to each of these classifications. In addition, the individual school district rank per classification was presented.

Since it would be incorrect to compare classifications with different numbers of school districts, the writer had to compare them on a one to one basis as demonstrated in Table 36. School districts with the better accumulative sick leave policies were Columbus and Kettering of classification two.

The second fringe benefit studied was the personal leave days permitted. Table 37 has been designed to illustrate the percentage of school districts to each of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Districts in each Classification</th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Accumulative Sick Leave by each Classification</td>
<td>07.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentage of Accumulative Sick Leave for Each Individual School by Classification</td>
<td>03.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>06.0</td>
<td>08.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 37

**Personal Leave by "Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation" Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (non-inst)</th>
<th>Non-Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (non-inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (non-inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (non-inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Districts in Each Classification</td>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Dayton, Youngstown</td>
<td>Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Districts by Classification</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Personal Leave by Each Classification</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentage of Personal Leave for Each Individual School by Classification</td>
<td>09.9</td>
<td>09.9</td>
<td>05.4</td>
<td>07.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the four classifications and has the ranked percentage of personal leave days to each classification. Also, the individual school district rank per classification was presented. School districts with the better personal leave policies were in classification one and two, with the respective school districts being Cleveland and Toledo, and Columbus and Kettering.

The third fringe benefit investigated here was life insurance for the employee paid by the school board. Table 37 has been designed to illustrate the percentage of school districts with this fringe benefit and the percentage of school districts without this fringe benefit. As demonstrated, 38.4% of the thirteen school districts had this provision while 61.5% did not. Also, the percentage of school districts to each of the four classifications was presented. The respective percentages were 15.4%, 15.4%, 23.1% and 46.1%. In addition, the percentage of school districts that provided this fringe benefit and the percentage of school districts that did not provide this provision were illustrated. Classification one, containing the school districts of Cleveland and Toledo, had the better programs.

The fourth fringe benefit investigated was the major insurances paid by the school board for the employees. The insurances considered here were hospitalization, major medical and surgical. The writer added the total number
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Districts in each Classification</th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT ( Teachers ) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non-Labor Oriented NEA ( Teachers ) CAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA ( Teachers ) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA ( Teachers ) CAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Life Insurance not paid by Board by each Classification</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Districts with Life Insurance</td>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>No Life Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation Classification</td>
<td>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Instit.)</td>
<td>Non Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) CAPSE (Non-Instit.)</td>
<td>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Instit.)</td>
<td>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) CAPSE (Non-Instit.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts in each Classification</td>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>Dayton, Cincinnati, Youngstown</td>
<td>Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Districts by Classification</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Districts with Major Insurance by each Classification</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average percentage of Major Insurances for Employee for each Individual School by Classification</td>
<td>08.1</td>
<td>08.1</td>
<td>07.2</td>
<td>07.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of programs provided into the number of programs existing in each of the four classifications. Table 39 has been designed to illustrate the number of school districts in each classification and it illustrated the percentage of major insurances to these four classifications. The percentages were as follow: 16.2%, 16.2%, 21.6% and 45.9%. Also, the average percentage of major insurances by individual school district in the classification was presented. Classifications with the largest average individual percentage had the best rank and had the best insurance programs. In this instance, classifications one and two had the best rank and they were tied for first. The school districts were Cleveland, Toledo, Columbus and Kettering.

The fifth fringe benefit investigated in this study was the major insurances paid by the board for the family of the employee. As stated in fringe benefit four, this benefit consists of hospitalization, major medical and surgical. This date was treated in the same manner as the fourth fringe benefit. Table 40 has been designed to illustrate the number of school districts in each of the four classifications and it illustrated the percentage of major insurances paid by the board for the family of the employee. Also, the average percentage of major insurances paid by the board for the employee's family to the individual school districts was illustrated. The school districts with the highest individual percentage were in classification one and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Districts in each Classification</th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>09.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average percentage of Major Insurance Paid by Board for Employee's Families for each Individual School by Classification</td>
<td>09.7</td>
<td>04.9</td>
<td>08.6</td>
<td>07.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two respectively, where Cleveland, Toledo, Columbus and Kettering were located.

The sixth fringe benefit covered in this investigation was the training programs provided by the school districts of the study. By using the five non-instructional employee areas, the writer discovered that three training programs were usually provided. The three programs were, pre-service training, probationary training, and in-service training. In some instances, school districts did not have various services as transportation and teacher aides. School districts of this nature were Cincinnati, Columbus and Lorain. The information of this table, (Table 41) was taken from Table 35 on non-instructional employee training programs.

Table 41 has been designed to illustrate the total number of training programs in existence and the number of programs not in existence. The percentages were 64.5% of existing programs and 34.4% of non-existing programs. Also, the percentage of school districts in each of the four classifications was presented. In addition, the percentages of training programs to each of these classifications was presented. The respective percentages were 14.6%, 13.1%, 21.9% and 50.4%. Finally, the average percentage of training programs was illustrated. The respective percentages were 07.3%, 06.5%, 07.3% and 08.4%. Classification four had more training programs on an individual basis than the other three classifications. School districts of this caliber were Akron,
### Table 41

**Training Programs by "Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation" Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation Classification</th>
<th>Labor Oriented APT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non-Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) CAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) CAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Districts in each Classification</td>
<td>Cleveland, Toledo</td>
<td>Columbus, Kettering</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Dayton, Youngstown</td>
<td>Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Districts by Classification</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Training Programs by each Classification</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentage of Training Programs for each Individual School by Classification</td>
<td>07.3</td>
<td>06.5</td>
<td>07.3</td>
<td>08.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentage of Training Programs existing and the Training Programs Needed</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Needed</td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary of the fringe benefit information, the writer presented the information by the individual school district and the four classifications by community orientation-organization affiliation. Through this method of presentation, various trends were established which indicated certain patterns. By limiting the fringe benefits of this study to six, the writer was able to investigate them in some depth.

The school districts of classification one had the overall best fringe benefit package. These school districts were Cleveland and Toledo and they were located in labor oriented communities where the teachers were affiliated with the AFT and the non-instructional school employees were primarily affiliated with local labor unions. The school districts of classification three had the second best overall fringe benefit package. The school districts were Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown. The community orientation-organization affiliations were: Labor oriented community, NEA affiliated teachers, and local labor union affiliated non-instructional school employees. Classification one and three have supported the notion that better fringe benefit packages exist for non-instructional school employees when they are affiliated with local labor unions and the school district is located in labor-oriented communities. There is little support as to the relationship of the teacher or-
izations on the fringe benefit packages of the non-instructional school employees; however, the school districts of classification one (Cleveland and Toledo) were affiliated with the AFT and ranked in first place. This same pattern existed for the salaries also. The third and fourth fringe benefit packages were found in classifications four and two respectively.

