DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 565 SP 010 749

AUTHOR McDonnell, Lorraine M.
TITLE NEA Priorities and Their Impact on Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 20p.; Position paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (29th, Chicago, Illinois, March 1-4, 1977); will be included in AACTE 1977 Yearbook

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; Decision Making; Educational Legislation; *Faculty Organizations; Labor Unions; *Policy Formation; Political Attitudes; *Professional Recognition; Status Need; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Associations; Teacher Education; *Teacher Militancy; Teacher Strikes; Teaching Benefits
IDENTIFIERS American Federation of Teachers; *National Education Association

ABSTRACT

The National Education Association (NEA) originally focused on a consensual relationship existing between classroom teachers and administrators on one hand and governing bodies of public education on the other. Both administrators and classroom teachers belonged to the same organization. During the past decade, the NEA became more militant, emphasizing political action, collective bargaining, and teacher strikes for higher pay and better working conditions, thus dividing teachers from management. In the light of lower student enrollment, decreased financial resources, and over-supply of teachers, priorities of NEA action are changing. There is now pressure to bring weight to bear on schools of education, which have tended to emphasize training of administrators, to recognize the needs and demands of the classroom teacher. In demanding greater professional status benefits for classroom teachers, the NEA is seeking to complement the economic gains achieved by their members. Greater teacher participation and more school-site inservice programs are urged to contribute to more effective program implementation and improved classroom learning process. In responding to demands of organized teachers, local district administrators and schools of education, by accepting partnership with organized teachers, can improve the professional standards of the higher-education-based teacher community. (JD)

Position Paper

Lorraine M. McDonnell

29th Annual Meeting

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

2

NEA Priorities and Their Impact on Teacher Education

Lorraine M. McDonnell

Social Scientist
The Rand Corporation
Santa Monica, Calif.

Prepared for the 29th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, Illinois, March 3, 1977.

Preface

This analysis is based on a long-term interest in teacher collective bargaining, but it is not the work of an insider to either the nation's teacher organizations or to the higher education-based teacher community. Consequently, the perspective offered here is that of a neutral observer, biased only by a tendency, common to political scientists, to see most societal activities as essentially political and involving the balancing of group interests.

The discussion prepresented in this paper draws upon the author's Ph.D. dissertation and upon research completed under the sponsorship of the Rand Corporation's Policy Research Center in Educational Finance and Governance, funded under a contract with the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the 1960s the National Education Association (NEA) drastically changed its organizational agenda in response to competition from the AFT and a challenge from its own urban membership. Using a combined strategy of collective bargaining and political action, the association concentrated its efforts on obtaining better economic and status benefits for classroom teachers. There is no doubt that organized teachers made significant gains over the last 10 years in terms of both increased salaries and greater influence over educational policy making. Now in the face of declining student enrollment and decreased financial resources for public education, the NEA faces a new challenge. It is unclear whether the association and its local affiliates can continue to deliver the same kind of benefits to their membership as they have

in the past. Consequently, they may find themselves attempting to substitute greater teacher control over educational policy for the wage gains the NEA was able to secure for its members in the past.

This paper is an analysis of both the NEA's priorities and an assessment of the association's potential impact on public educational policy over the next five to 10 years. The first section outlines the major changes which have occurred within the NEA since the mid-1960s and their consequences for other education-related groups. In the second section, the effect of current NEA priorities on the higher education-based teacher community are discussed and an attempt is made to deal with the question of whether or not there is a basis for cooperation between organized teachers and schools of education.

A Changed NEA and Its Effect on School Governance

Established in 1857, the NEA is the oldest and largest of the organizations which represent the nation's teachers. Its membership now numbers over 1.5 million. With an annual budget of more than $48 million, the NEA is the wealthiest professional organization in the country. In 1970, the NEA and its local affiliates enrolled 78.3 percent of the nation's public school teaching force as members.

During the past 15 years, the NEA has undergone a profound change in its organizational goals and programs. Previously, it had portrayed itself as a professional organization and had condemned collective bargaining, strikes, and affiliation with the labor movement. The NEA believed that a consensual relationship should exist between classroom teachers and administrators on the one hand, and the governing bodies of public education on the other. In keeping with the organization's concept of professional unity, both administrators and classroom teachers belonged to the same organization. Although the majority of the membership was composed of classroom teachers, most of NEA's leadership positions were traditionally held by those in either educational administration or higher education.

Although the organization had been pressured in the past by classroom teachers demanding more of a voice in association affairs,[1] it was not until the early 1960s that the NEA was actually faced with a set of challenges that threatened its very survival as the dominant professional group in public education. In his article on organizational change, James Q. Wilson hypothesizes that "many organizations will adopt no major innovations unless there is a 'crisis'—an extreme change in conditions for which there is no adequate, programmed response."[2] For the NEA this crisis was the victory of the AFT in New York City. Not only did the AFT win the right to bargain collectively for the teachers of New York City, but through the use of a strike the union was able to obtain higher salaries and better working conditions for the teachers. After the success in New York City, the AFT went on to win representational elections in other major cities. These victories indicated that at least urban teachers were dissatisfied with the NEA's limited approach to improving teacher welfare.

In addition to competition from the AFT, the NEA was faced with a second challenge, internal to its own organization. The leaders of urban associations, affiliated with the NEA and located largely in medium-sized cities and suburbs,

began to make demands on the association. They felt that the NEA had neglected the special needs of urban teachers. Yet at the same time, these urban leaders were committed to the NEA's traditional goal of teacher professionalism. Consequently, instead of turning *en masse* to the AFT with its more "bread and butter" concerns, they chose to stay within the NEA and press for reform.

