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Teacher security is defined as legal tenure of position, and schools under 850 A.D.A. are considered as small schools. These schools are so classed because of the optional tenure law which is in operation here in contrast to the compulsory tenure law which applies to schools above 850 A.D.A.

The problem, as undertaken, is to determine through collection of data by survey, the status of tenure in the schools subject to the optional tenure law; also to study conditions and effects as brought about by the granting of tenure or the lack thereof.

In order to determine the effects of tenure, it is necessary to draw comparisons of conditions existing in the case of permanent and probationary teachers. Such comparisons were drawn on the following points: Credentials, degrees, assignment of administrative responsibility, salaries, dependents, home and property ownership, community integration, amount and recency of professional improvement, inclination to move into larger schools, felt need for tenure protection, and selection of desirable tenure legislation.

Questionnaires were sent to 2,654 teachers in 153 schools located in 53 of the 58 counties of California. Of the 153 schools included, 58 are elementary and 95 are high schools. The returns on questionnaires was approximately 65 percent. Distribution of the questionnaires was handled through the administrator or his appointed representative in each of the 153 schools.

To assure a valid sampling, the schools contacted were selected by choosing those schools of the necessary size which appeared nearest the alphabetical center of the county lists of the apportionment sheet of state school funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.
In order to make valid comparisons of permanent and probationary teachers, teachers of each group were divided into experience groups as follows: 1 to 3 years inclusive, 4 to 10 years inclusive, and those teachers with over 10 years of experience.

In examining the general information, it was found that 395 or less than 23 percent of the teachers had been granted tenure. It was also shown that less than 5 percent of those eligible had been granted tenure since the inception of the optional law in 1931. Women are more often granted tenure than are men; this is truer to a greater extent in the elementary schools.

Study of the data reveals that permanent teachers show to an advantage in the matter of salary, average number of dependents, administrative responsibility, home and real property ownership, and community integration.

Probationary teachers show superiority in quality of degrees, and amount and recency of professional improvement. There seems to be little difference in the types of credentials held by the two groups.

In matters of opinion, 46 percent of the permanent teachers have considered moving into a large school as compared to 50 percent of the probationary teachers. Higher salary scale was the reason most frequently mentioned for moving, although 44 percent of the probationary teachers would move to get tenure.

The fact that they now have tenure is sufficient reason to keep 67 percent of the permanent teachers in their positions while 50 percent of the probationary teachers would be content to remain if given tenure protection.

Fifty-five percent of all teachers have felt the need for protection in their positions.

Thirty-five percent of all teachers would like the present compulsory tenure law applied to all schools and the dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers made easier. Twenty-eight percent of the teachers would like indefinite tenure with dismissal only upon recommendation of the administrator and the unanimous vote of the board of trustees.

Study the data presented in this study seems to justify the following conclusions:
1. Interest in the tenure question is very keen in the schools under 850 A.D.A.

2. The optional tenure law is not protecting the teachers in the schools under 850 A.D.A.

3. Women were and are granted tenure more often than men.

4. The granting of tenure retards the professional improvement of teachers to a small degree.

5. Permanent teachers receive higher salaries than probationary teachers.

6. Lack of tenure restricts the size of teachers' families.

7. Permanent teachers are favored in the delegation of administrative responsibility.

8. Permanent teachers become more thoroughly integrated community members.

9. Granting of tenure does/would keep about 60 percent of the present teachers in the small schools (schools in this study).

10. Teachers feel a definite need for protection in their positions.

11. Teachers want a change in the present tenure law.

12. The change should take one of the following courses:

   a. Apply the present compulsory law to all schools and make dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers easier.

   b. Indefinite tenure with dismissal only upon recommendation of the administrator and unanimous vote of the board of trustees.
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A STUDY OF TEACHER SECURITY IN CERTAIN
SMALL SCHOOLS OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Security of teachers in the small schools of California, when defined in terms of job security, leads us into the problem of teacher tenure and the California Teacher Tenure Law.

Teacher tenure, with its well meant but badly abused privileges, has probably caused more confusion in the minds of teachers, administrators and governing boards than any other educational issue in the history of the California Public Schools.

The tenure question has caused upheavels in governing boards which have resulted in the complete breakdown of professional relations between board and administration and administration and teaching personnel. Trustees have resigned, individually and in groups, rather than face the issues thrust upon them by certain tenure legislation.

Rather than select those teachers deserving of tenure, many districts adopted the policy of dismissal of all teachers at the end of a three year period, causing wholesale dismissal of the teaching staff in many instances, good and bad alike.
Unquestionably, the greatest weakness of the tenure law has been the abuse of the spirit of the legislation by administrators, governing boards and teachers alike.

The tenure question is not peculiar to the schools of California; leading educators throughout the country recognize the principles of, and the need for, some form of teacher security which will stabilize the teaching profession and insure the retention of worthy teachers.

In speaking of tenure, Williams says:

Stability is the basis of any profession. It is only when our teachers feel reasonably secure in the continuity and dignity of their service in a given locality that they will become a constructive power in the economic and social life of that community. (1)

The focal point of most dissatisfaction is the fact that it has been impossible to protect the good and the deserving teacher without also affording protection for the weak and undeserving.

It is with the realization that tenure is a question which, up to the present, has been laden with great possibilities and greater tumult, that the writer undertakes to present the case of those who have most to gain by any sound and workable solution; the teachers.

Statement of the Problem

Before stating this problem in terms of aims and expectancies, it is only fitting that certain terms used throughout the study be defined. These definitions are quoted in the light of general usage in regard to educational problems in the State of California.

**Teacher security** - Protection of, or right to, your position as a teacher.

**Blanket tenure law** - The tenure law as it existed in California from 1927 to 1931, and is today in schools over 850 A.D.A.

**Optional tenure law** - The clause in the present California tenure law which makes tenure optional with each board of trustees in schools under 850 A.D.A.

**Permanent teachers** - Teachers with tenure.

**Probationary teachers** - All teachers without tenure.

**A. D. A.** - Average daily attendance.

**Length of service** - Length of service in present position.

In this study, the problem was to determine by survey, certain facts pertaining to the working of the optional tenure law, which pertains to those public schools in the State of California which have less than 850 A.D.A.; also to determine, by the data collected, whether tenure, or the lack thereof, has any direct influence upon the professional, social and private lives of the teachers in
these schools. Although no recommendations are to be made at the completion of this study, the conclusions of the writer and the recommendations of the teachers included in this study, should serve as an indication of the trend of thought, and needs of the teachers in these small schools.

In this study, particular consideration has been given the following questions:

1. To what extent is the optional tenure law operative in the small schools? (under 850)

2. How is tenure distributed as to sex, size of schools and years of teaching experience?

3. Does lack of tenure influence length of service?

4. Is granting of tenure influenced by the type of credential and degree held by the teacher?

5. Are permanent teachers favored in the assignment of administrative responsibility?

6. Is there a differential in the salaries of permanent and probationary teachers?

7. Does the permanent teacher feel more free and able to assume the responsibilities of rearing a family and acquiring dependents?

8. Does tenure, or the lack thereof, affect the community integration of the teacher?
   A. Home and property owners.
   B. Membership in community organizations.

9. Does granting of tenure retard the professional improvement of teachers?

10. Does/would granting of tenure retard the migration of teachers to the large schools?
11. Do teachers feel the need of protection of their positions?

12. Do teachers want a revision of the greatest optional tenure law? If so, what would they substitute?

Purposes of the Study

Several studies have been made of the tenure situation in California. Only two of these, the studies of Hunter and Miller, have attempted to present the teachers' side of the tenure question. These studies were based on teachers' opinions concerning effects of the law as it read in 1930.

It is the purpose of the writer to present the case of the teachers, not entirely from the standpoint of teacher opinions, but from conclusions which can be safely drawn by a scientific study of the facts surrounding the social, home and professional lives of the teachers. Teacher opinion is often colored by experiences peculiar to the individual, but factual information remains static and lends itself to analysis.

Another purpose of this study was to present the situation existing in the schools under 850 A.D.A.


The Tenure Census presents the administrators' point of view with regard to tenure in these schools, but the teachers have not had an opportunity to present their side of the question for examination and analysis.

The third purpose of this study was to secure such facts and reach such conclusions, concerning the teachers in these smaller schools, as would be of value to the C.T.A. Tenure Committee. This committee is the body of teachers and administrators which determines the policies and submits the recommendations to the association.

Another and less worthy purpose perhaps, was the desire of the writer to make a comparison of the permanent and probationary teachers as a measure of self satisfaction.

Source of the Data and Scope of the Study

The data presented in this study was compiled from information and facts which were gathered by survey from 1732 teachers in 153 districts in the state of California. All information was furnished by the teachers.

Only those districts whose average daily attendance was below 850 were solicited, this because of the fact that the tenure law of California makes tenure compulsory in all schools above 850 A.D.A.

This study includes districts in fifty-three of the fifty-eight counties in the state.

Included in this study are:

I. Elementary schools from 100-500 A.D.A. ------ 39
II. Elementary schools from 500-850 A.D.A. ------ 19

Total elementary schools 58

III. High schools from 100-500 A.D.A. ------ 62
IV. High schools from 500-850 A.D.A. ------ 33

Total high schools 95

In order to present certain data pertinent to this study, it was necessary to set up tables in which the four classifications as listed above appear. Where this was necessary, the four classifications appear as Group I, Group II, Group III, and Group IV, reading down as they appear above.

Cooperation of Districts and Teachers

Twenty-six hundred and fifty-four teachers were asked to fill out and return questionnaires. Of this number, seventeen hundred and thirty-two responded. This shows a return of 65.26 percent which was gratifying to the writer. The high return was probably due to two things; first, the tenure question is one of great import to the teachers in these schools under 850 A.D.A., second, because of the method of handling the questionnaires. These were handled, in most cases, through an appointed chairman in each school. With a local teacher in charge
of distribution, collection and mailing, the percentage of returns was probably materially increased.

Due to the personal nature of some of the questions, about 10 percent of the teachers responding mailed the completed forms directly to the writer.

The cooperation of districts was not as whole-hearted as was that of the teachers. Of the 333 districts contacted, 153 signified their willingness to cooperate in the study. This gave a return of approximately 46 percent. The fact that the preliminary letters could not be mailed until March 15th probably had some bearing on the lower return of districts.

Cooperation of C.T.A. Tenure Committee

The Tenure Committee of the California Teacher's Association completed a study of conditions pertaining to tenure, during the late fall of 1940. This study, the 1940 TENURE CENSUS (5), deals with the tenure situation from the standpoint of the administrator. Through the agency of H. M. McPherson, Superintendent of Napa Union High School District, a member of the C.T.A. Tenure Committee, the plans for this study were presented for the examination of the committee at their 1941 spring

meeting. This group agreed to incorporate the findings of this study with those of the 1940 Tenure Census, before making any recommendations to the Association.

Classification of Districts and Teachers

Tenure studies by Stone (6), Rathbone and Rees (7), and Staffelbach (8), show conclusively that tenure statistics vary by size of districts rather than by geographical location or other factors.

The 1940 Tenure Census was conducted with the following classification of districts:

- Districts over 850 A.D.A.
- Districts 100-850 A.D.A.
- Districts under 100 A.D.A.