SUMMARY

In summary of Chapter IV, the writer tied together the variables of the study as they related to the thirteen school districts. This chapter was divided into three sections; namely, the pattern of negotiation, the salary pattern and the fringe benefit pattern. Each of these three sections treated the data first by the individual school districts and second by the four community orientation-organization affiliation classifications. From the invaluable information, the writer was able to establish the better salaries and fringe benefits as they related to the negotiation pattern.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Overview

In analyzing the data of Chapter IV, the writer was able to effectively describe the salary, fringe benefits and pattern of negotiations of the individual school districts and the school districts of the four "community orientation—organization affiliation" classifications. In formulating the final bonds of this study, Chapter V will connect the entire study through the summary, conclusions and recommendations. The first part, the summary, will point out various relationships and trends made apparent through the literature, methodology and data analysis.

Summary of the Problem

Literature and Methodology

Problems have been identified in the personnel program for non-instructional school employees and they were found to be related to the administration of salary, fringe benefits, and negotiations. Failures in these areas resulted in high turnover rates and low personal and job satisfaction and this was demonstrated in Chapter I and II. By limiting this descriptive study to thirteen Ohio school districts and five non-instructional school employee groups, the writer was able to isolate various influential factors; namely, the federal
and state labor movement and legislation, teacher organizations and their characteristics, community labor orientations, and five non-instructional school employee groups, their representative affiliations and their importance to the total school program.

In his study, *The Use of State Labor Relations Agencies in Education*, Eve\(^1\) suggested an increasing use of private sector collective bargaining in education, a growing interest in collective representation in education, and a gradual shift of more favorable public policies to collective bargaining in education. The writer found this to be true not only in education but in other sectors of public employment as well. Examples of this have been the recent strikes in 1970 such as the "blue flu" by police officials, "sick ins" by air controllers and fire fighters, "non-pick-ups" by sanitation employees, and "no deliveries" by postal employees.

The National labor movement was examined and found to relate to the federal and state labor movement. National labor policies explored were the Sherman Act, The Clayton Act, The Wagnor Act, and The Taft-Hartley Act. Federal labor policies investigated were Executive Order 10988 and Order 11491. State labor policies inquired into were the Wisconsin Act, Acts by Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon and Washington and the Ferguson Act of Ohio.

In the Ferguson Act by Ohio, strengths, weaknesses and revisions were discussed as they affected public employees, primarily school employees and employee representative organizations. Of the school employees, there were two groups;

---

\(^1\)Eve, Ibid.
namely, the teachers and non-instructional school employees. The teachers were represented by a state or local affiliate of the NEA and AFT, and the non-instructional employees were affiliated with OAPSE or the local labor unions. The characteristics of these organizations were noted and similarities were established between the four organizations which governed them, the AFT and the local labor union, and the NEA and OAPSE. The Ferguson Act with its strike limitations and differences in philosophical goals was also examined.

Chapter two established that the OAPSE and OEA had very similar philosophies and goals. Both of these equity groups considered themselves strongly non-labor oriented and very professional. Also, the local labor unions and the AFT have established themselves as being labor oriented and professional. Although a slight difference appears to exist among the four equity groups, actually there has been little or no difference in recent years. The major philosophical problem between the groups has been in methodology and strategy. Once, the NEA (an affiliate of the OEA) and OAPSE strongly considered strikes and work stoppages to be non-professional and illegal. This thought has some strength today; however, it is an established fact that the NEA called a state wide strike in Indiana in 1969. Similar actions have occurred even more recently by other NEA affiliates although the national organization still does not sanction strikes. In 1970, two school districts affiliated with OAPSE participated in strikes. Although OAPSE
has not sanctioned strikes, it has suggested that it would negotiate for members who participate in one. The AFT and the local labor unions have sanctioned, and participated in, strikes. During the 1970-71 school year, the following AFT affiliated school districts held strikes; New Haven, Connecticut; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Chicago, Illinois.

Although strikes by public employees have been illegal for many years, they have always occurred and with more frequency in recent years. A major problem has been that public legislation restricting strike activities has been too restrictive to be enforced. This is the reason the Ferguson Act is under revision today.

Another important fact isolated by this probe into the non-instructional employee program was the labor orientation of the community. The school districts were located in labor or non-labor communities. By relating this to the two groups of school employee representative organizations, the writer brought out three important influential factors. These factors were used to investigate the three problems of the non-instructional school employees; the pattern of negotiation, salary and fringe benefit programs. With the thirteen school districts and the six influential factors (variables) the writer developed four community orientation-organization affiliation classifications. The four school districts with their classifications listed as follows:
Cleveland and Toledo were in classification one. Here the community was labor oriented, the instructional employees (teachers) were affiliated with the AFT, and the non-instructional employees were affiliated with a local union.

Columbus and Kettering were in Classification Two. Here the community was non-labor oriented, the instructional employees were affiliated with OAPSE.

Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown were in Classification Three. The community was labor oriented, the instructional employees were affiliated with the NEA and the non-instructional employees were affiliated with a local labor union.

Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma and Springfield were in Classification Four. The community was labor oriented, the instructional employees were affiliated with the NEA and the non-instructional employees were affiliated with OAPSE.