The urban associations organized the National Council of Urban Education Associations (NCUEA) to operate as a bloc within the NEA. When appeals to the established leadership were unsuccessful, the NCUEA took its demands directly to the floor of the NEA's annual conventions. Although it took nearly 10 years, NEA policies were gradually changed by the votes of convention delegates.

By 1971 the urban associations had successfully transformed the NEA into an advocacy organization for classroom teachers. Instead of the NEA's traditional concept of professional unity, the conflicts of interest that exist between classroom teachers and school administrators were now emphasized. School boards were seen as natural adversaries, and the NEA actively promoted the right of teachers to bargain collectively and even to strike if necessary. During the 1960-61 school year there were only three teacher strikes nationwide, but by the 1970-71 school year the number had grown to 180 nationwide. During the decade over 500 strikes occurred, and two-thirds of the more than 500,000 teachers who participated were members of the NEA or its affiliates. It soon became clear to many school administrators that the NEA, by its support of collective bargaining and the right of teachers to strike, had placed itself in an adversary relationship with them. Consequently, in 1973 members of the American Association of School Administrators voted overwhelmingly to sever organizational ties with the NEA. Both the elementary and secondary principals' associations soon voted to follow the same course of action.

Another significant change in the NEA has been its heightened emphasis on political action as a strategy. Traditionally, the NEA portrayed itself as "above politics" and argued that it would be unprofessional for the association to become involved in partisan politics. Consequently it confined its lobbying to the provision of technical information to legislators and never adopted an "elect our friends and defeat our enemies" strategy as organized labor had. By 1971, the NEA had reversed its position on involvement in partisan electoral politics, and in 1974 an estimated $3.5 million was spent by NEA state political affiliates on federal, state, and local election campaigns.[3] The 1976 election marked the first time that the NEA has endorsed a presidential ticket in a national election. But again NEA political activity was focused on more than just active support of the Carter-Mondale candidacy. With the help of a sizable political action fund derived from a one dollar a member payroll deduction, organized teachers assisted congressional, state legislative, and school board candidates sympathetic to the NEA position.

With these changes in the NEA's basic strategy has come a significant transformation of its organizational goals. At all levels—national, state, and local—the NEA has reoriented its priorities away from the articulation of vague professional goals toward the provision of concrete welfare benefits for its members. As they relate to the long-term impact of teacher militancy, however, the economic gains made by organized teachers may be only

secondary. Rather, the fact that the NEA has finally attempted to put some "teeth" on the professional goals it has espoused since its founding could be of much greater importance. Through political action and the collective bargaining process, the NEA is trying to guarantee professional autonomy for classroom teachers, the full participation of teachers in the local implementation of educational programs as well as their right to assist in determining standards for professional preparation and licensure. In the next sections we will examine: (a) the collective bargaining goals of organized teachers, (b) their aims with regard to the political process, and (c) their overall impact on other education-related groups, and on school governance in general.

a. The Collective Bargaining Goals of Organized Teachers

Except for the data collected by the NEA and published biennially until 1971, there has been no systematic analysis of teacher contracts to see what types of educational practice items are actually included and how strong these provisions are.* It is clear, however, that organized teachers have tried to define scope more broadly than has been done in the private sector where it is confined to "wages, hours, and working conditions." Part of the problem is, of course, that this definition is difficult to apply in public education. For example, is the matter of class size a working condition, or is it a matter of educational policy and, therefore, the sole prerogative of local boards of education? But more important than the definitional problem is the whole issue of professionalism.

In their discussion of public sector scope of bargaining, Prasow and his colleagues argue that the standards of a profession, such as teaching, impose on its members certain imperatives in bargaining and in the employee-management relationship. These imperatives, then, "encourage a broad approach to defining scope of bargaining for the affected groups."[4] For teachers, such an approach has meant demands that they be given more of a voice in educational decisions and more control over the implementation of

*Under the sponsorship of the National Institute of Education and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, HEW, the author and a Rand colleague, Dr. Anthony Pascal, are now examining a nationwide sample of both AFT and NEA contracts to see what types of educational items have been included in final settlement. Included in our study are provisions relating to class size; teacher evaluation, promotion, assignment, and transfer procedures; utilization of paraprofessionals and student interns; as well as teacher participation in instructional policy making and the design of inservice programs. After we have analyzed variation in the scope of bargaining, dependent on school district and teacher organizational characteristics, we will begin fieldwork in a number of school districts selected to represent a range of both district and teacher organizational variables. During this second phase, we will attempt to determine precisely the extent to which organized teachers are able to participate in and influence districtwide and school-level decision making. The results of this study will be available in approximately one year.

educational programs. Organized teachers argue that as professionals they are better trained in the specifics of the learning process than are most policy makers and are, therefore, better equipped to make those decisions which most directly affect the classroom environment.* These demands have obvious economic consequences. Nevertheless, as Prasow notes, a far greater concern from the employers' point of view is that these goals represent a fundamental challenge to managerial authority.[5]

As was noted above, we do not yet have complete data on the inclusion of educational practice items in teacher contracts. However, we can obtain a tentative idea of what teachers are negotiating by examining the data on teacher contracts gathered by the NEA in the 1966/67, 1968/69, and 1970/71 school years.**

From an examination of Table 1, it is clear that the nonsalary and nonfringe items which are included most frequently in final contracts are those which relate directly to working conditions (e.g., teaching hours, lunch periods, etc.) and to teacher performance in the classroom (class size, teacher aides, etc.). Those items most likely to be defined as a part of district-level educational policy (viz., tax/bond programs, state/federal fund application, and budgetary item distribution) have been included in only a minority of the total number of comprehensive agreements negotiated. In addition, as the incidence of teacher collective bargaining has spread and the number of comprehensive agreements increased, these distinctly district-level policy items have failed to increase at the same rate, or in some instances, have actually decreased.