On advice of members of the C.T.A. Tenure Committee, this study was limited to those schools between 100 and 850 A.D.A. The reason for eliminating the districts above 850 is obvious since this is a study of conditions in the schools affected by the optional tenure law. In further limiting it to exclude the districts below 100 A.D.A., the following reasons are given: (2) There are 2,034 such districts in the state, many of which are one and two

(7) A. J. Rathbone and J. D. Rees, loc. cit.
teacher schools. (b) Teachers in schools of this type are more liable to be affected by local conditions than are those in the larger districts and it would be difficult to determine any tendencies unless the entire picture might be presented. (c) Unfortunately, the writer was not able financially to extend the survey to cover all, or a major portion, of these smaller districts.

In making comparisons and seeking tendencies from which to draw conclusions about any group of teachers, it becomes necessary to segregate these teachers into units of like experience. The teachers included in this study have been assigned to groups according to total teaching experience, as follows:

a. Teachers with 3 years, or less experience.

b. Teachers with 4 to 10 (inclusive) years experience.

c. Teachers with over 10 years experience.

The first classification, three years or less, was selected to conform with the legal probationary period which must be served before the granting of tenure. This first group will be, of necessity, made up entirely of probationary teachers, none of whom we might term highly experienced teachers.

The second classification was designed to include all teachers with more than three and less than eleven years of experience. This method of classification was chosen
because it would include in one group, all teachers who have been granted tenure through operation of the optional tenure law; this law having been in operation since 1931.

All teachers having over ten years of experience are included in the third classification. Teachers who have served over ten years in the profession must certainly be recognized as highly experienced teachers. The majority of salary schedules in schools of this size reach their maximum in ten to twelve years as shown by Hemmerlings' study. This would indicate that teachers reach their peak performance shortly after the tenth year of experience. Another reason for selecting the tenth year as the dividing line was to include all teachers granted tenure by the blanket law in the one group.

Hereafter in this study these groups will be referred to as teachers with 1-3 exp., 4-10 exp. and over 10 exp.

The Questionnaire

The planning of the questionnaire used in securing the information for this study required much time and thought. In order to insure a satisfactory return, it was necessary to make the form as brief as possible and yet ignore no phase of the problem which might yield a

worthy contribution. The original effort, after many hours of planning and elimination, included twenty-seven questions and required two sheets of standard typing paper. In this form the questionnaire was tested on forty "guinea pigs" in a nearby school of 800 students.

From the criticisms and suggestions which accompanied the completed forms on their return, the writer, with the aid of two interested administrators, was able to make the final and necessary eliminations and additions and draft the questionnaire in the form in which it appears in the appendix of this study, a single sheet containing twenty-two questions.

No extraordinary claims are made for this questionnaire, excepting that it yielded a return of better than sixty-five percent and supplied the information necessary for the completion of this study.

Method of Procedure

The plotting of a master sheet for the tabulation of information appearing in the questionnaires presented a problem. Tables had to be drafted which would take into consideration type and size of school, as well as groups of teachers with the same general range of teaching experience. These factors made the use of a single master sheet an impossibility. Two possibilities remained;
check through the questionnaires for information needed for each table or devise a master sheet for each of the questions; one from which information to fit any table might be easily secured.

Experimentation soon proved that a master sheet for each question was the simpler and quicker. Using this method each questionnaire could be scored and set aside, each requiring about four minutes for scoring by one person or two and a half minutes if two persons worked together as reader and checker.

The master sheets were easily converted into totals and these in turn into percentages, under such groupings as the question involved required. Some of the data were easily converted into tables, requiring only classification as to permanent or probationary teachers while others had to be examined and tabled under three classifications, such as type and size of school and experience of teachers.

Tables resulting from the described procedure appear in Chapter III, arranged as nearly as possible in the natural order of interest and applicability to the aims of this study.

A copy of one of the twenty-two master sheets will be found in the appendix.
Limitations of the Study

While this is a study of conditions and effects in certain schools under 850 A.D.A. in the state of California, it is true that some conclusions must be drawn from teacher opinion. It is admitted that teacher opinion in many cases may be conditioned by weaknesses in administrative set-up and personnel, by economic situations peculiar to certain areas, and in some instances by weaknesses of the teachers themselves.

All schools and teachers in the classification to which this study is adapted are not reported. Districts with less than 100 A.D.A. were not contacted for reasons already stated. Only 18.50 percent of the total teachers in schools between 100-850 A.D.A. are reported, however, of the 2654 teachers in the 153 districts covered by this study, 1732 or 65.26 percent are included.

Of the 395 permanent teachers reported, only 27 or less than seven percent have been granted tenure through operation of the optional tenure law. This made it difficult to use them as a comparative group.

On questions 19 and 22 of the questionnaire specific instructions were given that only one of several possibilities be checked. Due perhaps to a weakness of the instrument itself, a small percentage of the teachers made
a multiple choice, giving no indication of an order of preference.
CHAPTER II
THE BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Why is there a need for study of the tenure or security situation in the schools under 850 A.D.A.?

California schools are operating under two tenure set-ups; schools above 850 A.D.A. are subject to the compulsory tenure law, some form of which has applied to some schools since 1921, while the districts under 850 A.D.A. may give tenure to those teachers whom they elect.

This situation has not worked to the satisfaction of all concerned and several studies have been made in an attempt to find the answer to the problem of the small schools. These studies have shown varied results, often showing conclusions which were at cross purposes with studies of avowed identical aims. The majority of these studies, as briefly reviewed hereinafter, have been made from the point of view of the administrator and governing boards.

History of the Tenure Movement in California

The introduction of teacher tenure in California followed the general pattern of most educational trends. From an almost imperceptible beginning, tenure ideals gradually grew into tenure legislation and by 1927 all
public schools in California were subject to a compulsory tenure law.

Since 1927 changes have occurred which indicate that tenure in California has begun a recession to a stabilized level. Certain weaknesses appeared during the years of blanket tenure. It was obvious from the beginning that no one type of legislation would fit the many sizes and types of districts in the state. Districts in the state range in size from those employing one teacher to city districts employing several thousands. Social and economic conditions throughout the state vary just as widely and it is as futile to attempt to apply the same tenure law to all as it would be to apply the same salary scale to all districts.

It is not the intention of the writer to quote to the letter the past and present tenure legislation, but to interpret the meaning of the law and its modifications, and to review briefly the cases at law which have established the legality of each phase.

In 1890, the litigation which was to provide the first court decision regarding teacher tenure took place. It has since been known as the Kate Kennedy case and sections 1617 and 1793 of the Political Code consti-

(1) Kennedy v. Board of Education, 82 Cal. 483 (1890).
(2) Political Code of California, Sections 1617-1793, (1890).
In 1887, the principal bases for legal controversy. In 1890 these sections read as follows:

Section 1617 - The powers and duties of trustees of school districts, and boards of education are as follows:

To employ teachers . . ., provided, that no board of trustees shall enter into any contract with such employees to extend beyond the 30th day of June next ensuing.

Section 1793 - The holders of city certificates are eligible to teach in cities in which certificates are granted in schools of grades corresponding to the grades of such certificates, and when elected shall be dismissed only for insubordination or other causes.

The case was based on the apparent conflict of Sections 1617 and 1793. Kate Kennedy, after having served continuously for more than ten years as the principal teacher of the North Cosmopolitan Grammar School in San Francisco, on January 26, 1887, was granted a leave of absence to extend to May 1, 1887. The plaintiff had been elected for no specific period of tenure.

This leave of absence was in accord with the rules of the board of education.

On March 16, 1887, the board of education elected another to the position of the plaintiff and made an order transferring the plaintiff to a lower grade position at a greatly reduced salary. The plaintiff returned according to the terms of her leave of absence and
endeavored to resume her duties as principal teacher of North Cosmopolitan Grammar School, but she was denied this position.

The plaintiff filed application in the Superior Court for a writ of mandamus requiring the board of education to reinstate her in her former teaching position. Two legal issues were raised: (1) Did the board of education have the power to remove, without cause, a teacher elected for an indefinite period? (2) If not, is mandamus the correct action for the plaintiff to pursue to be reinstated?

The court held (1) that the board of education was without legal authority to remove the plaintiff or to place her in a lower grade position, and (2) that mandamus was the correct action to institute for regaining her former position.

On appeal from the Superior Court, the Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of the lower court and stated the rule: "The election of a teacher for no specified period of time, under Section 1793, (3) is an election for life, subject to dismissal for any of the causes mentioned in said Section and cannot against her consent be assigned to a lower grade position."

(3) Political Code of California, Section 1793, (1890).
The Court had to construe section 1617, which limited election to one year, in the light of section 1793, which evidently showed the intention of the legislature to provide indefinite tenure, to be terminated only for cause.

This decision established the teachers' right to tenure of position, unless elected for a definite period of time.

In 1911, Section 1617 of the Political Code was amended to read:

... except that teachers may be elected on or after June the first for the next ensuing school year, and such teachers so elected shall be deemed reelected from year to year thereafter, unless the governing body of the school district shall on or before the 10th of June give notice in writing to such teacher that his services will not be required for the ensuing year.

The effect of this legislation was to make the issue clear as to the annual election of teachers for a definite period of one year, with or without a yearly contract.

In 1921, the first definite tenure law was enacted. The Tenure Act of 1921 made tenure a fact for certain

(4) Political Code of California, Section 1617, (1911).
(5) Ibid, Section 1609, (1921).
districts. Prior to this time tenure had consisted merely of reelection from year to year in the absence of notice to the contrary.

The general provisions of the Tenure Act of 1921(6) were as follows: (1) Made tenure applicable to all districts employing six or more teachers and a principal who devoted as much as two hours a day to supervision; (2) set the period of probation at two years, employment for the third year constituting classification; (3) probationary teachers could be dismissed at the end of the first or second year by notice by June 10th; (4) permanent teachers could not be dismissed at any time, without cause, and without definitely prescribed procedure; and (5) administrators and supervisors were not eligible for permanent classification and the law limited the term of a principal to one year.

The constitutionality of the 1921 law was upheld in the case of Grigsby v. King.(7) The proper remedy for restoring permanent teachers wrongfully dismissed was also determined by this case.

The pertinent facts of the Grigsby case were:

(6) Ibid.
(7) Grigsby v. King, 202 Cal. 299, (1927)
The Board of Trustees of the Napa School, without even preferring charges against her, dismissed the plaintiff, Isadora Grigsby, at the end of her third consecutive year of teaching in the Napa School, a district employing at least eight teachers and a principal who devoted at least two hours daily to supervision.

After dismissal, the plaintiff petitioned the Superior Court to restrain said board from depriving her as a permanent teacher of her teaching position.

The Superior Court denied the writ of restraint on the following grounds: (1) Injunction not the proper action and, (2) the statute was not constitutional on the basis that it discriminated against a class of school and of teachers, and it impaired the freedom of the contract.

On appeal, the Supreme Court declared the statute constitutional and that the board of trustees had not followed the statute for dismissal of teachers and therefore the Superior Court had erred in not granting the restraining order asked by the appellant. Thus the Court ruled: (1) The Tenure Act of 1921 constitutional, and (2) a restraining order (injunction) the proper remedy for restoring permanent teachers wrongfully dismissed.