Salary and fringe benefit data by community orientation—organization affiliation classification are presented in Tables 43, 44, 45, and 46 and discussed below.
Summary

Community Orientation—Organization Affiliation

Classification One (labor oriented, AFT, local union)

The best salaries were found in Cleveland and Toledo. In regards to fringe benefits pertaining to time not worked with pay, both school districts had fifteen sick leave days. The personal leave days per year ranked in a first place tie with classification two (non-labor oriented, NEA and OAPSE). Also, the three major insurances—hospitalization, major medical and surgical—paid by the school board for the employee alone tied for first place with classification two. The same three insurances, but paid by the school board for the family of the employee, ranked first. The training programs—pre-service, probationary and in-service—placed second with classification three (labor oriented, NEA, local union). In regard to non-instructional employee work stoppages and work slow downs, only Toledo reported a work stoppage. Cleveland and Toledo reported work stoppages by teachers during the 1969-70 school year. Also, both school districts provided life insurance policies on the employees, paid by the school board. Finally, turnover rated third highest in Cleveland and Toledo. Table 43 has the summary figures listed above.
Summary:

Community Orientation—Organization Affiliation

Classification Two (non-labor oriented, NEA, OAPSE)

In the two districts in this category, Columbus and Kettering, the salary had a rank of three while many of the fringe benefits followed suit. Both school districts in this classification had fifteen sick leave days per year and ranked fourth in accumulative sick leave days. The personal leave days per year were equal with those of the school districts of classification one. Also, the three major insurances paid by the school board for the employees tied for first place with classification one. The same three insurances, paid by the school board for the family of the employee, ranked fourth. The three training programs ranked in fourth place also. In regard to non-instructional employee work stoppages and work slow downs, neither Columbus nor Kettering reported them. There were no work stoppages or work slow downs reported for the teachers either. In addition, no life insurance policies paid by the school board were provided for the employees. Finally, Columbus and Kettering ranked second lowest in turnover of non-instructional employees.
### TABLE 43

**SUMMARY: CLASSIFICATION TWO BY**

"COMMUNITY ORIENTATION-ORGANIZATION AFFILIATION"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation Classification</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Kettering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Non-Inst Work Stoppage in 1969-70 | No | No |
2. Teacher Work Stoppage in 1969-70 | No | No |
3. Annual Turnover Percentage Non-Inst | 11.8 | 6.0 |
4. Ranked Overall Pay Rates | 1 | 10 |
5. Ranked Overall Accumulative Sick Leave | 8.5 | 10.5 |
6. Personal Leave Days Per Year (days) | 3 | 3 |
7. Life Insurance Provided by School Board | No | No |
8. Number of Major Insurances for Employee | 3 | 3 |
9. Number of Major Insurances for Family of Employee | 0 | 3 |
10. Number of Training Programs Existing over the number of Training Programs Needed | 6/12 | 10/15 |
Summary:

Community Orientation—Organization Affiliation

Classification Three (labor oriented, NEA, Union)

This classification represented three school districts; Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown. In regard to salary, the combined school districts ranked second. All three school districts received fifteen sick leave days per year and ranked second in the combined maximum accumulative sick leave days. The personal leave days per year ranked a poor fourth. In regard to the three major insurances paid by the school board for the employees, Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown ranked third. This same insurance that covered the family of the employee ranked second. The three training programs of Cleveland and Toledo ranked second in a tie with classification one. Of work stoppages and work slow downs for non-instructional employees, only Youngstown reported any such act. As previously mentioned only two non-instructional work stoppages were reported and the other one existed in Toledo of classification one. Work stoppages and work slow downs for teachers were reported by Dayton and Youngstown and not Cincinnati. In regard to life insurance paid by the school boards for the employees, neither of the three schools provided it. Finally, the area of turnover percentages had a poor ranking of fourth. Table 44 has detailed figures on these findings.
TABLE 44

SUMMARY: CLASSIFICATION THREE BY
"COMMUNITY ORIENTATION—ORGANIZATION AFFILIATION"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY ORIENTATION—ORGANIZATION AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Youngstown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Non-Inst. Work Stoppage in 1969-70</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Work Stoppage in 1969-70</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual Turnover Percentage Non-Inst</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ranked Overall Pay Rates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ranked Overall Accumulative Sickness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal Leave Days Per Year (days)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Life Insurance Provided by School Board</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No. of Major Insurances for Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No. of Major Insurances for Fam. of Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. No. of Training Progs. existing over the no. of Train.Prog.needed</td>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>9/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:

Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation

Classification Four

The six school districts in this category were Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma and Springfield. The combined rank of the salaries in these school districts placed them in the lowest position, or fourth. Although sick leave was fifteen days per year in each school district, the accumulative rank for all school districts of this classification was three. The personal leave days per school year ranked third. The three major insurances, paid by the school board for the employee, ranked a poor fourth. The same insurances for the family of the employee ranked in the third position. The six school districts ranked in the best position, or first for the three training programs. In regard to work stoppages and slow downs for non-instructional employees, none of the school districts reported participating in any. However, Lorain and Parma reported that the teachers participated in work stoppages during the 1969-70 school year. Of the six school districts in this classification, three reported no life insurance for the employees; namely, Lorain, Parma and Springfield. As for turnover percentages, the school districts of classification four ranked number one which was the lowest and the best. Table 45 has figures on four.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Affiliated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAPSE (Non-Inst)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Work Stoppage in 1969-70</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual Turnover Percentage Non-Inst.</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ranked Overall Pay Rates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ranked Overall Accumulative Sick Leave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal Leave Days Per Year (days)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Life Insurance Provided by School Board</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No. of Major Insurance for Employees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No. of Major Insurance for Family of Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. No. of Training Programs Existing over the no. of Training Programs Needed</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>5/15</td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>12/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As tables 42, 43, 44, and 45 indicate, the salaries, fringe benefits and negotiation patterns differ between the individual school districts and among the school districts in the four classifications. The conclusion has been designed to emphasize these differences by ranking the pertinent issues from one to four.

**Conclusion**

A conclusion drawn from the summary information is that certain factors have strong influences on the non-instructional school employee program. Although it has been impossible to generalize beyond the limitations of the study, specific patterns have been discovered within the school districts in the four classifications by "labor orientation-organization affiliations." The writer has listed three important issues; salary, fringe benefits and patterns of negotiation. Recalling that these have been the selected criteria by which to judge the non-instructional school personnel program, the writer has used ranks of one (best) to four (worst). In Table 46, these ratings have been illustrated.

By reviewing Table 46, it is obvious that the school districts of classification one (labor oriented, AFT, union) have the best total (lowest) number of points. Although there exists no remarkable difference in the four classifications, they were able to be rated. The school districts
### Table 46

**Conclusion Statements on the Four "Community Orientation-Organization Affiliation" Classifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labor Oriented AFT (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Non-Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) Union (Non-Inst)</th>
<th>Labor Oriented NEA (Teachers) OAPSE (Non-Inst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Salary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negotiation Trend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Salary information from Table 33
2. Fringe Benefits information from Tables 37 through 42
3. Negotiation information from Tables 6 through 10
4. Significance of total: lowest number is classification with best school districts overall
of one, Cleveland and Toledo, were in labor oriented communities with the teachers affiliated with the AFT and the non-instructional employees affiliated with a local labor union. With these three strong labor factors, the school districts in this classification rated best in all categories except one; namely, the pattern of negotiation.