Despite the fact that organized teachers have chosen not to negotiate over how district-level decisions are to be made, the collective bargaining goals have had and will continue to have an impact on school governance. School and classroom-level items subject to negotiation, such as class size, teacher aides, and curriculum review, have the effect of limiting the flexibility of school management at all levels from the superintendent to the principal. As a result of an expanded scope, then, management may be more constrained in its authority and teachers may have greater influence over policy decisions at the school and classroom level. (The effect of a widened scope of bargaining on school governance will be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent section.)

---

*While this discussion is focused particularly on the NEA, conclusions about collective bargaining and political action goals also apply to the AFT.

**It must be pointed out that there are a number of problems with this data. For each time period, the NEA surveyed all school systems with 1,000 or more students (n = 7,122), asking those with collective negotiations for teachers to respond to a questionnaire and to return a copy of their final agreement for the designated school year. The response rate for each time period differed greatly, showing a significant increase from 1966/67 to 1970/71. Given the NEA's research procedures, we can assume that most of the difference in response rate is due to the growth of collective bargaining over this period—in 1966/67 far fewer districts had collective negotiations than had in 1970/71. However, until we know more about the nature of the response rate bias, the analysis here can only be preliminary and the conclusions tentative.

Table 1

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF COMPREHENSIVE AGREEMENTS BY TYPE OF PROVISIONS (EXCLUDING SALARY AND FRINGE ITEMS) 1966/67, 1968/69, and 1970/71*

(Reprinted from Lorraine M. McDonnell, Teacher Collective Bargaining and School Governance, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California December 1976)

Items	1966/67[1] Number of Agreements	1966/67[1] Percent of Total Agreements	1968/69[2] Number of Agreements	1968/69[2] Percent of Total Agreements	1970/71[3] Number of Agreements	1970/71[3] Percent of Total Agreements	Percent Increase 1966/67-1970/71[4]
TOTAL NUMBER OF COMPREHENSIVE AGREEMENTS ANALYZED	389	100.0	978	100.0	1,529	100.0	293.1
Instructional Program							
Curriculum review	85	21.8	173	17.7	395	25.8	364.7*
Teacher qualifications	66	17.0	221	22.6	470	30.7	612.1*
Special education programs	59	15.2	178	13.2	327	21.4	454.2*
Tax/bond programs	67	17.2	62	6.3	45	2.9	-32.8
State/federal fund application	26	6.7	38	3.9	54	3.5	107.6
Test evaluation and application	4	1.0	16	1.6	15	1.0	275.0
Budgetary item distribution	58	14.9	19	1.9	43	2.8	-25.9
Teacher evaluation	48	12.3	62	6.3	106	6.9	120.8
Textbook selection and distribution	140	36.0	317	32.4	366	23.9	161.4
Pupil-teacher ratio/class size	222	57.1	577	59.0	888	58.1	300.0*
Instructional aids	169	43.4	244	24.9	306	20.0	81.1
Secretarial/clerical assistance	36	9.2	115	11.8	182	11.9	405.6*
School calendar or year	252	64.8	441	45.1	897	58.7	256.0
Pupil progress reports	19	4.9	69	7.0	100	6.5	426.3
Extracurricular activities	131	33.7	209	21.4	292	19.1	123.0
Parent-teacher conference	94	24.2	200	20.4	466	30.5	395.7*
Integration	116	29.8	19	1.9	60	3.9	-48.2
Teacher aides	73	18.8	285	29.1	284	32.0	569.9*
Personnel Policies and Practices							
Individual contracts	184	47.3	108	11.0	364	23.8	97.9
Teaching hours or day	194	51.2	513	52.5	819	53.6	322.2*
Teaching load/class schedule	192	49.4	429	50.3	654	42.8	240.6
Subject area assignment	242	62.2	517	52.9	695	45.5	187.2
Special education assignment	43	11.0	269	27.5	354	23.2	723.2*
Hours before and after class	153	39.3	425	43.4	606	39.6	296.1
Duty-free planning periods	211	54.2	509	52.0	805	52.7	281.5
Duty-free lunch period (elementary)	237	60.9	584	59.7	884	57.8	273.0
Duty-free lunch period (secondary)	222	57.1	575	58.8	852	55.7	283.8
Non-classroom service duties	187	48.1	421	43.0	617	40.4	230.0
Promotions	242	62.2	463	47.3	703	46.0	190.5
Professional growth/inservice-training	112	28.8	513	52.5	754	49.3	573.2*
Regular teaching meetings	131	33.7	373	38.1	720	47.1	449.6*
Transfers	261	67.1	558	57.1	886	57.9	239.5
Dismissal and resignation	114	29.3	157	16.1	358	23.4	214.0
Grievance procedure	347	89.2	889	90.9	1,362	89.1	293.0*
Binding arbitration	130	33.4	398	40.7	672	44.0	416.9*
Code of ethics	133	34.2	298	30.5	346	22.6	160.2
Teacher reprimand	157	40.4	342	35.0	521	34.1	231.8
Teacher protection/pupil discipline	230	59.1	589	60.2	824	53.9	258.3
Personnel file	173	44.5	575	58.8	749	49.0	332.9*
Damaged/stolen property reimbursements	133	34.2	238	24.3	307	20.1	130.8
Teacher evaluation procedures	241	62.0	595	60.8	884	57.8	266.8
Teacher facilities	212	64.5	506	51.7	690	45.1	225.5
Substitute teachers	57	14.6	442	45.2	580	37.9	917.6

*Denote those items whose inclusion in final agreements increased at a rate equal to or faster than the growth in the total number of comprehensive agreements (i.e., 293.1%).