In 1927, the Tenure Act of 1921 was amended to apply to all districts without restriction as to the number of teachers. This amendment also provided that teachers might be elected on or after May 2nd for the
next ensuing school year and each teacher so elected shall be deemed reelected from year to year, except administrators and supervisors, provided, that any person not under permanent tenure who shall fail to signify acceptance within 20 days after notice shall be deemed to have declined the same.

Provision is made for classification of teachers as permanent who have served successfully in districts for 2 or 3 years. Such classification is optional with the board as to the end of the second or third year.

In 1929 two Sections were added to the School Code(8) which made minor changes in the law. Section 5.500 set the probationary period at 3 years for all teachers and all schools. Section 5.502 excluded administrators and supervisors from classification as permanent employees unless they are affected by city, or city and county charter provisions. This section also set the date for dismissal of probationary teachers as not later than June 10th.

In 1931, the School Code(9) was again amended. Section 5.501 restricts tenure in its application to teachers in districts having over 850 A.D.A. and makes tenure optional in districts below this figure. Sections

5.652 and 5.663 make provisions for procedure of trial for dismissal, and sets the date for notice of dismissal of probationary teachers as May 15th.

A minor addition was made in 1937. Section 5.667 (10) of the School Code was amended to include unified school districts of over 850 A.D.A. under the compulsory tenure law, even though the individual districts be of less than 850 A.D.A.; also that the division of any district should not affect the status of any teacher already classified as permanent.

The causes for which permanent teachers may be dismissed are listed in Section 1609 of the Political Code as follows: Immorality, incompetency, conduct unbecoming a teacher or unprofessional conduct, physical unfitness, persistent and willful failure to obey state school laws and regulations of the state board of education, justifiable decrease in number of teaching positions, (dismissals must be based on seniority), dishonesty, persistent and willful failure to obey reasonable regulations or employing school board, conviction of a felony, and criminal syndicalism or moral turpitude.

Such charges, if preferred by a board, must be served on the teacher, in writing, giving notice of

(11) Political Code of California, Section 1609, (1921).
intention to dismiss in 30 days unless a hearing is demanded. Such notice may not be served between May 15th and September 15th. The teacher must demand a hearing within 30 days or be dismissed.

A permanent teacher dismissed by a board for cause, may have recess to a trial de novo at court. In regard to this the School Code of California reads as follows:

Section 5.404 - It is within the power of a court to try de novo a teacher who has been dismissed by a board of education on charges, as described in said Section 1609 of the Political Code.

This law is the teacher's only means of redress in cases where the board may have made charges erroneously founded. In short, there is no authority in a school board to dismiss a permanent teacher arbitrarily; a good cause must exist.

The Argument for Tenure

Stone sets forth several basic assumptions which seem necessary to the statement of argument for tenure:

1. The public schools exist primarily in order that children may be educated.

2. The education of children is best achieved under conditions which foster and conserve the professional status and growth of teacher.

(12) School Code of California, Section 5.404, (1927).
3. The professional status and growth of teachers can be assured only when there are adequate and reasonable means of eliminating teachers who may, with reasonable certainty be judged unworthy, incompetent, and/or unfit for the service they should render.

4. The professional status and growth of teachers can best be achieved when stability and security of tenure are assured for those who with reasonable certainty can be judged as worthy and competent teachers.

5. Proper administration of the public schools fails to the extent that unworthy, incompetent, or unfit teachers are not eliminated and also to the extent that worthy and competent teachers are not assured stability and security of tenure. (13)

Stone's assumptions are basic ideals with which few educators will take issue. If such assumptions are basically sound it appears that there should be tenure for the worthy and no protection for the unworthy. This is wishful thinking.

Many claim that without tenure there is a constant shifting and changing of teachers which often leaves the pupils in a bewildered state of mind. A change of teachers often means a change of methods and a resultant interruption of the learning process. Concerning this Lewis says:

The education of children suffers greatly under the instruction of new and inexperienced teachers. (14)


(14) Ervin E. Lewis, Personnel Problems of Teachers, p. 353
It is claimed that teachers without the protection of tenure cannot concentrate on their work throughout the year as the worry of annual election comes up each spring. This has been well stated following a study made by the N.E.A.:

Tenure results in a sense of security for teachers, which is conducive to greater concentration on the major aspects of the work.(15)

On the same question, Williams says:

Under the annual election plan, there is ever present the feeling of anxiety which robs the conscientious teacher of much of his power and efficiency.(16)

Many say that boards of trustees and administrators give preference to "home town" teachers; often dismissing a good teacher to make way for a "political" appointment. Tenure would do away with this practice. On this subject Williams says:

The public school system should be free of personal and partisan influence and free from the malignant power of patronage and spoils.(17)


Teachers without tenure are more liable to plan their work on a year-to-year basis, as indeed they are employed. A teacher with tenure protection can do good, long-term planning with the expectancy of remaining to carry through her plans. Williams agrees in stating:

Permanence of employment would give teachers the opportunity to plan out their work along lines of constructive long-time policies.\(^{(18)}\)

It is difficult for an administrator to build morale in a constantly changing teaching staff. A sound spirit of cooperation and loyalty can only be attained with a faculty well oriented in the ideals, traditions and standards of the institution. Lewis agrees on this matter:

The development of a local espirit de corps is almost impossible when each year inexperienced teachers are replaced by inexperienced teachers.\(^{(19)}\)

In defense of tenure it would be fitting to present the views of some of California's leading educators. Following is an excerpt from a letter to all teachers' organizations in California from Willard E. Givens, written while President of the C.T.A. in 1932:

The purpose of the public schools is to promote in every way possible the best interests of the children of California. This can best be accomplished by the employment of people who have excellent character, splendid training and real teaching ability, safe-guarded from political influences and assured of tenure so long as they exert a helpful influence upon children and are efficient in instructing them.

When teachers are given this assurance, they establish themselves as useful citizens in the localities in which they teach. The confidence in their professional positions, which this assurance gives, encourages them in continued professional improvement resulting in finer service to the children.(20)

Following is a statement made by Grover O'Connor, California Federation of Civil Service Associations, Attorney at Law, San Francisco. This statement was made before the State Legislature in March, 1933:

I am appearing on behalf of the California Federation of Civil Service Associations. To us, teacher tenure means nothing more or less than Civil Service. All of the arguments I have heard tonight have been presented time and again against Civil Service.

... Once a teacher has passed appropriate tests as to his qualifications, and served a proper probationary period, he should not be disturbed in his position as long as he behaves himself and continues competent.

The present Teacher Tenure Law provides for a probationary period of three years. I respectfully submit that if a board of trustees cannot determine within three years the competency and qualifications of a teacher, then Boards of Trustees should be abolished, rather than Teachers' Tenure.(21)

(20) C.T.A. Files, Bay Section, Berkeley, California. (21) Ibid.
Will C. Wood, for eight years Superintendent of Public Instruction in the State of California, was an exponent of teacher tenure. A quotation from a letter written by Wood to Assemblyman Eugene Roland, Chairman of the Education Committee in 1933 follows:

May I offer as justification of this letter covering certain pending school legislation, my fourteen years' connection with the State Department of Education, including eight years as Superintendent of Public Instruction.

... Tenure has in most cases removed the appointment of teachers from the whirl of local politics. I can recall when teachers' positions in our city were pawns used to pay political debts, and when teachers had to make yearly arrangements with the local political bosses and "near" bosses. I do not wish to see the schools returned to the vicious spoils system.

... We have abolished the vicious patronage system from the schools of California through tenure legislation. I urge that there be no backward step taken through the amendment of tenure laws in any manner that will affect the principle of tenure for teachers. (22)

The report of the N.E.A. Committee on Tenure, 1935, advances the following reasons for tenure:

1. To prevent political control of schools and teaching positions.
2. To permit and encourage teachers to devote themselves to the practices of their profession without fear or favor.
3. To encourage competent and public-spirited teachers to remain in the schools.

(22) Ibid.
4. To discourage school management based on fear and intimidation.
5. To prevent the discharge of teachers for political, religious, personal, or other unjust reasons.
6. To protect teachers in their efforts to secure well financed and adequate education for the children in their charge. (23)

There is no end of evidence which might be presented to strengthen the case for tenure; however, the foregoing should be convincing that there is a real need and place for teacher tenure.

**The Argument Against Tenure**

The opponents of teacher tenure make just as many charges against it, as do its exponents. These charges are in some cases backed by supporting evidence, in others, are unsupported. Here, the writer will try to present those claims which have been proved justifiable and those which have the backing of expert opinion.

The most common criticism of tenure is well stated in the following paragraph from a report of the N.E.A. Committee on Tenure:

A good teacher doesn't need it; a poor one doesn't deserve it. Experience in trying to dismiss an

incompetent teacher works hardships on good teachers who are dismissed at the end of a probationary period in order to avoid tenure. (24)

Lewis sheds a different light on the subject with this statement:

When tenure is not guaranteed, the teachers knows they are constantly under fire and therefore strive to do their best. (25)

There have been claims that tenure teachers are not as progressive and cooperative as those without tenure. This is supported by Lewis:

Under a permanent tenure system the schools inevitably become filled with many teachers who are unprogressive and incompetent. (26)

Another claim made by the opponents of tenure is that it is practically impossible to dismiss an incompetent teacher. Cubberley lists this as one of the objectionable features in his writings:

The dismissal of those who are no longer efficient is practically impossible. Attempts to do so puts the Superintendent on trial and not the teacher. (27)

(26) Ibid., p. 354-5.
(27) Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public School Administration, p. 645.
One of the chief causes for dissatisfaction with the tenure law in California, and other states as well, has been the fact that it protects the married teacher whose husband is gainfully employed. In a survey of opinions on tenure, the N.E.A. Tenure Committee found the following to be one of the chief complaints:

There is only one argument against tenure, and that is that married (female) teachers hang on for dear life to their jobs as long as it is possible, and this makes it difficult for young graduates who are seeking employment. (28)

Homstedt, in his study of tenure in New Jersey, reached the following conclusions:

1. Tenure did not reduce dismissals.
2. Tenure stabilizes employment for teachers of 15-20 years experience.
3. Tenure protected married teachers.
4. Tenure gave teachers an even chance of winning an appeal. (29)

The findings of the 1940 Tenure Census (30) shows that nearly 20 percent of the districts over 850 A.D.A. do not give tenure on completion of the three year probationary period. This means that the teachers

in these schools face almost automatic dismissal at the end of their third term of teaching.

The arguments against tenure have not been as numerous as those in favor of it; however, pressure groups seem to appear in force in opposition to any proposed tenure legislation. Several efforts have been made to erase the tenure law from the statutes and, but for the concerted protective action of the California Teachers Association, it is doubtful whether tenure would enjoy the prestige and application it does today in certain schools of the state.

Review of Related Studies

There have been numerous studies of tenure situations throughout the United States; however, it is the intention of the writer to discuss briefly only those studies which deal specifically with the tenure problem in California schools.

A study by Miller (31) in 1931 found that the tenure law (compulsory tenure for all districts) had increased teacher turnover in the small districts and decreased it in the urban districts. Miller also reached the conclusion that tenure had not lessened the professional

improvement and efficiency of the teachers but had increased both.

Another finding was that greater care in the selection of the teaching staff was evinced as a result of the tenure law. Miller's final conclusion was that the law should be amended to prevent discrimination against teachers in the small districts, after which the salutary influence of tenure on the teaching profession might be retained to the satisfaction of teachers and administrators and to the benefit of the children of the public schools of the state.