The second best overall rating was given to the school districts of classification three (labor oriented, NEA, union); Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown. This classification was characterized by a labor oriented community, teachers affiliated with the NEA and non-instructional school employees affiliated with local labor unions. Top rating by this classification was gained in the secondary spots such as salary and fringe benefits.

Although little can be concluded about the teacher representative organizations here, much can be deducted from the community labor orientation and non-instructional employee affiliation. In both classification one and three, the five school districts were located in labor oriented communities where the non-instructional school employees were affiliated with local labor unions. In two of the five school districts, Cleveland and Toledo, the teacher representative organizations were the AFT. The findings have indicated the possibility of higher salaries and better fringe benefits existing in labor oriented classifications.
The school districts of classification two (non-labor oriented, NEA, OAPSE) ranked in the third position on the overall issues. The school districts were Columbus and Kettering and they were characterized by being located in a non-labor oriented community, NEA teacher affiliations and OAPSE non-instructional employee affiliations. School districts in this classification rated a first in the negotiation trend, i.e., fewer strikes, fewer work slow downs and a lower turnover rate. In salary and fringe benefits, the ratings were three and four respectively.

The fourth and final rating was given to the school districts of classification four (labor oriented, NEA, OAPSE); namely, Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma and Springfield. The characteristics of these school districts were that they are labor oriented communities where the teachers were affiliated with NEA and the non-instructional employees were affiliated with OAPSE. The highest rank for this classification was a second in negotiation trends. The other rankings for salary and fringe benefits were respectively a four and three. Fewer strikes and work slow downs, and turnover rates existed here than in classification two. This has supported the notion that fewer strikes, work slow downs and low turnover rates existed in communities where the teachers were affiliated with the NEA and the non-instructional employees were affiliated with OAPSE. To reiterate an earlier point,
the writer discovered philosophical similarities between the NEA and OAPSE which supported no strike provisions in their constitutions. In reverse, philosophical similarities were noted between the AFT and local labor unions which were affiliated with the AFL-CIO and this data has also been supported by the research of this study.

Classifications one and three were respectively ranked in the position of 4 and 3. This has been indicative that the school districts were in labor oriented communities, and the non-instructional employees were affiliated with local labor unions. Previously the writer stated that AFT and NEA affiliates have participated in work slow downs and work stoppages. The school districts of Cleveland and Toledo (classification one) were AFT and the school districts of Cincinnati, Dayton and Youngstown (classification three) were NEA affiliated. A third point developed was the labor orientation of the communities. School districts of classification two (Columbus and Kettering) were located in non-labor oriented communities and school districts of classification four (Akron, Canton, Euclid, Lorain, Parma and Springfield) were located in labor oriented communities. Because of uncontrollable variables not included in this study, the writer could not specifically state that the labor orientation of the community influenced the salary and fringe benefit trends.
Recommendations

The final section of this investigation has been designed to set forth certain suggestions and necessary recommendations. Various criteria need to be established, re-established and expanded to enhance the personnel program for non-instructional employees.

Before making any recommendations, certain limitations of this descriptive investigation must be reiterated. No attempts have been made in this investigation to downgrade systems with some inadequacies or to belittle the importance of the instructional segment of the educational enterprise. The primary aim of any educational enterprise is based on developing an adequate non-instructional employees' program so that the maximum benefits can accrue to the instructional component. Also, the ultimate aim of quality education for the child is made possible. By no means has the writer insinuated that the non-instructional component is more important than the instructional component. The writer re-states that this has been a descriptive study rather than a comparative study and requests that the material of this study be accepted as descriptive and not be quoted out of context for comparative purposes. A final request by the writer has been for further investigation in this area. Much valuable information has been revealed, yet a tremendous amount has yet to be uncovered.
With these limitations in mind, the writer decided to make some recommendations concerning general programs for non-instructional personnel. While some of these recommendations were stimulated by the data from the thirteen school districts studied, others grew out of "being with" non-instructional personnel problems for over a year and a half.

**Recommendation 1. Combined Personnel Program.**

The personnel departments for the instructional and non-instructional employees should have the same base and be treated equally. Generally, the non-instructional employees have been hired through the business office by the business manager rather than by a trained specialist in personnel. Since the guiding principles of personnel administration are similar, the programs merit the same treatment.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the non-instructional employees program has been traditionally overshadowed by its instructional counterpart. There needs to be recognition of the importance of the non-instructional employees to the total educational enterprise. School districts should study the functions of the non-instructional program to reveal its strengths and weaknesses and to gain an appreciation of it.

**Recommendation 2. Non-instructional Organization Affiliations.**

Non-instructional employee representation through representative organizations has become a permanent feature of the Public School System. Public employee organizations have increased forty-five percent in the last decade. The rapid growth of union-
ism in public sectors is evident for the future. E. Wright Blake has made the following predictions:

a. Unionization in the public sector is going to increase rapidly and extensively in the 1970's.

b. Union action in the foreseeable future is going to be militant.

c. Collective power will become a major objective of the union leaders.

d. The combination of political and economic bargaining strategies and tactics will disturb the collective bargaining between public management and public employee unions and associations.

e. Civil service concepts of personnel policy and arrangement are going to suffer and be severely modified.

f. The public is going to be paying a big price for what the public employees gain.²

If labor relations are to exist, a Public Employee Relations Board will be needed to judge and enforce sanctions on either public employers or unions which refuse to bargain in good faith or commit unfair labor practices.

Another recommendation in this area is for revision of state laws and provisions governing collective bargaining and negotiation for public employees. Provisions for negotiations of private employees are well established; however, most public employees have only the right to organize.

²Ibid., p. 21-25.
Strikes have been the major weapon used to enforce their demands and have usually brought extreme hardships on the public by the curtailing of their services. Although strikes have been prohibited and punishments have been threatened, strikes still have occurred. When laws cannot be functional they should be dropped or revised. In states where unions are not allowed in education, the employees have joined substitute organizations. Although many communities still question whether public employees should be permitted to organize and negotiate, collective bargaining is the future trend for all sectors of public employment and should be encouraged.