Source: "Trends in Negotiable items for Teachers," *National Education Association Negotiation Research Digest*, Vol. 6, No. 3, November 1972, pp. 13-14.

[1]Of the 1,540 classroom teacher agreements analyzed, 398 (25.8%) were comprehensive. "What's Being Negotiated," *National Education Association Negotiation Research Digest*, Vol. 1, No. 6, February 1968, p. B-1.

[2]Of the 2,605 classroom teacher agreements analyzed, 978 (37.5%) were comprehensive. These comprehensive agreements covered 43.8% (420,118) of all teachers employed in school system with negotiated agreements. "What are Teacher Negotiating?" *National Education Association Negotiation Research Digest*, Vol. 3, No. 6, Feb. 1970, p. 15.

[3]Of the 3,522 classroom teacher agreements analyzed, 1529 (43.4%) were comprehensive. These comprehensive agreements covered 53.5% (654,922) of all teachers represented in school system with negotiation agreements. "What Are Teachers Negotiating?" *National Education Association Negotiation Research Digest*, Vol. 5, November 1971, p. 20.

[4]Calculated by the author from NEA data.

Although it is only an assumption at this point, our preliminary analysis and the conclusions of others who have studied teacher collective bargaining indicate that there is a stage process involved. When a teacher organization begins to bargain collectively in a local school district, its first concern is with economic issues. Once the bargaining relationship matures and a number of initial gains are made, the teacher organization will then go beyond wages and benefits and begin to bargain on items traditionally considered to be related to educational policy.[6]

Before moving on to a discussion of organized teachers and political action, two other points should be made about the determinants of collective bargaining outcomes. First of all, from our preliminary analysis it appears that such variables as teacher organization strength (e.g., proportion of the total teaching force enrolled as members, ability to compete with a rival organization, and willingness to strike); school district characteristics (e.g., district wealth, elected as opposed to an appointed school board, amount of LEA expertise in bargaining, etc.); and area amenability to organized labor are more important in determining scope of bargaining than are state provisions regulating public employee collective bargaining. For example, the states with the broadest scope of bargaining (Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin) differ in their statutory provisions, but in all these states the NEA and the AFT are strong, militant, and competitive with each other.[7] In addition, the concept of collective bargaining for teachers gained early acceptance in these states, partly because they are states in which organized labor has traditionally been strong.

Secondly, it has been argued that given the present enrollment decline and financial problems faced by local districts, school boards will be more willing to concede to teacher organizations on issues of governance (i.e., educational policy issues) in order to conserve scarce resources. In other words, there will be some kind of tradeoff between increased monetary benefits and greater control over district and school-level decision making. Again, this is only an assumption and it is still too early to determine whether such a trend will develop. What is important, however, is that teacher participation in educational policy is a collective bargaining goal of teacher organizations independent of current constraints on their ability to obtain greater economic benefits for their members.

b. Organized Teachers and the Political Process

Both the NEA and the AFT turned to political action because they realized there are real limits on what can be gained through the collective bargaining process alone. Not only are more resources available at higher levels of government, but by going outside the traditional board of education/teacher organization relationship, organized teachers believe they have a better chance of accomplishing their aims.

The first goal of political action by teachers is to insure that they achieve more of their demands vis á vis the collective bargaining process. At the same time, however, both the AFT and the NEA realize that in some instances it is more efficient to lobby the state and federal governments. For example, instead of fighting with each Local Education Agency (LEA) for the right to bargain collectively, the teacher organizations are working for the passage of state and

federal laws mandating collective bargaining for teachers. This strategy is a much more effective use of their organizational resources. In addition, both groups realize that, given the present inability of local jurisdictions to provide for all of the costs of public education, demands must be made on the state and federal governments to assume a greater responsibility for financing public education. In a sense, the AFT and the NEA are attempting to "level-up" the locus of educational decision making to higher levels of government.

It is still too soon to assess systematically the impact of the teacher organizations foray into politics. The NEA did not commit itself to a program of political action until 1971, and the AFT, until recently, did not act independently of the AFL-CIO political action arm, COPE. Consequently, it is too early to determine just how successful they have been in influencing the passage of legislation designed to supplement and facilitate collective bargaining settlements. At the national level, the NEA has been successful at least in the short run. A majority of the candidates it supported in 1974 were elected—229 out of 282 NEA-endorsed candidates running for the House of Representatives and 21 of the 28 who were supported in their races for the Senate.

While these legislators may be sympathetic to organized teachers, there is no guarantee that they will always be willing to support the demands of the AFT and the NEA. For example, most analysts believe that the recent passage in California of a bill mandating collective bargaining for teachers was due to the efforts of the AFT and the NEA in the 1974 election.* At the same time, however, the governor and the state legislature have been unwilling to appropriate the additional state aid for schools that the teacher organizations have requested.

Teacher organizations in some areas have also been successful in electing candidates to local school boards who support the aims of organized teachers. Again, this is a relatively new practice and the consequences of these electoral alliances are still unknown. Nevertheless, such arrangements have the potential to create not only serious conflicts of interest, but also a further blurring of the line between management and employee organizations.

In the next section, we will outline the effects—both present and future—of teacher collective bargaining and political action on education policy-making and on the client and professional groups involved in public education.

c. Organized Teachers and School Governance

Along with the demands of various client groups for equal educational opportunity, the activities of organized teachers have contributed greatly to the increased politicization of educational policy making over the last 10 years. The new goals and strategies that both the NEA and AFT have decided to pursue can alter the kinds of policies that are enacted, the level of government

*Over $550,000 was spent in 1974 in state-wide elections by the political action arm of the California Teachers Association.[8] In fact, the AFT and the NEA spent more money in the 1974 California election than any other interest group and were second only to the total spent by the entire oil industry in that state.[9]

at which major decisions in this area are made, and the relative balance of power among the various actors involved in public education in the United States. In this section, we will first examine how the activities of organized teachers have impacted on the various levels of government and then how they have affected their other education-related groups.