Another study of tenure bonditions in schools of all sizes was made by Hunter (32) in 1931. This study was based on opinions of teachers regarding the effects of tenure on the teaching profession and upon opinions concerning the specific limitations and qualifications of the tenure law.

Hunter concluded that both rural and urban teachers believed that a tenure law was desirable, also that the teachers believed that the compulsory law was discriminatory in its protection as between rural and urban situations.

Stone (33) made a study of the teacher tenure situation in California schools in 1934. This study was based on opinions and facts supplied by administrators, superintendents, lawyers, boards of trustees and in a few instances, the teachers themselves.

Stone found that tenure protects teachers from political, sectarian and personal pressures; reduces turnover, thus stabilizing the profession; promotes improved morale of the teaching staff; and makes teachers feel that they are an integral part of the community thus fostering active participation in community activities.

Stone also concluded that tenure legislation tends to retain the experienced teachers in service; provides an incentive for teachers to prepare themselves properly; and is the force which gives the feeling of security to the breadwinner and permits him to become a taxpayer and a fixed member of the community.

Stone's last conclusion was that tenure results in a more careful selection of teachers and tends to eliminate the unfit by fixing a time limit on the probationary period.

A study by Price (34) in 1932 was written from the standpoint of the administrator, superintendent and trustee. This study was undertaken with the purpose of finding out how the tenure law was working with relation to the schools of the state.

Prices' conclusions drawn from replies of administrators were as follows:

1. The tenure law has not improved teaching in 88 percent of the districts.
2. The tenure law has decreased efficiency in 40 percent of the districts.
3. The tenure law has not protected good teachers in 77 percent of the districts.
4. The tenure law has caused the release of good teachers in 29 percent of the districts.
5. Inefficient teachers have been protected in 50 percent of the districts by the tenure law.
6. Selection of teachers has been improved in 50 percent of the districts by the tenure law.
7. Public opinion in 57 percent of the communities is unfavorable to the law.
8. Seventy-eight percent favor a change in the law.
9. Some form of tenure is desired. Only 28 percent favor no tenure at all.
10. The probationary period is long enough.
11. About one-third have found it possible to dismiss undesirable permanent teachers. All have found it difficult.
12. A school's efficiency is not determined by its ratio of permanent to probationary teachers.
13. Administrators should be included in a satisfactory law.
14. Some definite work should be required for permanent tenure.

In 1938 the California Teachers Association authorized a study of the tenure situation as it existed at that time throughout the state. Elmer H. Staffelbach, (35) Director of Research, was in charge of this study which investigated conditions in schools above and below the 850 A.D.A. mark.

Although Staffelbach elected not to draw any conclusions after completing the study, the data indicates that the following conditions were existant at the time: Seventy-five percent of the teachers in districts over 850 A.D.A. were on tenure, compared to 28 percent in the smaller schools; 80 percent of the large schools reported that good teachers were given tenure at the end of their third year of teaching as a matter of course; and the policy of denying permanent status to all teachers was unsatisfactory in 3 out of 4 districts.

Staffelbach's study also indicated that a decisive majority of the administrators favored some form of term contract for teachers in the schools under 850 A.D.A.

In 1940, the California Teachers Association again authorized a study of the tenure situation, and the result was the 1940 Tenure Census. (36) This study was conducted by Rathbone and Rees and its purpose was to investigate conditions relating to tenure in districts under 100, from 100-850, and over 850 A.D.A.

Rathbone and Rees were unwilling to draw any conclusions but did point out the significant findings of the study. The study indicated that protection of unsatisfactory teachers was too great, only .002 percent having been dismissed during the last 5-year period. It also pointed out that the tenure law was not operating on a broad enough base since 94 percent of the districts, 22 percent of the A.D.A. and 27 percent of the certified teachers reported did not have tenure benefits.

The study also indicated that the tenure law was protecting 27,592 good teachers who are rendering satisfactory service to 730,758 pupils.

This study was presented from the point of view of the administrator and the county superintendent of schools.

Relation to Previous Studies

Although this study has no direct relation to any of the previous studies on the subject in California, it does have a relation to certain of the studies briefly reviewed. Most of the previous studies have been based on subjective opinions from which conclusions were drawn. This study, while its ultimate objective is the same as that of the studies of Hunter (37), Miller (38) and Price (39), is designed to reach conclusions which are based on data compiled from reliable sources. The information secured through the questionnaires is mainly factual and the data should be valid and of significance in reaching reliable conclusions.

This study is a limited one, pertaining only to those schools where the problems of tenure are admittedly the keenest. All reported studies have been general with the exception of the 1940 Tenure Census (40).

---


(40) A. J. Rathbone and J. D. Rees, 1940 Tenure Census. C.T.A. Unpublished study, 1940.
CHAPTER III

THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the data of this study. All data presented here has been compiled from the completed questionnaires received from 153 schools in 51 counties of California. All schools included in this study range between 100 and 850 A.D.A. The data pertains to facts about and opinions of, 1732 teachers in these schools. All teachers answered the same questionnaire and in most cases left no part of the instrument unanswered.

For convenience in presenting the data, the schools were classified and designated as follows: Elementary schools from 100-500 A.D.A., group I; elementary schools from 500-850 A.D.A., group II; high schools from 100-500 A.D.A., group III; and high schools from 500-850 A.D.A. as group IV. These schools will appear as designated above in the tables to follow.
TABLE I
The Number and Percent of Teachers and Schools in Each Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original plan was to have approximately the same number of teachers in each group; however, the high schools showed a greater return by districts than did the elementary; thus more high school teachers than elementary are represented in this study.

In an attempt to secure an equal number of teachers from each of the four school groups, cooperation was sought from two small elementary schools, two small high schools, one large high school, and one large elementary school in each of the 58 counties of the state. (San Francisco County excepted, as San Francisco City and County is a unified District). Since there are only
48 high schools between 500-800 A.D. in the state, all 48 were solicited for cooperation.

Table II shows the number and percent of districts which cooperated in the study.

**TABLE II**

Number and Percent of Districts Cooperating in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number contacted</th>
<th>Number reported</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No attempt was made to contact teachers in schools where the administration did not indicate willingness to cooperate. Only 33.3 percent of the elementary schools expressed a willingness to cooperate compared to 58.7 percent of the high schools which so indicated.
TABLE III
Showing Relation of 1732 Teachers Reported, to Totals of State and Districts Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total teachers</th>
<th>Number included in this study</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>712 districts from 100-850 in State of California</td>
<td>9359</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 districts reported in this study</td>
<td>2654</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table III it can be seen that the return on teacher questionnaires was 65.26 percent, indicating unusual interest on the part of the teachers. The findings of this study should be reliable since it includes over 45 percent of the districts between 100 and 850 A.D.A., and the teachers reported represent a random sampling of 51 of the 57 counties which have schools of the classification listed for study. There are no teachers reported from the following counties: Alpine, Lassen, Mono, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne. In these counties there are only 159 teachers in schools between 100-850 A.D.A., or 1.6 percent of the total of the state. Alpine and Mono Counties have no schools, elementary or high, which come under this classification.
Distribution of Tenure

Of the 1732 teachers reported in this study, only 395 or 22.81 percent are classified as permanent teachers. Table IV shows the distribution of these permanent teachers in the four school groups.

TABLE IV

Distribution of Permanent Teachers in Four School Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>All teachers reported</th>
<th>Permanent teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>19.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>25.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>22.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV shows that the distribution of permanent teachers is fairly constant throughout the four groups of schools.

We find the greatest percentage of permanent teachers in the large high schools. This is consistent with the findings of the 1940 Tenure Census.\(^\text{(1)}\) Another

agreement is the percentage of permanent teachers. The Census showed that 25.14 percent of the teachers in schools between 100-850 were classed as permanent employees. The Census was a more comprehensive study, covering 77.44 percent of these districts.

TABLE V
The Method by which 395 Permanent Teachers Attained Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanketed in under 1921 and 1927 laws</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>93.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted through optional clause in 1931 law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V shows that only 27 teachers, less than 7 percent of the permanent teachers, have secured tenure through operation of the optional clause in the 1931 Tenure Law. This will perhaps show more significance if we view the data from another standpoint.
TABLE VI
Distribution of Tenure on Basis of Length of Service in Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No. Permanent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years service</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>68.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>39.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VI shows that 460 or over 26 percent of the teachers included in this study have been employed by the same district between four and ten years inclusive, yet only 22 or less than 5 percent of this group have been classified as permanent teachers. When compared with over 68 percent permanent teachers in the group with over ten years of service in the same district, it shows conclusively that the optional clause in the tenure law, applying to schools under 850 A.D.A., is not providing an appreciable number of teachers with tenure protection and benefits. Of the 373 permanent teachers with over ten years of service in the same position, all but 5, or 1.3 percent secured tenure through the blanket tenure law, previous to 1931.
Perhaps the clearest way of stating this is to say that over 95 percent of the teachers, who have served the recognized three year probationary period since 1931, are still without the benefits of tenure. In direct contrast, over 68 percent of those who served this probationary period previous to 1931 are classified as permanent teachers.

The intent of the makers of the optional clause was no doubt to provide administrators with the means of rewarding deserving teachers with tenure and at the same time protect deserving teachers in schools or districts where wholesale dismissals were the practice in avoiding the blanket law.

The law has at least worked to the advantage of teachers in districts that do not approve of tenure, but it apparently has failed in its other objective.
Table VII shows that over 57 percent of all teachers in this study are women. On closer observation it can be seen that this is not the general trend in both elementary and high schools. In the elementary schools the ratio of women to men is greater than 4 to 1. This is not so in the high schools where the ratio is practically even, 53.91 percent of the teachers being men.

These figures in themselves contribute little to the study, but when incorporated with the data presented in Table VIII, they should become meaningful.

One of the greatest claims against tenure was that it protected women teachers after marriage. Many claimed that the optional law would prove that deserving men teachers would be given tenure in preference to women.
This we shall investigate by reviewing the data in Table VIII.
### TABLE VIII

Showing Number and Percent of Teachers Granted Tenure by Optional and Compulsory Laws: Distribution by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>395 Permanent Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional Tenure Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men: % : Wom.: %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Elementary Schools</td>
<td>3: 30.0: 7: 70.0: 7: 5.8: 113: 94.2: 10: 7.7: 120: 92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 High Schools</td>
<td>8: 47.1: 9: 52.9: 115: 46.4: 133: 53.6: 123: 46.4: 142: 53.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII showed that over 57 percent of the teachers in the schools surveyed were women. In the elementary schools this figure was 81 percent and in the high schools, 46 percent. Table VIII shows that over 66 percent of all permanent teachers included in this study are women.

As mentioned before, the ratio of women to men in the elementary schools is approximately 4 to 1. Under the blanket tenure law existing from 1921 until 1931, the ratio of women over men in the granting of tenure was 19 to 1 in the elementary schools. This indicates plainly enough that women were more often granted tenure in these schools than were men. Since the optional law became effective in 1931, the ratio on granting of tenure has risen until it now rests at 7 to 1 in these schools. The trend is still definitely in favor of women over men in the granting of tenure in elementary schools, however.

In the high schools we have a different picture. There the ratio of women to men teachers is practically even. Table VII showed that the men were in the majority, 54 percent against 46 percent women. This gives the men a ratio of 1 1/6 to 1 over the women. In the matter of granting of tenure we find that the women are favored by a ratio of 2 to 1 under the blanket law, 1921 to
1931, and by a ratio of 3 to 2 since the optional law went into effect in 1931.