In regard to strikes, Joseph P. Goldberg stated that strikes reflect the changed state of public employee labor relations:

"Next to efforts to bring wages and fringe benefits into line with private sector earning, strikes over union representation and union security issues were most prominent, reflecting both frequent absence in the public sector compared with the private sector of statutory machinery for representation arrangements and efforts to obtain initial agreements."\(^3\)

Recommendation 3. Civil Service Commission Changes

Negotiation with the Civil Service Commission in certain Ohio school districts needs to be revamped. David Stanley stated that the era of unilateralism and unquestioned sovereignty has passed because the major and most distinct effect of

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 6.
unions in public sectors has weakened management.\(^4\) The Civil Service is losing its effectiveness because the new era of bilateralism has arrived. Although the civil service will not go out of business, it will continue to lose its ability to function effectively by the bargaining process. The unions have begun to fulfill their function by getting higher pay, expanded fringe benefits and better work conditions.


High turnover rates have long plagued the non-instructional employees program. Many factors have contributed to this, but prominent causes have been inadequate salaries and fringe benefits, low job and personal satisfaction, low morale, poor in-service training and induction programs and limited opportunities. Equity organizations and collective bargaining have contributed to the improvement of these conditions. By no means have all of the results been positive. Employee retention will remain a problem until more improvements have been made.

Salary improvements have long been a need. There should be a base other than the minimum wage scale which is out of date. Second, the wage scale needs to be equal with that of

private enterprise to equal the competition for competent employees. Third, more twelve month employment is necessary since these employees have to live during the summer months. Fourth, securing better salaries will have a direct bearing on the retention of better employees. For a number of reasons, custodial jobs have often been considered suitable for people no longer able to work in normal positions or retirement people or part-time or second job people. This attitude frequently has caused inferior custodial services from incompetent personnel. Fifth, the salaries should have cost of living increases so that employees can maintain decent standards of living.

The fringe benefits package for non-instructional employees needs to be expanded. Although salary increases have, and should, take precedence over fringe benefits, the possibility of spending funds for new fringe benefits should not be overlooked because of additional advantages. Many fringe benefits have not been classified as earned income so they have been tax exempted. Other benefits have been tax delayed such as some retirement plans. Group purchase of fringe benefits usually has a lower cost per capita than individual purchases. The general public has frowned more upon salary increases than fringe benefits expansion. The fringe benefits package should have provisions to include the family of the employee and the employee after retirement.
Recommendation 5. Training Program Changes.

Training programs have long been a valuable asset to the success of personnel programs, yet they have been poorly developed. Pre-service training and orientation programs are strongly recommended. Many times, induction programs contribute to the initial adjustment and long range retention of prospective employees. Jordan has stated that orientation programs have a greater impact on the non-instructional employees than on the instructional employees because the instructional employees usually come to school systems with reasonable knowledge of the total educational enterprise. Improvement in programs in this area introduces the total educational system, opens channels of communication, indicates specific job responsibilities and future trends of the departments and the system.

Quality in-service training programs have long been a need. Although certain qualifications have been required, there has also been a need to further develop them. With education rapidly changing and becoming the most effective change agent, change must be introduced through this channel. Increased utilization of human potential and resources, the introduction of new methods, supplies and equipment and other items of this nature can readily be accomplished through

---

these channels. In addition, high caliber training programs will encourage new responsibilities thereby developing potential leadership. Jordan has summarized the primary aims of in-service activities as being to: (1) reinforce preservice and orientation programs, (2) explain changes in the district's internal organization which will affect service employees, (3) develop better understanding of roles, responsibilities and relationships of different employee groups in the district, (4) improve the communication patterns among personnel and buildings in the district, (5) explain the changes in work procedures, and (6) improve the skills needed in present positions.6


High morale has been a significant ingredient to the success of any organization, yet it has existed at a very low level among non-instructional employees. Although the need has been acknowledged for individual and job satisfaction, salary and fringe benefits have played the major role. Pride and respect in job titles and working relationships are also a requisite for success. Being identified by degrading names such as non-professionals, janitors, cleaning women, laborers and other names of this caliber have been considered to be de-humanizing. The training requirements have inspired proper respect. As a result of changes in

6 Ibid., p. 51.
this area, pride and respect will yield higher morale, quality job performance, promptness and aggressiveness, cooperation, and job and personal satisfaction.

Recommendation 7. Retirement, Tenure and Severence.

Will the retirement plans of today be sufficient for non-instructional employees to maintain a decent standard of living many years from now? The responsibility resides with the administrator who must make sure that former employees do not sink into substandard living conditions because of inadequate retirement plans. It is recommended that the state retirement plans be checked to determine the answer to the above question. It is suggested that the unused sick leave benefits be converted into a worthwhile benefit such as major health insurance.

Tenure provisions have long been needed for the non-instructional employees. Generally, tenure has been offered only to the instructional employees however, the non-instructional employees deserve this security also. Civil service employees have this protection and all public employees should have the same privilege.

Severence provisions need to be revamped. In some instances, non-instructional employees have received some form of pay when leaving a position. Usually the pay has been for vacation and retirement, but some school systems omit this pay. It is recommended that all school systems provide sev-
erence pay especially when employees have accumulated vacation days and sick leave.

**Recommendation 8. Sick Leave.**

Some form of quality control is needed for sick leave provisions. School districts have paid non-instructional employees salaries and have usually given them fifteen sick leave days with full pay. When employees take these days, whether they are sick or falsely sick, the school district has to pay someone else to perform the duties. This means that the school district has paid twice for the same service. The school district has limited methods of making sure that the employees are actually sick and are not abusing this privilege. To limit the number of abuses, the school districts must develop another method to compensate the good hearted employees who feel that this is their right and do not want to forfeit it when leaving the system. As previously suggested, maybe sick leave can be converted into insurance or some other benefit at retirement. The school district would save because substitute employees must orient themselves to the job and they usually still cannot perform it as well as the regular employee. If the employee dies before retirement, the benefits should be given to the family of the employee and the sick leave benefits could be converted into benefits for the family. It is the writer's opinion that this protection would add to the employee's protection for his family and would help to retain competent employees.
Recommendation 9. Supervision and Staff Participation.

Although supervision exists, more quality supervisory leadership is needed. It is a well known fact that supervisory level leadership has been a major factor for success in business. The non-instructional supervisors and managers have need of in-service training which includes organizational behavior theory, social psychology and personnel administration. Since supervisors and managers serve as liaison officers between the top level administration and the lower eschelon worker, they should be on the school's supervisory team.