The full impact of teacher collective bargaining on state and federal program priorities is yet to come. In implementing their programs at the local level, federal and state officials traditionally had only to deal with local school administrators. Now many state and federal program mandates are affected by the collective bargaining process. Past evaluations have recognized that whether or not an educational innovation is actually implemented at the classroom level is dependent on the behavior of individual teachers. Nevertheless, if the formal authority of classroom teachers is expanded as a result of collective bargaining gains, federal administrators will have yet another factor to include in their implementation strategies. For example, the decisions of organized teachers may determine what types of federally-funded innovative programs are tried within a given district, what priority they are given during the implementation process, and whether or not they are incorporated into the district's program once federal funding stops.

One could argue that if the leaders of a local teachers' organization support a particular federal program, other teachers in the district will respect their colleagues' judgment and thus be more amenable to implementing the program in their own classrooms. In other words, the effective delivery of federal and state programs can be facilitated by the leadership of a local teacher organization—by persons who are closer to classroom teachers than are district administrators. Such an argument, though, would only be an assumption at this point. How the expanded scope of bargaining in public education will affect the success of federal program implementation is an issue which needs to be explored.

We do know, however, that more and more federal mandates are becoming the subject of collective bargaining. For example, the mainstreaming requirement of the Education for All Handicapped Act (PL 94-142) has meant demands for smaller class size or a weighting scheme to make handicapped students count more in determining pupil/student ratios than other students, as well as demands for the provision of more inservice training to teachers. The mandate of the Emergency School Aid Act, stating that districts must have integrated teaching staffs as a condition for funding, has led to the negotiation of more complicated involuntary transfer policies. Finally, teacher contracts limiting the duties teachers can be required to perform have made it more expensive for LEAs to apply for federal and state funding. Many federal and state program applications require teacher input: yet because teachers cannot be asked to stay after school hours to write these applications, districts must spend additional money to pay for the necessary teacher release time. These examples illustrate that federal and state government can expect to see its policies shaped, not just by the lobbying activities of organized teachers and by their participation on professional regulatory bodies, but also by the collective bargaining demands of local teacher organizations.

Perhaps the most immediate impact of organized teachers is being felt by local boards of education. As the NEA changed its goals and strategies over the last

decades, it also began to strengthen its local associations and, in 1970, established what is called the UniServ programs. The goal of this program is to provide one staff person in the field for every 1,200 teachers. If a local association does not have 1,200 members, it can join with other local associations until the proper membership level is reached. The NEA pays a portion of each staff member's salary, with the state and local associations contributing the remainder. Staff members are trained in negotiation and grievance procedures, business management, political action, public relations, and the efficient use of state and NEA resources and economic services. During the first three years of the program's existence, over 500 local associations throughout the country had decided to participate. One of the most important effects of UniServ has been to create in many areas a disparity between the local school board and the teachers' organization in overall bargaining effectiveness. The local NEA affiliate not only has the expertise of a permanent staff member trained in collective bargaining procedures, but it can also call upon the state and national organization for additional assistance and even for substantial funding in the event of a crisis. School boards, on the other hand, often rely exclusively on their own resources and negotiate using their own staff without employing any professional labor relations experts.

In many areas, not only do school boards have fewer resources than the local teacher organization, but they are also subject to bypass strategies which the teacher organization persuades the mayor or other municipal and state officials to use to intervene in the collective bargaining process in order to effect a better settlement. This tactic has led, in some areas, to proposals for city or countywide offices of collective bargaining which would negotiate contracts for all public employees working in a particular jurisdiction. The establishment of such an agency would probably weaken school board control over personnel policy. Also, as teacher organizations target more and more of their political activity to the state and federal levels in the hopes of "leveling-up" control over aspects of collective bargaining and school finance, the responsibilities and autonomy of local school boards will be further weakened.

These changes in the distribution of influence within educational policy-making bodies is, of course, impacting on other actors and groups involved in the process. One group to be particularly affected are midrank school administrators, especially school principals. Are they to be considered part of the "management team" or is their basic community of interest on the side of classroom teachers? Traditionally, most principals have thought of themselves as part of management and have been opposed to being included in any type of collective bargaining arrangement. But as teacher collective bargaining has become more widespread, many principals have begun to reevaluate this position. This is particularly true in large urban districts where the individual principal is far from the top district administrators who actually make the policy decisions which the principal must implement at the school level. Many principals also feel that their leadership position within the school has eroded as teacher organizations have gained more control over educational decision making.

The response of some principals has been to establish union-like organizations of their own. The case of San Francisco principals who formed an organization affiliated with the Teamsters Union is perhaps the most extreme example of

this response. Most principals have not chosen such an alternative though.* Yet if they are to preserve their self-interest as well as their morale and effectiveness, school administrators must find a way to counterpoise the demands of organized teachers for scarce district resources and for authority over educational policy making.

Another group which has recently felt that its interests are threatened by teacher collective bargaining is the general public and parents, in particular Parent and taxpayer groups have become increasingly concerned not just wi. the cost of public education but also with teacher productivity and the effectiveness of the learning process. Yet as Charles Cheng argues, ". . . enlargement of the scope of bargaining pulls more and more educational policy decisions into the collective bargaining arena, (and) parents and communities are pushed further than ever from the educational power structure."[11]

PTAs and other community-based groups have now begun to try to incorporate community input into the collective bargaining process. These advocates of greater citizen participation argue that formal negotiations should be open to public observation and even some form of tripartite bargaining (with a public representative included) should be considered.[12] Some jurisdictions have already begun to make the negotiating process more public. For example, a new labor relations law in Florida has a "sunshine" provision which opens the collective bargaining process to the public.[13] In other areas, voters have used the referenda system to articulate their concerns abo.t public employee collective bargaining.