In summing this up it would seem safe to conclude that women were and are more often given tenure than are men teachers. Since the optional tenure law went into effect, the percentage of men teachers granted tenure has materially increased.

The tables thus far presented were based on factual information gathered from questions 1 to 7 of the questionnaire. These questions were necessary in order that the teachers and schools might be classified and identified as belonging in groups which were necessary for presenting a clear picture of the situation being studied.

The data presented hereafter in this study will be set up in tables and presented in the manner in which it will be most convenient for analyses. No set form is used in tabling the information, each question is set to a form which will bring forth the significant facts and trends.

Teaching Credentials

Is the granting of tenure influenced by the type of credential held by the teacher? This question has its debatable points. Some administrators believe that the
general credential is the highest and most desirable type. Others will argue that the holder of the general credential is a 'jack of all trades' type of teacher. These people would do away with the general credential and employ specialists only.

The writer can quote no authorities on this subject but it is a fact that this is often the point of contention when administrators of the small schools meet in group discussion.

For use in this study the writer has arbitrarily rated the three general types of credentials in the following order: Administrative as highest and most desirable, general as the highest of the strictly teaching credentials, and the special as the lowest type. This rating has some virtue since the credentials are rated in the order of length of training necessary for obtaining each.
### TABLE IX

Types of Credentials Held by 1732 Teachers Reported in this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>395 Perm. Teachers</th>
<th>1337 Prob. Teachers</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>80.51</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec. and Gen.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IX shows the number and percent of permanent and probationary teachers holding the three general types of teaching credentials. There is little basis for stating that the granting of tenure is influenced or affected by the type of teaching credential held by the teacher. The only trend which may hold some significance is shown by permanent teachers holding administrative credentials to a greater extent than the probationary teachers. Nearly 18 percent of the tenure teachers hold administrative credentials, as compared to 9.6 percent of the probationary. Combined special and general credentials are held by 8 percent of the probationary teachers while only
3 percent of the permanent teachers do likewise.

The data in Table IX shows little to indicate that there is any appreciable difference in the type of credentials held by the permanent and probationary teachers, other than the matter of administrative credentials, where the permanent teachers hold an edge of almost 2 to 1, 17.72 percent of the permanent teachers having the administrative against 9.65 percent of the probationary.

Degrees of Teachers

In looking at the degrees held by the teachers included in this study, it is necessary to separate the elementary from the high school teachers. This is necessary because of the difference in laws, which until recently were widely divergent in setting up standards for teachers in the two types of schools. Until 1930, no degree was necessary in order to teach in the elementary schools of California. Teachers entering the profession since that time have been required to complete the bachelor's degree. High school teachers have had to meet the bachelor's degree requirement since 1915, with the exception of certain highly specialized teachers and some Smith-Hughes teachers for a short period following the World War.
Question 9 of the questionnaire: "Indicate the highest degree you now hold", was included for the purpose of determining if possible what relation existed between degree held and the granting of tenure. The information concerning this question will be found in Tables X and XI.
TABLE X

Showing Degrees Held by all Permanent Elementary Teachers,
Based on Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees held</th>
<th>130 Permanent Elementary Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers with 1-3 exper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE Xa

Showing Degrees Held by all Probationary Elementary Teachers,
Based on Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees held</th>
<th>1-3 exper.</th>
<th>4-10 exper.</th>
<th>over 10 exper.</th>
<th>All probationary teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5 (4.39%)</td>
<td>19 (13.01%)</td>
<td>84 (55.63%)</td>
<td>108 (26.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>108 (94.73%)</td>
<td>122 (83.56%)</td>
<td>60 (39.73%)</td>
<td>290 (70.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>1 (.88%)</td>
<td>5 (3.43%)</td>
<td>6 (3.97%)</td>
<td>12 (2.92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>1 (.87%)</td>
<td>1 (100.00%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>114 (100.00%)</td>
<td>146 (100.00%)</td>
<td>151 (100.00%)</td>
<td>411 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables X and Xa show the number and percent of elementary teachers holding degrees of the three levels as well as those teachers who hold none. In Table Xa we see that the probationary teachers with 1-3 years experience, for the most part, possess a bachelor's degree. Of the 114 teachers in this classification, 108 or 95 percent have this degree, less than 5 percent have none and less than 1 percent have a master's degree.

In Table X we see that there are only 4 permanent elementary teachers with less than ten years of teaching experience. This number is too small to base any statement on; however, all 4, or 100 percent of the group, have a bachelor's degree.

By moving to Table Xa we find a group of probationary teachers with 4-10 years experience. Of the 146 teachers in this group, 19 or 13 percent have no degree at all, 122 or better than 83 percent have bachelor's degrees, while 5 or 3.4 percent have the master's degrees.

We can perhaps get the best picture of the situation by examining the two groups with over 10 years of teaching experience. Table X shows that 103 of the 130 permanent teachers in this group have no degree. This is nearly 82 percent of the group. Twenty-four or 18.46 percent have bachelor's degrees while only 3 or 2.38 percent have master's degrees. Probationary teachers of the
same experience show the following: Of the 151 teachers in the group, 84 or 55.6 percent have no degree, 60 or 39.7 percent have bachelor's degrees and 6 teachers or about 4 percent have master's degrees. In this group we also find one teacher with the doctor's degree.

Due to the few permanent elementary teachers in the group of teachers with 4-10 years of experience, no valid conclusions can be drawn by comparison with the probationary teachers of like experience. Teachers with over ten years of experience offer a better chance of comparison. The teachers without tenure show a definite superiority over the permanent teachers. Nearly 40 percent of the probationary teachers in this group have bachelor's degrees. When one considers that this was not required by law when these teachers went into service, it is evident that this group has improved its standards to a greater degree than have the permanent teachers of the same experience; the permanent teachers of same experience showing only 15.8 percent with the bachelor's degrees.

High school teachers will be considered as a unit, due to the difference in requirements mentioned previously. The data pertaining to these teachers will be found in Tables XI and XIa.
TABLE XI

Showing Degrees Held by all Permanent High School Teachers

Based on Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree held</th>
<th>1-3 exper.</th>
<th>4-10 exper.</th>
<th>over 10 exper.</th>
<th>All permanent teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>54.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

265 Permanent High School Teachers
### TABLE XIa

Showing Degrees Held by all Probationary High School Teachers, 
Based on Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree held</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>84.23</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>75.34</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>52.88</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>71.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>38.13</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>23.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In considering the high school teachers we need not consider those teachers who have no degree, since these are teachers of highly specialized fields or teachers who have been teaching since 1915. Twelve percent of the permanent teachers and 4.1 percent of the probationary teachers fall in this group. The majority of the permanent teachers so listed are those who have been teaching over 25 years. The 38 cases among the probationary teachers are those who are highly specialized in most cases; music teachers, librarians, and certain industrial arts teachers.

In Table XIa we find that probationary teachers with 1-3 years experience show the highest percent of bachelor and lowest percent of master's degrees, which is natural since these people have had less chance for advanced study following issuance of their teaching credentials. We find that of the 279 teachers in this group, 235 or over 84 percent have the bachelor's degrees while only 36, or less than 13 percent have achieved the master's degrees. Eight of this group are teaching on special credentials and have no degree of any nature.

As was the case in the elementary field, the number of permanent teachers in the 4-10 year group is too small to use as a valid comparison group, only 8 teachers
appearing there. Seven of these or 87.5 percent hold a bachelor's degree, the other a master's degree. The same experience group of probationary teachers shows 278 of a group of 369 teachers, holding the bachelor's degrees. This is slightly over 75 percent of the total. Eighty or 21.6 percent have master's degrees and 3 or less than 1 percent have doctor's degrees. Considering the few cases in the permanent group, the teachers of 4-10 years experience seem to compare very favorably, the probationary teachers showing a slight edge in master's degrees, 21.6 percent as against 12.5 percent for the permanent teachers.

In the group with over 10 years experience, we find the same situation that existed in the elementary schools. The probationary teachers show a greater proportion of teachers with the master's degrees. One hundred six or 278 teachers or over 38 percent of the probationary teachers have master's degrees, compared to 84 or 257 permanent teachers, which shows only 32.6 percent. The percent of teachers with the bachelor's degrees is fairly even in the two groups; the permanent teachers with 140 or 54.4 percent against 147 or 52.8 percent for the probationary teachers.

No doctor's degrees were reported by the permanent teachers, while 3 were reported in each of the 4-10 and
over 10 years experience groups of probationary teachers.

The only justifiable conclusion that can be reached is that the probationary teachers have to a greater degree improved their professional standards. This tendency seems consistent in both the elementary and the high school groups. This is particularly noticeable in the groups of teachers with over 10 years of teaching experience.

Teachers Salaries

As mentioned previously in this study, one of the charges made against tenure was that it protected the weak teachers. If this is true the only defense against these teachers would be to keep them low on the salary scale in an effort to discourage them from staying on in the school or district. The purpose of including question 11:

"Please check the bracket in which your present salary falls. $1320-1499 $1500-1999 $2000-2499 $2500-2999 $3000 and over."

was to determine whether or not such a defense had been set up, or if on the other hand, the tenure teachers were in the higher salary brackets.

The salary brackets were set at $500 intervals at the suggestion of members of the C.T.A. Tenure Committee. The initial bracket starts at $1320, the minimum salary
for all full-time teachers in the State of California, and ends at $1500. This arrangement was made because the usual starting salary of high school teachers is from $1500 to $1750 per year.

As in the case of degrees, the salaries will have to be dealt with on the basis of elementary and high schools, since the salary differences are too great to consider the two types of schools as one group.

Table XII and XIIa will present the data concerning the elementary schools. The figures relating to salaries of high school teachers will be found in Tables XIII and XIIIa.
### TABLE XII

**Number and Percent of Permanent Elementary Teachers in Six Salary Brackets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Brackets</th>
<th>Teachers:</th>
<th>Teachers with 1-3 exp.:</th>
<th>Teachers with 4-10 exp.:</th>
<th>Teachers over 10 exp.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1320-1499</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1: 25.00</td>
<td>37: 29.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1999</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1: 25.00</td>
<td>37: 29.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2499</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1: 25.00</td>
<td>37: 29.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500-2999</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1: 25.00</td>
<td>37: 29.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 &amp; over</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1: 25.00</td>
<td>37: 29.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4: 100.00</td>
<td>126: 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Principals

### TABLE XIIa

**Number and Percent of Probationary Elementary Teachers in Six Salary Brackets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Brackets</th>
<th>Teachers:</th>
<th>Teachers with 1-3 exp.:</th>
<th>Teachers with 4-10 exp.:</th>
<th>Teachers over 10 exp.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1320-1499</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2: 80.70</td>
<td>56: 38.78</td>
<td>59: 39.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1999</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2: 80.70</td>
<td>56: 38.78</td>
<td>59: 39.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2499</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2: 80.70</td>
<td>56: 38.78</td>
<td>59: 39.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500-2999</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2: 80.70</td>
<td>56: 38.78</td>
<td>59: 39.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 &amp; over</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2: 80.70</td>
<td>56: 38.78</td>
<td>59: 39.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>114: 100.00</td>
<td>146: 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Principals
TABLE XIII

Number and Percent of Permanent High School Teachers in Six Salary Brackets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Brackets</th>
<th>Teachers with 1-3 exper.</th>
<th>Teachers with 4-10 exper.</th>
<th>Teachers with over 10 exper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1320-1499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500-2999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 &amp; over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Principals

TABLE XIIIa

Number and Percent of Probationary High School Teachers in Six Salary Brackets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Brackets</th>
<th>Teachers with 1-3 exper.</th>
<th>Teachers with 4-10 exper.</th>
<th>Teachers with over 10 exper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1320-1499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500-2999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 &amp; over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Principals
Table XIIa shows that the salaries of all elementary
teachers with 1-3 years of experience fall in the first
two salary brackets. Of the 114 teachers in this classi-
fication, 92 or 80.7 percent are in the $1320-1499
bracket while 22 or 19.3 percent are in the $1500-1999
bracket.