Employee participation in the decision making process is needed. This makes employees a part of the total educational structure. Also, staff participation helps develop higher morale and valuable resources in personnel can be utilized.


A uniform statewide classification system is needed and should be based on the Dictionary of Occupational Titles and Job Descriptions. While conducting the interviews, the writer came across many self-made titles which made it impossible to compare jobs beyond the particular school districts. The requirements for many of these jobs varied as did the salaries. Uniform job descriptions would alleviate overlapping job descriptions.
Criteria are needed that will improve the workload formulas and the selection of employees assigned to perform certain duties.

Year-round employment is desirable. Generally, non-instructional employees have been hired for nine or ten months. To maintain a decent standard of living during the summer months, usually an employee has to seek other employment.

There has also been a need for full-time employment rather than part-time work where people use the position as a second job.

Quality personnel evaluation programs for non-instructional employees have long been a need. Frequently, evaluation programs have been misinterpreted and poorly developed. Jordan has stated that the basic aim of any evaluation program should be to improve the performance of the employee and to make the program reach its goals.\(^7\) Also evaluation would have an influence on effective communication, quality job performance, promotion and transfer and dismissal information. This information has also been helpful in re-defining job descriptions. In a progressive evaluation system, a justifiable basis for rating and appraisal is needed.

In conclusion, this investigation gathered data on the salary, fringe benefits and trend of negotiations for non-

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 52.
instructional school employees in the thirteen largest school
districts in the State of Ohio. As previously pointed out,
little concern has been given to the non-instructional school
employees in the past. The summary, conclusion and recom-
mendations indicate the areas of greatest need for change
and offer a partial bridge to span the existing gaps in the
programs for non-instructional school employees.
APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE - GUIDE ON NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SCHOOL EMPLOYEES

1. GENERAL INFORMATION
   A. ____________________________ Name of District
   B. ____________________________ (Street)
   ____________________________ (City) (State) (Zip Code) Address
   C. Type of District: (Please Check)
      ______ 1. City ______ 2. Suburban ______ 4. County Unit
   D. GENERAL INFORMATION ON PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES:
      1. Has the Board of Education formally recognized a bargaining unit for the professional staff? (Yes or No)
      ______
      2. How many years have formal negotiations existed? (Number)
      ______
      3. What organization has been recognized as the bargaining agent for professional staff? (Please check)
         _____ a. American Federation of Teachers Affiliate
         _____ b. National Education Association Affiliate
         _____ c. Independent
         _____ d. Other
         ______
      4. Have the teachers in your district ever held a professional study day, strike, or any other type of work stoppage in 1969-70? (Yes or No)
         ______
   E. GENERAL INFORMATION ON NON-INSTRUCTIONAL EMPLOYEES:
      1. Total non-instructional staff (1969-1970) (Number) ______
      2. Total turnover rate for non-instructional employees 1969-70 (Number) ______
      3. How many years have formal negotiations existed? (Number) ______
Questionnaire-Guide on Non-Instructional School Employees

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WITH A CHECK IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX

YES  NO

4. Non-instructional employees are hired through the personnel office.

5. Non-instructional employees are hired through the business office.

6. Is there a labor relations bureau in the community?

7. Do the unions or OAPSE write legal contracts?

8. Handbooks are provided with pertinent information on duties, rights and privileges?
# PART TWO

Please answer these questions with the correct response (percentage, number, or yes-no). Answer these responses by the corresponding category at the top.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Food Service</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Teacher Aides</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of employees</td>
<td>(number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turnover rate per category</td>
<td>(percentage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pre-service training</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Probationary work period</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In-service training</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Percentage of employees represented by Local Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Percentage of employees represented by OAPSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the Local Union effective?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is OAPSE effective?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are fees charged for in-service training?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is there a negotiation team?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of days in work stoppage in 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Number of hours in work week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are dues check-offs permitted?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are insurance check-offs permitted?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are representation elections permitted?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Is this a closed shop?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Have periods of arbitration been held?</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Cost of living increases are given</td>
<td>(yes-no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART THREE

BENEFITS PERTAINING TO PAY FOR TIME NOT WORKED

A. Leaves with Pay for Major Purposes as: Personal Illness, Quarantine, or Accidental Injury

1. Are the provisions of your sick leave plan above the state-mandated program? (yes or no)

2. What is the annual allowance in days per year for sick leave at full pay? (number)

3. What is the total number of days of sick leave at full pay which may be accumulated? (number or unlimited, if applicable)

B. Short Term Leaves with Pay for Minor Purposes as: Personal Leave, Personal Business, Emergency Leave

1. Are personal business or emergency leaves granted? (yes or no)

2. How many days per year? (number)

3. Are these days deducted from sick leave? (yes or no)

4. Are other short-term leaves granted? (yes or no)
   If yes, answer chart with correct response.
C. Absences of Half-Day or Less With Pay. Please answer with correct response (yes or no) in blank under categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Appointment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Appearances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Self-Improvement Not On School Time

1. Are funds provided to pay persons who earn additional high school credit? (yes or no)

2. Are funds provided to pay persons for attendance at overnight conferences or workshops held when school is not in session? (yes or no)
E. Retirement Benefits. Retirement provisions paid by the Board of Education and employee? (check items applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retirement Plan</th>
<th>Paid by School Board (percentage)</th>
<th>Paid by Employee (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Severance Pay

1. Do you have a provision for severance pay? (yes or no)

   If yes, please answer the following:

   Payment is dependent upon: (please check items below)

   a. Departure under any circumstances.
   b. Quits (departure is employee's decision)
   c. Dismissal (departure is school system's decision)
   d. Retirement
   e. Death
PART FOUR

BENEFITS PERTAINING TO INSURANCE PAID EITHER TOTALLY OR IN PART BY THE SCHOOL BOARD

A. General Information

1. Do you provide any type of insurance coverage for your employees? (yes or no)
   
   If yes, please answer the remainder of Part Four.
   If no, please answer Part Five.