In addition to the clients of public education and those most directly involved in delivering services to students, the institutions devoted to teacher preparation have also been affected by the changed goals of organized teachers. In its efforts to achieve greater status for the classroom teacher, the NEA has begun to infringe on what has traditionally been the sole prerogative of education schools—the setting of standards for teacher preparation and accreditation. Adopting the concept that a profession is self-regulating, the NEA is advocating the full participation of teachers in the establishment of professional standards. Concretely, such a position has led to demands that teachers constitute a majority on state licensure commissions, be included on advisory committees setting curriculum policy for individual schools of education and, at the district level, be involved in the design of inservice and professional development programs.

In the next section, we will discuss in detail how these demands are affecting schools of education and why apparent conflicts of interest have developed between the two groups.

Before concluding this general discussion of organized teachers and school governance, one additional point should be made. To indicate that organized

---

*In early 1975, there were about 1,015 public school administrator unions, of which 998 were located in only eight states (Connecticut, New Jersey, Washington, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Ohio).[10]

teachers are now affecting the content of educational policy decisions is not to argue that such a change is necessarily bad. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that such a change may allow for more effective implementation of innovative programs and, hence, an improvement in classroom instruction. Recent research on federally-funded innovative educational programs found that teacher morale and teacher willingness to expend extra effort were important determinants of program success.[14] A similar study which focused on reading achievement concluded, "In general, the more active was the role of teachers in implementing the reading program, the more reading achievement improved."[15] To the extent that teachers are granted autonomy in their own classrooms and a voice in how the learning process is structured, they can positively affect the quality of instruction.

What is important to consider, however, is that organized teachers, because of the kinds of demands they are making and by their superior numbers and resources, may be excluding other groups affected by public education from the policy process. It is clear that in making evaluations about educational policies, organized teachers are not solely guided by the professional criterion of student learning effectiveness (i.e., the acquisition of basic skills by students). They also have self-interests which may, at times, come into conflict with the public interest as it relates to education. Public education is one of those areas in which the so-called "public interest" is difficult, if not impossible, to define. Yet it is clear that the needs and desires of other groups besides teachers must be considered.

The NEA and Schools of Education

Like the teaching profession itself, the nation's schools of education are experiencing a time of uncertainty. Since the late 1960s, there has been a surplus of trained teachers which has steadily worsened over time. Some economists have predicted that the current surplus will soon peak and gradually decline, ending in the early to mid-1980s. This period will then be followed by a time of teacher shortage. In any event, analysts predict continuing imbalances (shortages or surpluses) in the market for teachers.[16]

The current oversupply of teachers has obviously influenced the NEA's strategies and goals. Because of the depressed market for teachers and the financial constraints under which most school districts are operating, the association may have to substitute the acquisition of status benefits for the economic gains it previously secured for its membership. At the same time, however, it is important to realize that the NEA would pursue so-called professional goals regardless of present conditions in education. In addition, it is our belief that the association will continue to pursue these goals even if the predicted teacher shortage occurs in the 1980s. The NEA is firmly committed to improving the professional status of its members, and such a policy implies the full incorporation of classroom teachers into all aspects of professional decision making.

It is important to view current efforts of the NEA in their historical and philosophical context. While their demands are not directed against schools of education per se, it is reasonable to assume that the NEA's behavior is partly a reaction to the way they believe these institutions have traditionally regarded the role of classroom teachers. Schools of education are often perceived by

classroom teachers as being more responsive to the needs of school administrators than to those of teachers.

Schools of education came into their own at the turn of the century, once they were able to convince the academic community and local elites that they could impart expert knowledge to future school administrators.[17] Reform at that time was defined by schools of education in terms of the establishment of school management as a "learned profession," not as the preparation of better-trained teachers.

In some ways this secondary role for teacher training continues even today. When classroom teachers look at national rankings of schools of education, they may notice a very interesting situation. Those schools which are ranked highest nationally have either no teacher training component or retain it as a low priority program. The "prestige" institutions are primarily schools of applied social science, designed to train educational researchers and administrators. Granted the vast majority of the 1,200 colleges and universities engaged in teacher preparation do not have such a focus. Yet as long as teacher training is absent or peripheral in these prestige institutions, one is likely to conclude that teacher training contributes little or nothing to the quality of an education school. With this dominant focus on the training of administrators and researchers, it might also be assumed that schools of education have decided educational reform and innovation can best be instituted from the top down or from the outside in by either school administrators or academic researchers. By emphasizing school administration and educational research and by awarding status to their peers engaged in such endeavors, education school faculties have (perhaps unwittingly) made teachers feel like second-class citizens in the educational enterprise.

Organized teachers are also critical of education schools and other academic institutions engaged in educational research for another reason. Not only do teachers see a gap between research findings and their practical application, but much of this research is irrelevant to them. Often it is directed solely to educational policy makers and school administrators or, if it deals with actual classroom practice, involves the application of a "canned technology" without regard for local needs and problems. Consequently, policy makers at all levels have found themselves responsible for programs whose implementation stops at the classroom door. The NEA recognizes this gap between research and practice as an issue and has, therefore, identified the following as one of its organizational goals:

> To stimulate educational research that is responsive to the problems of classroom practitioners.[18]

The present policies of the NEA must be viewed as more than just the teachers' associations flexing their newly-found organizational muscle. There are historical and practical reasons why classroom teachers have been dissatisfied with the performance of the nation's schools of education. Now they intend to make these institutions more responsive to their needs. Consequently, with regard to teacher preparation, licensing, and inservice/professional development, schools of education must be prepared at least to share authority and responsibility with organized teachers.