Of the 4 permanent elementary teachers in the 4-10
year group, 3 or 75 percent are in the second or $1500
bracket, the remaining teacher is in the first bracket.

There are 146 probationary teachers with 4-10 years
of experience, of which 56 or over 38 percent have
salaries in the first bracket. Of the remaining teachers,
81 or 55.1 percent of the group have salaries in the
second or $1500 bracket and 5 or 3.4 percent are in the
$2000-2499 bracket. Four of the group were principals
with salaries between $2500 and $2999.

There were 126 permanent elementary teachers with
over 10 years of experience. Of these, 37 or less than
30 percent fall in the first or $1320 bracket. Eighty-
one or 53.6 percent fall in the second or $1500 bracket
and 4 or less than 3 percent have salaries between $2000
and $2499. In this group we find 7 principals, 4 with
salaries of $2500-2999 and one with a salary of over
$3000.
The principals involved in this study are so few that no attempt will be made to draw any conclusion as to their comparative status. This study deals with facts concerning teachers only.

Table XIIIa shows that of the 279 probationary high school teachers with 1-3 years of experience, only 6 appear in the first or $1320 bracket, representing 2.1 percent of the total. Two hundred forty-nine teachers, slightly less than 90 percent, have salaries between $1500 and $1999 while 22 are in the third or $2000 bracket. This represents approximately 8 percent of the group. Only 2 or less than 1 percent of the total appear in the $2500-2999 bracket.

Of the 8 teachers with tenure in the 4-10 year group, 2 or 25 percent are in the $1500 bracket while the other 6 or 75 percent have salaries ranging from $2000 to $2499. The same group of probationary teachers, numbering 369, shows 2 or less than 1 percent in the first salary bracket at $1320-1500. Two hundred fourteen or about 58 percent are in the $1500 bracket and 129 or slightly less than 35 percent have salaries between $2000-2499, while another 20 representing 5.4 percent are in the 2500-2999 bracket. Four principals show in this group, each with a salary above $3000.
Permanent high school teachers with over ten years of teaching show 59 of a total group of 257 with salaries in the $1500 bracket. This represents approximately 23 percent of the group. One hundred thirty-one or 50.9 percent have salaries between $2000 and $2499 while 51 or practically 20 percent have salaries ranging from $2500 to $2999. Sixteen principals with salaries of over $3000 are in this group.

Probationary teachers with over 10 years experience, as shown in Table XIIIa, finds 2 teachers still in the initial or $1320 salary group. In the $1500 bracket we find 87 of a total of 278, representing 31.2 percent. One hundred twenty-three or 44.2 percent have salaries between $2000-2499 and 41 teachers representing about 15 percent of the total have salaries falling in the $2500-2999 bracket. There are 25 principals reported in this group, each with a salary above $3000.

In summing up the data presented concerning the salaries of the permanent and probationary teachers, it is difficult to draw any conclusions concerning the teachers with 4-10 years of teaching experience since there were only 4 elementary and 8 high school teachers in the permanent groups. In using these few cases we find that in the elementary schools the permanent teachers have a slightly higher percentage of their
teachers in the higher brackets, 75 percent being above $1500. In comparison to this, the probationary teachers have only 61 percent above $1500.

In the same experience groups in the high schools, we find that the permanent teachers have 75 percent of their teachers above the $2000 mark as compared to less than 42 percent of the probationary teachers.

In the groups representing over 10 years of teaching experience, we can make some valid comparisons. The permanent teachers in the elementary schools have over 70 percent of their teachers with better than $1500 per year. Against this the probationary teachers can show no better than 61 percent above the same figure.

High school teachers, in comparing the permanent against the probationary, show very much the same picture in these groups of over 10 years experience. The permanent teachers have over 77 percent of their teachers above the $2000 salary mark, compared to less than 68 percent for the probationary teachers.

This evidence would lead us to the conclusion that the administrators are not using a low salary as a weapon to rid themselves of undesirable permanent teachers. The conclusion which must be drawn is that the better salary follows the permanent or tenure teacher in both the elementary and the high school.
Dependents of Teachers

Does the granting of tenure make a teacher more able and willing to assume the responsibility of dependents?

Do married men teachers who have tenure feel that they are more capable of caring for dependents and as a result, assume the responsibilities of larger families and a greater number of dependents?

These were the questions in mind when question 12 was added to the questionnaire:

"How many persons are dependent on you?"

Table XIV will present the data concerning the average number of dependents of all teachers included in the study while Table XIVa will deal only with the men teachers reported in the study.
TABLE XIV

Showing Dependent Index of all Teachers as Indicated by Average Number of Dependents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Permanent Teachers</th>
<th>Probationary Teachers</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. in:Total:Group</td>
<td>No. in:Total:Group</td>
<td>No. in:Total:Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group:depend.:Index</td>
<td>group:depend.:Index</td>
<td>group:depend.:Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 exper.</td>
<td>393 235 .6</td>
<td>393 235 .6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 exper.</td>
<td>12 9 .8</td>
<td>515 605 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 yrs. exper.</td>
<td>383 556 1.5</td>
<td>429 669 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>395 565 1.4</td>
<td>1337 1509 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1732 2074 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No answer was interpreted as meaning no dependents.
Table XIV shows the dependent index of all teachers included in this study. These are figured on a basis of years of teaching experience since this is undoubtedly the greatest factor entering into the acquiring of dependents.

In the 1-3 years experience groups, we find that the index or average number of dependents is .6 or less than 1 per teacher. These are all probationary teachers since there are no tenure teachers with less than 3 years of teaching experience.

In comparing the 4-10 experience groups, we find only 12 teachers in the permanent group, making this an unsatisfactory comparison situation. These 12 however, have an index of .8 as compared to 1.2 for the 515 teachers in the probationary group of same experience.

Teachers of over 10 years experience show an index of 1.5 for 383 permanent teachers and 1.6 for 429 probationary teachers.

These figures seem to indicate that the probationary teachers have a higher average number of dependents per teacher. This probably would not be a valid conclusion, except in making a general statement about all teachers. In order to make any significant conclusion we should
examine the data from the angle of dependents of the recognized breadwinner, the man teacher.

Table XIVa will present the data which should be significant in reaching a conclusion as to the effect of tenure on ability and willingness to assume the responsibilities of family and dependents.
TABLE XIVa

Showing Dependent Index of all Men Teachers
as Indicated by Average Number of Dependents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Permanent teachers</th>
<th>Probationary teachers</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. in: Total: Group</td>
<td>No. in: Total: Group</td>
<td>No. in: Total: Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group: depend.: Index</td>
<td>group: depend.: Index</td>
<td>group: depend.: Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 exper.</td>
<td>173: 207: 1.2</td>
<td>173: 207: 1.2</td>
<td>173: 207: 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 exper.</td>
<td>2: 6: 3.0</td>
<td>259: 466: 1.8</td>
<td>261: 472: 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 yrs. exper.</td>
<td>122: 317: 2.6</td>
<td>185: 388: 2.1</td>
<td>307: 705: 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>124: 323: 2.6</td>
<td>617: 1061: 1.7</td>
<td>741: 1384: 1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No answer was interpreted as meaning no dependents.
Table XIVa shows that the index of 173 probationary men teachers with 1-3 years of experience is 1.2, compared with .6 for all teachers of the same experience.

Of the teachers with 4-10 years experience, we find that the permanent teachers have an index of 3.0 for the two teachers in this group. The 259 probationary teachers with the same experience show an index of 1.8. This comparison carries little weight since the permanent group is composed of only two teachers.

A valid comparison may be drawn between the 122 permanent and 185 probationary teachers with over 10 years of experience. The permanent teachers have an index of 2.6 compared to 2.1 for the probationary.

A general comparison of the two total groups, permanent and probationary, finds the permanent teachers with 2.6 and the probationary with 1.7. The difference here is partially accounted for by the inclusion of 173 young teachers with less than 4 years of experience.

Of special significance is the comparison of teachers with over 10 years of experience. The permanent teachers in this group show a decided edge in dependents which would lead us to conclude that tenure teachers feel more free to accept the responsibilities of raising a family and acquiring dependents.
Delegation of Administrative Responsibility

Does administrative responsibility follow the tenure teacher?

The data pertinent to this question will be found in Tables XV and XVa.
TABLE XV

Showing Delegation of Administrative Responsibility
to All Permanent Teachers, Based on Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers with:</th>
<th>Teachers with:</th>
<th>Teachers with:</th>
<th>All permanent teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 exper.</td>
<td>4-10 exper.</td>
<td>over 10 exper.</td>
<td>teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have delegated administrative responsibility*</td>
<td>8 66.67</td>
<td>169 44.13</td>
<td>177 44.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have none**</td>
<td>4 33.33</td>
<td>214 55.87</td>
<td>218 55.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12 100.00</td>
<td>383 100.00</td>
<td>395 100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Administrative responsibility was defined in the questionnaire as follows: Principal, vice principal, dean, department head, and counselor.

** No answer was interpreted as meaning no administrative responsibility.
TABLE XVa

Showing Delegation of Administrative Responsibility to All Probationary Teachers, Based on Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All probationary teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers with 1-3 exper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have delegated administrative responsibility*</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have none**</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Administrative responsibility was defined in the questionnaire as follows: Principal; vice principal, dean, department head, and counselor.

** No answer was interpreted as no administrative responsibility.
Table XV shows the extent to which administrative responsibility is delegated to permanent teachers reported in this study. Table XVa shows the same situation for the probationary teachers.

Let us refer first to Table XVa where we find that 68 of 393 probationary teachers with 1-3 years experience have some type of administrative responsibility.

Table XV shows that 8 or 67 percent of the permanent teachers with 4-10 experience have some administrative responsibility. We find that this is true of only 155 or 30 percent of the probationary teachers in this experience group.

Teachers with over 10 years of experience find the permanent teachers with 169 or over 44 percent with some type of administrative assignment. In the same group of probationary teachers we see that only 36 percent have this responsibility.

The total groups show the permanent teachers with 44.8 percent and the probationary with only 28 percent who have this assignment.