2. Do you offer a package of insurance programs from which employees may choose or are they, just as a matter of course, enrolled in the programs available? (please check)
   
   a. Package offered
   b. Enrolled in programs available

B. Insurance Benefits - Please answer these questions with the correct response (check yes or no) in the space provided under corresponding category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Insurance</th>
<th>Coverage Provided (yes-no)</th>
<th>Coverage for Employee only (yes-no)</th>
<th>Percentage paid by school for school only</th>
<th>Percentage paid by school for family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART FIVE

MISCELLANEOUS FRINGE BENEFITS

A. Workmen's Compensation

1. Does your district provide for Workmen's Compensation coverage for disabilities occurring on the job or in line of duty? (yes or no)

2. Does your district provide an equivalent plan for Workmen's Compensation? (yes or no)

Comments (Parts Four and Five)
PART SIX

FUTURE OF FRINGE BENEFITS

Please answer these questions with brief statements.

A. In your opinion, what will be the next fringe benefit added to your package?

B. In your opinion, what will be the next fringe benefit, currently being provided, to be increased or broadened?

C. What are the reasons for the turnover rate?

D. What are the reasons for the non-instructional employees forming equity groups?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

E. What are the reasons for the non-instructional employees not forming equity groups?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

F. If major problems have not been covered adequately, please state them briefly.
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
   d. 
APPENDIX B

LETTERS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS
Mr. John E. Doe, Director
Business Affairs
49 E. College Avenue
Yourtown, Ohio 45501

Dear Mr. Doe:

I appreciate very much your willingness to assist us in our research on non-instructional employees within the state of Ohio. As I mentioned to you on the telephone, our study will focus upon the collection of information about negotiation patterns and salary and fringe benefit information about non-instructional school employees such as clerical employees, food service employees, operation (custodial) employees, transportation employees and teacher aides.

Mr. Mel Williams, one of my research assistants, is planning on meeting with you in your Springfield office on (time and date). At that time, he will ask you a number of specific questions from the questionnaire enclosed.

Your assistance in this study will help us provide a more effective base line of data for school personnel and state personnel to utilize in future decision making regarding non-professional employees. When the study is completed, we will forward a summary of the findings directly to you.

Thanks again for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur W. Eve
Associate Professor

AWE:1kp
Enclosure
APPENDIX C

FERGUSON ACT
FERGUSON ACT

CHAPTER 4117

STRIKES BY PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

4117.01 Definitions.
4117.02 Strike by public employees prohibited.
4117.03 Termination of employment.
4117.05 Strike defined.

4117.01 (17-7). Definitions. As used in sections 4117.01 to 4117.05, inclusive, of the Revised Code:

(A) "Strike" means the failure to report for duty, the willful absence from one's position, the stoppage of work, or the abstention in whole or in part from the faithful, and proper performance of the duties of employment, for the purpose of inducing, influencing, or coercing a change in the conditions, compensation, rights, privileges, or obligations of employment, or of intimidation, coerking, or unlawfully inducing others from remaining in or from assuming such public employment.

Such sections do not limit, impair, or affect the right of any public employee to the expression or communication of a view, preference, or opinion on any matter related to the conditions or compensation of public employment or their betterment, so long as such expression or communication is not designed to and does not interfere with the full, faithful, and proper performance of the duties of employment.

(B) "Public employee" means any person holding a position by appointment or employment in the government of this state, or any municipal corporation, county, township, or other political subdivision of this state, or in the public school service, or any public or special district, or in the service of any authority, commission, or board, or in any other branch of the public service.

Source: GC § 17.3, §17.4.

4117.02 (17-8). Strike by public employees prohibited.

No public employee shall strike. No person exercising any authority, supervision, or direction over any public employees shall have the power to authorize, approve, or consent to a strike by one or more public employees, and such person shall not authorize, approve, or consent to such strike.

Source: GC § 17.9, § 17.9.

4117.05 (17-11). Restatement. A person violating sections 4117.01 to 4117.05, inclusive, of the Revised Code, may be appointed or re-appointed, employed, or re-employed, as a public employee, but only upon the following conditions:

(A) His compensation shall in no event exceed that received by him immediately prior to the time of such violation;

(B) His compensation shall not be increased until after the expiration of one year from such appointment or re-appointment, employment or re-employment;

(C) Such person shall be on probation for a period of two years following such appointment or re-appointment, employment or re-employment, during which period he shall serve without tenure and at the pleasure of the appointing officer or body.


4117.01 (17-12). Strike defined. Any public employee who, without the approval of his superior, unlawfully fails to report for duty, or abandons his position, or abstains from, or makes a change in, the conditions, compensation, rights, privileges, or obligations of employment, or of intimidation, coercing, or unlawfully inducing others from remaining in or from assuming such public employment as on strike, provided that notice that he is on strike shall be sent to such employee by his superior by mail addressed to his residence as set forth in his employment record. Such employee, upon request, shall be entitled to establish that he did not violate sections 4117.01 to 4117.05, inclusive, of the Revised Code. Such request must be in writing, with the officer or body having power to remove such employee, within ten days after a written communication of such employee, or has ceased. In the event of such request such officer or body shall within ten days commence a proceeding for the determination of whether such sections have been violated by such public employee, in accordance with the law and regulations applicable to a proceeding to remove such public employee. Such proceedings shall be undertaken without unnecessary delay.

4117.05 (17-10). Termination of employment. Any public employee who violates sections 4117.01 to 4117.05, inclusive, of the Revised Code, shall thereby be considered to have abandoned and terminated his appointment or employment and shall no longer hold such position, or be entitled to any of the rights or emoluments thereof, except if appointed or re-appointed.

Ojur 23: 23, Labor § 43.

4117.03 (17-9). Termination of employment.

A person violating sections 4117.01 to 4117.05, inclusive, of the Revised Code, may be appointed or re-appointed, employed, or re-employed, as a public employee, but only upon the following conditions:

(A) His compensation shall in no event exceed that received by him immediately prior to the time of such violation;

(B) His compensation shall not be increased until after the expiration of one year from such appointment or re-appointment, employment or re-employment;

(C) Such person shall be on probation for a period of two years following such appointment or re-appointment, employment or re-employment, during which period he shall serve without tenure and at the pleasure of the appointing officer or body.


4117.02 (17-8). Strike by public employees prohibited.

No public employee shall strike. No person exercising any authority, supervision, or direction over any public employees shall have the power to authorize, approve, or consent to a strike by one or more public employees, and such person shall not authorize, approve, or consent to such strike.

Source: GC § 17.9, § 17.9.