Teacher Preparation and Accreditation

In this area, the NEA's basic purpose is to guarantee classroom teacher participation in decisions regarding the content of teacher training programs and standards for accreditation. To this end, the association presently has equal representation with AACTE on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. The NEA is also lobbying for the establishment of state Commissions on Teacher Standards and Licensure. These bodies would set standards for all teacher preparation institutions within a given state, develop licensing criteria, and generally, monitor professional ethics and performance. The NEA model for such an agency calls for a majority of its members to be classroom teachers.

California and Oregon have already established such commissions and the experience of the California commission may be indicative of what other states might expect in the future. The commission consists of 10 members, four of whom are presently classroom teachers, two are local school administrators, and four are from higher education. The four college professors must each represent different fields so only one is involved directly in teacher education. There is no question that with the establishment of the commission classroom teacher participation in defining criteria for adequate teacher preparation has greatly increased. Each institution engaged in teacher training in California must demonstrate that it has developed a mechanism to involve classroom teachers in the design of teacher preparation programs. This mandate has usually been met by the [illegible] advisory councils in each school of education.

Some issues that have come before the commission reflect conflicts of interest between classroom teachers and teacher training institutions. For example, organized teachers argued that the commission, in creating a new credential for special education teachers, should give credit for experience to teachers already working in the field. The education schools, on the other hand, wanted only course work to be used as a criterion for credentialing. Other disputes have revolved around the present commission requirement that local teacher organizations must approve the employment of student interns in their district's schools. The teachers would also like to see more clinical experience required as a condition for obtaining a teaching credential.

In most of these disputes the classroom teacher position has prevailed, though not in all instances. For example, the requirement that teacher organizations have to sign-off on student intern programs is now being reconsidered by the commission, and it is likely that the power of organized teachers in this area will be significantly reduced. Even if the schools of education are not able to wield equal influence on such commissions with organized teachers, an argument can be made that they are better off under this system than under a more politicized, less professional one.

On the whole, state NEA affiliates are larger, have a more strategically-placed membership, and greater financial resources for political action than do most schools of education. Therefore, it seems logical to assume that without such commissions organized teachers would attempt to have many of their demands met by state legislatures. If the kinds of teacher preparation and accreditation requirements now being established by the California Commission were enacted as laws by the state legislature, they would be less flexible and much harder to modify over time. Those involved with the work of

the commission believe that both the classroom teachers and the schools of education recognize the advantage of having these issues decided by a less political, more professionally-oriented body. In fact, many observers have been surprised at the reluctance of the California Teachers Association (CTA) to bypass the commission and go directly to the legislature in the event of an unfavorable ruling. Both the CTA and the education schools have been unwilling to take action which might weaken the commission. In addition, the education schools (particularly those affiliated with the state university system) have found their visibility heightened as the result of the state-wide forum provided by the commission. Consequently, their influence within their own colleges and universities has been strengthened.

There is no question that the establishment of State Commissions on Teacher Standards and Licensure could bring about major changes in the way standards for curriculum and accreditation are determined. Nevertheless, given the increasing political power of teachers, such commissions may be the most professional and equitable way to balance the interests of classroom teachers with those of education schools.

Inservice Teacher Education and Professional Development

The goal of organized teachers with regard to inservice and professional development activities has been two fold:

1. To make the content more relevant to the day-to-day experiences and problems of classroom teachers, and
2. To transform control over teacher inservice from the exclusive jurisdiction of higher education institutions to a more collaborative structure involving, in addition to schools of education, teacher organizations, and local school districts.[19]

Classroom teachers argue that the content of traditional professional development programs has been weak for two reasons. First of all, most of the professional development courses offered by schools of education are intended to help teachers move out of the classroom by training them to become counselors, school librarians, and eventually, administrators. However, many teachers want to take courses which will help them improve classroom skills relevant to their present assignment. Secondly, teachers believe that this job-related training should include more than just the informational components of staff development, such as workshops, courses, and conferences. It should also include operational components, emphasizing on-site or in-classroom observation and follow-up.

The demand that organized teachers be granted more influence over the design and management of inservice activities stems from their disenchantment with the way such activities are usually structured. They feel that inservice needs and program format should be jointly determined by the teachers' organization, the LEA, and schools of education. In addition, organized teachers want schools of education to be willing to provide inservice at school sites. Any movement towards greater field-based teacher training would, of course, mean that schools of education would have to change the way they have traditionally delivered services.

To achieve their goals as they relate to teacher preparation and accreditation, the NEA has had to lobby primarily at the state level. On the other hand, in

order to change the content and involve teachers in the design of professional development activities, the NEA and its affiliates are working at all three levels of government. At the federal level, organized teachers successfully lobbied Congress last year to establish teacher centers for the inservicing of classroom teachers and the formulation of new curricula. Instead of being controlled by schools of education, these centers will be run as project grants to local school districts and will be operated under the supervision of a policy board, the majority of whose members are classroom teachers. Only 10 percent of the available funds will be allocated directly to schools of education or other institutions of higher learning; and while colleges and universities may run these centers under contract to local districts, ultimate control over center policy will be in the hands of classroom teachers. In some states, legislation is now being introduced to provide supplemental funds for staff development. These state funds would be consolidated with federal Teacher Center resources and administered on the same basis.