These figures lead to the conclusion that administrative assignments are most often made to the permanent teachers. This fact is no doubt closely related to the findings in the study of salaries. There it was found that the permanent teachers were in higher salary brackets.
Teachers and Home Ownership

Does tenure give the teacher the feeling of security that will lead him to ownership of his home and/or other real property in the community in which he teaches? This question has many significant points as may be seen in Table XVI.
TABLE XVI
Number and Percent of Teachers Owning Homes and/or other Real Property,
Based on Groupings of Like Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience groups</th>
<th>Permanent teachers</th>
<th>Probationary teachers</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. in: Own</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No. in: Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years experience</td>
<td>393 : 21 : 5.34</td>
<td>393 : 21 : 5.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years experience</td>
<td>12 : 6 : 50.0</td>
<td>515 : 116 : 22.52</td>
<td>527 : 122 : 23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years experience</td>
<td>383 : 271 : 70.76</td>
<td>429 : 202 : 47.09</td>
<td>812 : 473 : 58.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>395 : 277 : 70.13</td>
<td>1337 : 339 : 25.36</td>
<td>1732 : 616 : 35.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data concerning home ownership by teachers has been tabled in groups of like teaching experience since all teachers in each group may then be presumed to have had the same period of time in which to orient themselves in the community.

Table XVI shows that in the group of probationary teachers with 1-3 years experience, only 21 of 393 own their own homes. This is a percentage of approximately 5 percent.

Permanent teachers of 4-10 experience show 6 of 12 teachers or 50 percent owning their homes. The like group of probationary teachers have 116 or 22.5 percent owning homes.

Of special significance is the fact that over 70 percent of the permanent teachers with over 10 years of experience own their homes, compared to 202 of 429 probationary teachers for 47 percent. The totals for all permanent against all probationary teachers shows 70.13 percent for the permanent and 25.36 percent of home owners for the probationary teachers.

There is little reason why it cannot be concluded here that the permanent teachers definitely feel more free and able to purchase their own homes and/or other property in the community in which they teach. This is significant in that such teachers will ordinarily have
more interest in the community and its betterment.

Social Integration of Teachers

Is it true that permanent teachers become better members of the community than do the probationary teachers? Do the permanent teachers take a more active part in community affairs, such as service clubs, lodges, church organizations and other civic clubs?

The data appearing in Table XVII was compiled from the information furnished by question 15 of the survey instrument. The purpose was to establish the community identity or social integration of teachers in the communities in which they taught. This question and its resultant data should, when analyzed, show to a good degree the extent to which teachers have established themselves.
TABLE XVII

Showing Measure of Community Integration as Indicated by Average
Number of Memberships in Service and Civic Clubs and Fraternal Organizations, Based on Groupings of Like Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience groupings</th>
<th>Permanent teachers</th>
<th>Probationary teachers</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. in: Total: Group: Organ: Index</td>
<td>No. in: Total: Group: Organ: Index</td>
<td>No. in: Total: Group: Organ: Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>393 : 592 : 1.51</td>
<td>393 : 592 : 1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>12 : 26 : 2.17</td>
<td>515 : 896 : 1.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>429 : 948 : 2.21</td>
<td>812 : 1867 : 2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>395 : 945 : 2.39</td>
<td>1337 : 2436 : 1.82</td>
<td>1732 : 3381 : 1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XVII shows the average number of service, social, religious, and civic clubs and organizations to which teachers in the various experience groups belong. This average we shall refer to as the integration index.

Probationary teachers with 1-3 years of experience show an integration index of 1.5, indicating that the average teacher in that group belongs to between one and two clubs or organizations in the community in which he teaches.

Permanent teachers with 4-10 years of experience have an index of 2.2 as compared to 1.7 for the probationary teachers of the same experience.

Permanent teachers with over 10 years of experience show an index of 2.4 while the probationary teachers of a like teaching experience have an average of 2.2 clubs or organizations per teacher.

While the difference in the permanent teachers and probationary is not pronounced, it is evident that the permanent teachers do have the higher average participation in civic and service organizations, which should indicate that they have a more definite and living interest in the community. This group, having tenure, would not be liable to participate in these organizations for any reason other than genuine interest in the community.
Professional Improvement

One of the charges most often hurled against tenure is that the tenure teacher hides behind his protection and fails to improve himself professionally. In asking each teacher to indicate the number of units earned since accepting the first teaching position, the writer had in mind the establishment of a unit-per-teaching-year index. In Table XVIII this index is set up, using only two groups, the permanent and probationary teachers. It was not necessary to base this table on years of teaching experience since the average is figured on the number of years of experience.

TABLE XVIII

Professional Improvement Index of all Teachers Based on Average Semester Units of Summer Session or Extension Work per Year of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of: Collective: Index or average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent teachers</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary teachers</td>
<td>1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No reply was interpreted as no units earned.
Table XVIII shows that the professional improvement index of all teachers is 1.8 units per year of teaching. The index of all permanent teachers is 1.6 compared to 1.9 for all probationary teachers.

Converted into terms of summer session attendance, this would indicate that the average probationary teacher attends a six weeks summer session or its equivalent every three years.

Permanent teachers, on the other hand, attend one six-weeks session approximately every four years. The fact that more permanent teachers have completed master's degrees may have some bearing on the situation.

The only conclusion that can be reached is that the data shows that probationary teachers, on the average, show a greater degree of professional improvement per year of teaching experience than do the permanent teachers.

In the matter of recency of professional improvement through attendance at summer sessions and units earned through extension work, Table XIX presents the data pertinent to this phase.

Question 17 of the questionnaire asked the teachers to state the date of their last attendance for credit at a summer session or in extension work. These dates were bracketed into periods of recency, each step representing
a three year period, as 1-3, 4-6, 7-9 and over 9 years. The reason for three-year steps or brackets is as follows: Most schools of the size being studied base their salary scale raises on a requisite of six units of professional study every third year. (1)

TABLE XIX
Recency of Professional Improvement of all Permanent Teachers Included in this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years since units earned</th>
<th>1-3 years exper.</th>
<th>4-10 yrs. exper.</th>
<th>Over 10 yrs. exper.</th>
<th>All Perm. Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>57.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIXa
Recency of Professional Improvement of all Probationary Teachers Included in this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years since units earned</th>
<th>1337 Probationary Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 9 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XIXa will have to be considered as we present the data concerning the recency of professional improvement of the probationary teachers. In this table we find that of 393 teachers with 1-3 years experience, 180 or 45.8 percent have attended since accepting their position, while 54.2 percent have failed to attend.

In Table XIXa we see that of the 515 probationary teachers with 4-10 years experience, 410 or nearly 78 percent have attended during the last three years: 55 teachers or 10 percent have not attended for a 4-6 year period and less than one percent of the group have not attended for periods of 7-9 and over 9 years. Fifty-five of this group have never attended at any time. This is approximately 10 percent of the group.

Table XIX shows the recency of professional improvement of all permanent teachers included in the study. Teachers with 4-10 years experience of this classification, show that 9, or 75 percent have attended during the last 3 year period. Two have not attended for a 4-6 year period, this being 17 percent of the group. Only one has never attended.

In considering teachers with over 10 years of experience, we find in Table XIX that of the 383 permanent teachers in this experience group, 220 or over 57 percent have attended or earned units during
the past three year period. Twenty percent have not attended for a 4-6 year period and an equal number, 30 or 7.8 percent fall into each of the 7-9 and over 9 year brackets. Twenty-four teachers or over 6 percent of the group have never attended at any time.

Table XIXa reveals that there are 429 probationary teachers with over 10 years of experience. Of this number, 30\(^4\) or nearly 70 percent have attended for credit during the last three years. Sixty-four or 15 percent have not attended for a period ranging from 4-6 years, while another 4 percent fall in the 7-9 year bracket. Twelve teachers or 2.8 percent have not earned units for over nine years and another 31 or 7 percent have never attended since accepting their first teaching position.

In comparing the permanent teacher with the probationary, we find that the percent that have never attended for credit at any summer session or extension course is practically even. This is also true of the teachers with 4-10 years experience.

The probationary teachers with over 10 years experience show to an advantage over the permanent teachers with the same years of teaching, the greatest difference being that over 70 percent of the probationary teachers have attended during the past three years compared to only 57 percent of the permanent teachers.
The data leads to the conclusion that the probationary teachers have the greatest percentage of teachers with recent professional improvement, this being particularly noticeable in the groups with over 10 years of teaching experience.

Do Teachers Migrate to the Larger Schools?

Many educators claim that since the optional tenure law was applied to schools under 850 A.D.A. the teachers in those schools have tended to migrate to the larger schools in search of tenure. The object of question 18 in the questionnaire was to determine whether the teachers in the small schools do tend to migrate to the larger ones. Table XX is self-explanatory.

**TABLE XX**

Showing Number and Percent of Teachers Who Have Considered Moving into a Compulsory Tenure District Since Accepting Present Teaching Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>teachers</th>
<th>probationary</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>66.84</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XX shows the number and percent of permanent teachers who have considered moving into a large school.

Of a total of 395 permanent teachers reported in this study, 124 or approximately 31 percent answered "yes". Of the 1337 probationary teachers, 676 or over 50 percent answered "yes".

The only conclusion which can be drawn from this is that nearly 50 percent of the teachers in the schools between 100 and 850 A.D.A. would move into the larger schools under certain conditions. It is also evident that the permanent teachers are not as prone to move as are the probationary.

Table XXI shows why teachers would move to the larger schools.
TABLE XXI

Reasons Why 800 Teachers Have Considered Moving Into A School Over 850 A.D.A. Since Accepting Present Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>124 Permanent</th>
<th>676: probationary</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61.29</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58.06</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A. To secure tenure.
B. Higher salary scale.
C. To teach a specialty.
D. Professional advancement.
E. To live in a large community.
F. Other reasons.

Table XXI shows the reasons, and frequency of appearance, given by 800 teachers who said they had considered moving into a school with over 850 A.D.A.

The largest percentage of both permanent and probationary teachers checked higher salary scale as a reason for moving, 61 percent of the permanent and 59 percent of the probationary teachers.

The next highest frequency was professional advancement, checked by 58 percent of the permanent and 56 percent of the probationary teachers. Of the remaining four
reasons, the distribution was about even with the exception of moving to secure tenure.

Forty-four percent of the probationary teachers would move into the larger schools to secure tenure and 25 percent would move in order to teach a specialty. Sixteen percent would move in order to live in a larger community while only 8 percent listed other reasons.

The significant point about the data presented in Table XXI is the fact that 44 percent of the probationary teachers would move to secure tenure. The other reasons checked are common to both groups and should be the natural reasons for any progressive teacher to consider moving into another or larger school.

This lends support to the theory that the optional tenure law is driving good teachers from the small schools. Maybe it should be stated that the non-operation of the optional law is driving teachers from the small schools.

Table XXII will present the data concerning tenure and satisfaction in present position.
TABLE XXII

Showing How Tenure Does/Would Influence Teachers to Remain in Present Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1337 Permanent Teachers</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>67.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXII presents the reactions of all teachers to the question: "Does/would tenure in your present position make you satisfied to remain in the community?"

Due perhaps to some weakness of the question over 12 percent of the teachers failed to answer question 20. Several teachers accused the writer of having a "loaded" or "leading" question, while others said that tenure did not have anything to do with their willingness to remain in the community.

Despite the criticism, over 87 percent of the teachers answered the question with no attendant remarks.

Table XXII shows that over 67 percent of the permanent teachers answered in the affirmative while only about 40 percent of the probationary teachers did so.
Nearly 53 percent of the total number of teachers reported answered "yes" on this question, indicating that teachers in the small schools are not only aware of tenure but would be content to remain in the smaller schools if given the protection and benefits of tenure.