4117.05 (17-11). Restatement. A person violating sections 4117.01 to 4117.05, inclusive, of the Revised Code, may be appointed or re-appointed, employed, or re-employed, as a public employee, but only upon the following conditions:

(A) His compensation shall in no event exceed that received by him immediately prior to the time of such violation;

(B) His compensation shall not be increased until after the expiration of one year from such appointment or re-appointment, employment or re-employment;

(C) Such person shall be on probation for a period of two years following such appointment or re-appointment, employment or re-employment, during which period he shall serve without tenure and at the pleasure of the appointing officer or body.


4117.01 (17-7). Definitions. As used in sections 4117.01 to 4117.05, inclusive, of the Revised Code:

(A) "Strike" means the failure to report for duty, the willful absence from one's position, the stoppage of work, or the abstention in whole or in part from the faithful, and proper performance of the duties of employment, for the purpose of inducing, influencing, or coercing a change in the conditions, compensation, rights, privileges, or obligations of employment, or of intimidation, coercing, or unlawfully inducing others from remaining in or from assuming such public employment. Such sections do not limit, impair, or affect the right of any public employee to the expression or communication of a view, preference, or opinion on any matter related to the conditions or compensation of public employment or their betterment, so long as such expression or communication is not designed to and does not interfere with the full, faithful, and proper performance of the duties of employment.

(B) "Public employee" means any person holding a position by appointment or employment in the government of this state, or any municipal corporation, county, township, or other political subdivision of this state, or in the public school service, or any public or special district, or in the service of any authority, commission, or board, or in any other branch of the public service.

Source: GC § 17.3, §17.4.

4117.02 (17-8). Strike by public employees prohibited.

No public employee shall strike. No person exercising any authority, supervision, or direction over any public employees shall have the power to authorize, approve, or consent to a strike by one or more public employees, and such person shall not authorize, approve, or consent to such strike.

Source: GC § 17.9, § 17.9.

4117.05 (17-11). Restatement. A person violating sections 4117.01 to 4117.05, inclusive, of the Revised Code, may be appointed or re-appointed, employed, or re-employed, as a public employee, but only upon the following conditions:

(A) His compensation shall in no event exceed that received by him immediately prior to the time of such violation;

(B) His compensation shall not be increased until after the expiration of one year from such appointment or re-appointment, employment or re-employment;

(C) Such person shall be on probation for a period of two years following such appointment or re-appointment, employment or re-employment, during which period he shall serve without tenure and at the pleasure of the appointing officer or body.

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ORGANIZATIONS
AND PERSONNEL INTERVIEWED
AKRON
Mardis Williams, Asst. Supt.
70 N. Broadway
Akron, Ohio 44308

CANTON
Steven Soldatis
Director of Business Affairs
618 High Avenue, N.W.
Canton, Ohio 44703

CENTERVILLE
John Corwin
Director of Special Services
Centerville Board of Education
Centerville, Ohio 45459

CLEVELAND
James Fallon
Director of Business Affairs
Cleveland Board of Education
1380 E. Sixth Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Darian H. Smith, Asst. Supt.
1380 E. Sixth Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

CINCINNATI
John F. Geiger, Director
Employee Relations
230 E. 9th Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

COLUMBUS
F. T. Rudy, Asst. Supt.
270 E. State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

DAYTON
Walter Spurgeon, Director
Business Operation
348 W. 1st Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402

EUCLID
John Lewis, Business Manager
651 E. 222nd Street
Euclid, Ohio 44123

HAMILTON
Steve Pulanski
Director of Personnel
Hamilton Board of Education
332 Dayton Street
Hamilton, Ohio 45011

KETTERING
John T. Lucas, Asst. Supt.
3490 Farhills Avenue
Kettering, Ohio 45429

LORAIN
Clyde R. Scott, Asst. Supt.
1020 Seventh Street
Lorain, Ohio 44052

PARMA
Albert J. Matkovick
Asst. to the Supt. in Charge of Personnel
6726 Ridge Road
Parma, Ohio 44129

SPRINGFIELD
John Garver, Acting Director
Business Affairs
49 E. College Avenue
Springfield, Ohio 45501

TOLEDO
Everett Dean, Asst. Supt.
Manhattan & Elm
Toledo, Ohio 43608

YOUNGSTOWN
Anthony Bellino
Director of Business Affairs
20 West Wood Street
Youngstown, Ohio 44503
OHIO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Dr. Martin Essex: State Superintendent
Dr. John Brum:
Mr. John Barkum: Personnel

OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Mr. Glenn Darr: Consultant
Mr. R. W. Hindman: Director
Mr. John Brown: OAPSE Legal Advisor
Columbus, Ohio

OHIO ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYEES
Mr. James Taylor: Director Government Services

OHIO CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION
Mr. James F. Marshall: Executive Secretary
APPENDIX E

CINCINNATI TAX PAYER SUIT
The following items are based on reports appearing recently in the public press or employee organization publications.

**Fallout From Ohio Court Case On Cincinnati Strike Continues**

Pay increases negotiated February 8 in settlement of a month-long strike by 1,500 members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Council 51 were withheld from the strikers checks for the first time on July 2 in response to an order of the Court of Appeals for the First Appellate District of Ohio. In a June 22 ruling, the court held that city officials could not choose to ignore the punitive provisions of the state's no-strike Ferguson Act, and ordered that the pay hike be withheld for one year (GERR 356, B-5). The court's order, officially entered June 29, does not require the city to collect wage increases paid since February, however. The city will place the newly withheld increases in an escrow account pending final determination of the issue by the Ohio Supreme Court. According to reports, city attorneys formally notified the high court of their intent to appeal the order on July 2, and will have 20 days from that date to prepare their arguments. AFSCME representative Robert Brindza told reporters, meanwhile, that the union has also petitioned the state supreme court for leave to enter the case, but noted that both lower courts refused to admit the union. AFSCME will also seek a show cause order from the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas to enjoin city administrators from carrying out the appeals court order, he said. In yet another development, Hamilton County Court Judge William J. Morrissey ordered July 6 that AFSCME officers appear to show cause why they should not be held in contempt for continuing their strike despite a court injunction. Although city officials had dropped this action, too, as part of the settlement, attorney James Goldman, the taxpayer who prosecuted the successful appeals court ruling, ruling, also succeeded in separate efforts to become a party to the original injunction proceeding, and has re-activated it on the basis of the appellate court decision.
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