At the local level, some teacher organizations are negotiating over inservice/professional development items. Provisions in this area include the establishment of a district fund to finance teacher development of curriculum projects, the inclusion of teachers in the design of district inservice programs, and even the introduction of new inservice programs to be conducted by the teacher organization itself.

The attitudes of many school administrators and education school faculties make a reorganization of professional development programs very difficult to accept. As one local superintendent stated, teachers have traditionally been viewed by these groups as ". . . just routine people, doing a routine job."[20] Yet more than the growing political power of teachers should motivate these groups to begin to redefine the content and structure of professional development programs. There is increasing evidence, based on studies of successful local district program implementation, to indicate the importance of directly involving teachers in the design of inservice programs which:

- stress the professionalism of teachers and their responsibility for solving classroom-related problems;
- provide them discretionary funds with which to solve these problems;
- allow joint teacher/administrator governance in determination of staff development needs and activities; and
- make no attempt to offer a standardized district program, but rather encourage small group efforts tailored to school site needs.[21]

In other words, a very persuasive argument can be made that greater teacher participation and more school-site inservice programs will contribute to more effective program implementation and an improved classroom learning process. Therefore, in responding positively to the demands of organized teachers, local district administrators and schools of education can be assured that they are doing more than just acting in a politically expedient manner.

Conclusions

In demanding greater professional status benefits for classroom teachers, the nation's teacher organizations are seeking to complement the economic gains achieved by their members over the past decade. While the NEA may be more

professionally oriented than the AFT and have its disagreements with the union, both organizations are strongly committed to improving the status of classroom teachers. In addition, they are in essential agreement on the types of strategies to pursue in order to achieve this goal.

To some extent, declining student enrollment and decreased financial resources have forced organized teachers to substitute greater teacher control over educational policy for the wage gains of the past. Yet it is quite clear that the NEA would pursue professional goals regardless of present economic conditions and that they will continue to pursue these aims even if the present teacher surplus were to disappear. In fact, the NEA has not viewed stiffer preparation and licensing standards as a particularly effective way to deal with the present teacher surplus and have concentrated instead on attacking the problem from the demand side with attempts to reduce class size. Consequently, it is not short-term employment and financial prospects which have prompted current NEA and AFT demands. Rather, it is the belief of classroom teachers that they should have autonomy in their classrooms and a voice in how the learning process is structured.

Although the nation's schools of education may feel that they have lost their preeminent position in the area of teacher preparation and inservice, they need not view these developments with alarm. If schools of education can accept a partnership with organized teachers, neither the interests nor the professional standards of the higher education-based teacher community need to be compromised.

Organized teachers need schools of education. In designing new curriculum and inservice programs, they need the expert assistance that education school faculties can provide. Consequently, schools of education can continue to provide the same basic kinds of services as they have in the past. However, they will have to reorient their focus. Courses will have to be designed with teacher input; faculty will have to be willing to leave their traditional podiums for school sites; and, above all, there will have to be a demonstrated belief that effective innovation is possible from the bottom up.

Footnotes

1. Ralph Dickerson Schmid, "A Study of the Organizational Structure of the National Education Association: 1884-1921" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis, 1963), pp. 293-294.
2. James Q. Wilson, "Innovation in Organization: Notes Toward a Theory," in James D. Thompson, ed., *Approaches to Organizational Design* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966). p. 208.
3. Neal R. Peirce, "Public Employee Unions Show Rise in Membership Militancy," *National Journal* 7, No. 34, (August 23, 1975), p. 1246.
4. Paul Prasow, *et al.*, *Scope of Bargaining in the Public Sector– Concepts and Problems*, (Public Sector Labor Relations Information Exchange, U.S. Department of Labor, 1972), p. 29.
5. Ibid., p. 36.
6. For example Robert Howlett, Chairman of the Michigan Employment Relations Commission noted this trend in discussing the Michigan experience. As cited in D. Howlett, "Class Size: A Mandatory Bargainable Issue," *NOLPE School Law Journal* 3, No. 2, (Fall 1973), p. 6.
7. For a discussion of teacher organizational militancy on a state-by-state basis, see: Lorraine M. McDonnell, "The Control of Political Change Within an Interest

Group: The Case of the National Education Association" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1975), chapter IV.

8. Peirce, op. cit., p. 1246.
9. Michael Harris, "Teachers Almost Outspent the Oilmen," *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 27, 1975, p. 7.
10. B. S. Cooper, "Middle Management Unionization in Education," *Administrator's Notebook* 23, No. 6, (February 1975), 1-4.
11. Charles W. Cheng, "Community Representation in Teacher Collective Bargaining: Problems and Prospects," *Harvard Educational Review* 46, No. 2 (May 1976), 153.
12. Lawrence Pierce, "Teachers' Organizations and Bargaining: Power Imbalance in the Public Sphere," in *National Committee for Citizens in Education, Public Testimony on Public Schools* (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1975), p. 153.
13. Peirce, op. cit., p. 1242.
14. Paul Berman and Milbrey W. McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change*, Vol. IV (Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1975), p. 20.
15. David Armor, et al., *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools* (Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1976), p. 52.
16. Stephen Carroll, "Federal Influence on the Production and Employment of Teachers," paper presented at the Symposium on The Federal Interest in Financing Schooling, The Rand Corporation, Washington, D.C., September 23, 1976.
17. David B. Tyack, *The One Best System*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 135-136.
18. *NEA Handbook*, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1976-77), p. 42.
19. Alexander M. Nicholson and Bruce R. Joyce, *The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education* (Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976), p. 35.
20. Milbrey W. McLaughlin, "Pygmalion in the School District: Issues For Staff Development Programs," (San Francisco: Teachers' Centers Exchange, Far West Laboratory, forthcoming).
21. Ibid.