Do Teachers Feel the Need of Protection?

As was quoted earlier in this study, certain educational authorities claim that the good teachers don't need tenure and the poor ones don't deserve it. Table XXIII may shed some light on the question of needs for protection of teaching positions.

**TABLE XXIII**

Showing Number and Percent of Teachers Who Have Felt the Need of Protection of Their Position During Their Teaching Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>57.22</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>54.60</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>55.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>36.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXIII shows that over 55 percent of all teachers have felt a definite need for protection of their positions at some time during their teaching careers. This is not a situation peculiar to any one group, over 57 percent of the permanent and nearly 55 percent of the probationary teachers agreed. If the opposite side is taken, the picture becomes even more clear cut since only 28 percent of the permanent and 33 percent of the probationary teachers answered in the negative. Over 8 percent did not respond to the question.

The conclusion here is that there is definitely a need for some form of protective legislation which will apply to the small schools. This is only teacher opinion, but the teachers should be in the favored spot to render a valid opinion.

Improvements in Tenure Law-Teachers Opinions

If there is a need for protection of the teachers positions, what would the teachers themselves suggest? It is now a pretty well-established fact that the optional tenure law is practically non-operative.

Would teachers care to face the problems of compulsory tenure again?

Is there a middle road, where the better features of both systems might be incorporated?
Question 22 asked the teachers to check those possibilities listed which would be most desirable in their schools.

**TABLE XXIV**

Recommendations of Teachers Concerning Certain Proposed Changes in the Tenure Law as it Now Applies to Schools Under 850 A.D.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Probationary Teachers</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A *</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A. Make no change at all.
B. Do away with all tenure laws.
C. Apply present compulsory law to all schools and make dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers easier.
D. Term contracts of 3, 4 or 5 years.
E. Indefinite tenure with dismissal only upon recommendation of administrator and unanimous vote of trustees.
F. Other possibilities.
The permanent and probationary teachers were pretty well in agreement as to which of the proposed changes would be most beneficial. Over 40 percent of the permanent and nearly 34 percent of the probationary teachers agreed that the present compulsory law should be applied to all schools and an easier means of dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers be drafted.

About 22 percent of the permanent and 31 percent of the probationary teachers suggested that teachers be elected for an indefinite term with dismissal only upon recommendation of the administrator and a unanimous vote of the board of trustees.

Twenty-five percent of the probationary teachers would be satisfied with term contracts of 3, 4 or 5 years. Less than 15 percent of the permanent teachers agreed.

Seventeen percent of the permanent teachers would make no change at all, only 5 percent of the probationary teachers agreeing, however. Ten percent of the probationary teachers would do away with all tenure laws, but to this only 3 percent of the permanent teachers would concur.

Since only 7.7 percent of all teachers believe that no change should be made, it is conclusively evident that the great majority of the teachers want some type of tenure that will protect the position of the deserving
teacher. It is evident from studying Table XXIV that this would be in the form of C or E on the questionnaire:

C. Apply the present compulsory law to all schools and make dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers easier.

or

E. Indefinite tenure with dismissal only upon recommendation of administrator and unanimous vote of board of trustees.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

In the first part of this study a review of ideas concerning tenure was made. A great deal of disagreement and conflict of opinion was found among authorities. This might be expected, due to the complexity and far reaching possibilities of tenure. Size of district, type of community and the administrator and trustees involved, all add to the problems confronting teachers in their desire and efforts to secure security through a workable tenure law.

In summarizing the findings of this study, the writer has attempted to present an accurate and unbiased analysis of the implications found in the tabled data.

This study includes 1732 teachers, 68 percent of whom are high school teachers and 32 percent elementary. Of these teachers, 395 or 22.8 percent are permanent or tenure teachers with distribution proportionate in the four groups of schools, that is, elementary schools from 100-500, elementary schools from 500-850, high schools from 100-500, and high schools with 500-800 A.D.A.
This study includes teachers employed in 153 districts in which there are 2654 total teachers. Each of these teachers was sent a questionnaire through the administrator or an appointed chairman of the system. The 1732 questionnaires received represents a return of about 65 percent.

Of the 395 teachers with permanent status, only 27 or less than 7 percent have been granted tenure through operation of the optional tenure law which has been in effect since 1931.

There are 460 teachers reported in this study who have had from 4 to 10 years of service in their present positions. Of this number, 22 or less than 5 percent have been granted tenure. There are 547 teachers included who have served over 10 years in their present positions. Of these teachers over 68 percent have tenure.

There are 991 women teachers reported in this study, representing 57.21 percent of the total. The ratio of women to men in the elementary schools is 4 to 1 compared to a ratio of approximately 1 to 1 in the high schools. The ratio of granting of tenure by sex shows that women are more often granted tenure than men. This is true in both elementary and high schools, but to a greater degree in the elementary schools. This practice was common during the period of compulsory tenure as well as since 1931.
There was little difference shown in the matter of teaching credentials, however 17.72 percent of the permanent teachers hold administrative credentials compared to 9.65 percent of the probationary.

Probationary teachers show a greater percent of teachers with master's degrees in the elementary field. This is not true in the high schools, however, 32 percent of the permanent teachers having this degree compared to approximately 24 percent of the probationary teachers. When viewed from the standpoint of teaching experience this does not hold true, both elementary and high school teachers of probationary status showing a superiority.

Permanent elementary teachers show over 70 percent of their number with salaries over $1500. Probationary teachers show only 61 percent above this figure. This situation also obtains when viewed in groups of like teaching experience. The high school teachers follow the same general pattern, the permanent teachers showing about the same percentage over the probationary.

Table XIV showed that the average number of dependents of all permanent teachers was 1.4 while that of the probationary teachers is 1.1. This holds true when these groups are examined from the standpoint of years of teaching experience as well. This situation was further
examined by considering only the men teachers reported, this group comprising the recognized breadwinners and family heads. When viewed from this angle the difference becomes more pronounced, the permanent teachers having an index of 2.6 compared to 1.7 for the probationary.

Forty-four percent of the permanent teachers have some type of administrative responsibility as compared to 28 percent of the probationary teachers. This figure holds true when considered from the standpoint of years of experience, but not to quite such an extent.

Seventy percent of the permanent teachers own their homes and/or other real property in the community in which they teach. Of the 1337 probationary teachers in this study, 25 percent own their homes and/or other real property. This also is true when viewed from teaching experience groupings, 25 percent of the probationary teachers owning who have had 4-10 years of experience and 50 percent of the permanent teachers of like experience doing likewise. Less than 6 percent of the teachers with 1-3 experience own homes or property.

Community integration as shown by the average number of community clubs and organizations to which teachers belong, found the permanent teachers with an average of 2.39 per teacher and the probationary with 1.82.
In the matter of professional improvement in service, the probationary teachers have averaged 1.9 units per year of teaching experience and the permanent teachers 1.6 units per year.

In recency of professional improvement, the probationary teachers have an edge on the permanent, over 66 percent having attended summer session or received credit for extension work during the last 3 year period. Of the 395 permanent teachers, approximately 58 percent have attended during this period.

Forty-six percent of the permanent teachers have considered moving into a school of over 850 A.D.A. since accepting their present positions. Of the 1337 probationary teachers included in this study, 676 or over 50 percent have considered moving into a large school. These people are those who have considered moving for any reason whatsoever.

Sixty-one percent of the permanent teachers and 59 percent of the probationary would move to get into a school with a higher salary scale. Fifty-eight percent of the permanent and 56 percent of the probationary would move to accept a position that offered professional advancement while 44 percent of the probationary would move to secure tenure. The other listed reasons drew about an equal number of checks: To teach a specialty,
to live in a larger community, and for other reasons not listed.

The fact that they have tenure is sufficient reason to keep over 67 percent of the permanent teachers in their present positions and communities. Nearly 50 percent of the probationary teachers would be satisfied to remain in present positions and communities if given tenure.

Fifty-five percent of all teachers have felt the need of protection of their positions since accepting their first teaching positions. This is true about the same extent in both permanent and probationary groups.

Of the six alternatives concerning changes in the tenure law, 35 percent of all teachers checked the following: "Apply the present compulsory tenure law to all schools and make the dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers easier." Considered as groups, 40 percent of the permanent and about 34 percent of the probationary teachers checked this. Twenty-eight percent of all teachers checked the following: "Indefinite tenure with dismissal only upon recommendation of administrator and unanimous vote of the board of trustees.

The remaining suggestions were checked in order of frequency as follows: Term contracts, 23 percent; do
away with all tenure laws, 9 percent; make no change at all, nearly 8 percent; and other possibilities, 6.7 percent.

Conclusions

The evidence presented in this study seems to justify the following conclusions:

1. Interest in the tenure question is very keen in schools under 850 A.D.A.

2. The optional tenure law is not protecting teachers in schools under 850 A.D.A.

3. Women were and are granted tenure more often than men.

4. The granting of tenure retards professional improvement of teachers to a small degree.

5. Permanent teachers receive higher salaries than probationary teachers.

6. Lack of tenure restricts the size of teachers' families.

7. Permanent teachers are favored in the delegation of administrative responsibility.

8. Permanent teachers become more thoroughly integrated community members.

9. Granting of tenure does/would keep approximately 60 percent of the present teachers in the small schools.
10. Teachers feel a definite need for protection in their positions.

11. Teachers definitely want a change in the present optional tenure law.

12. The change should take one of the following courses:

a. Apply the present compulsory law to all schools and make dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers easier.

b. Indefinite tenure with dismissal only upon recommendation of administrator and unanimous vote of board of trustees.
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Appendices

Appendix A. Survey Instruments
Dear Fellow Principal:

Mr. Rathbone, Chairman of the Tenure Committee, State Council of the C.T.A., recently completed a tenure census which when interpreted by Mr. Rathbone and Mr. Rees, resulted in the following conclusions:

1. Teachers in the schools under 850 A.D.A. do not now have tenure, excepting in cases where the teachers are hold-overs from the days of blanket tenure.

2. Many of the teachers in schools above 850 A.D.A. are becoming "tramp" teachers due to distrust of the present tenure law operative in those schools.

3. The tenure law is not operating on a broad enough base; ninety-four percent of the districts, 22 percent of the A.D.A. and 27 percent of the certificated employees do not have tenure benefits.

The situation as revealed by the census is bringing increasing unrest in the ranks of rural teachers. There is little evidence that C.T.A. representatives from the large cities will admit that curative measures must be taken.

Unfortunately, we who represent the rural areas have no direct evidence on the need or desirability of tenure adjustment in the districts under 850 A.D.A.

Your cooperation is requested in securing data which will give a clear picture of the status of teachers in the small districts. We hope to answer the following questions:

1. Do districts outside the compulsory tenure law lose their better teachers to the larger districts?

2. Do teachers without tenure become worthy and well integrated members of the community?
3. Does tenure or the lack thereof affect the professional growth of teachers in service?

4. Do teachers without tenure feel the need for security?

5. What form of security legislation would rural teachers want enacted?

Enclosed is a self-addressed card; will you please indicate whether you would be willing to cooperate in securing the data by distributing a survey form to your teachers and then returning it to us? The survey sheet can be completed in about three minutes and all information is to be supplied by the teacher.

Very truly yours,

H. M. McPherson, Supt., Napa Union High School District, Member, Tenure Committee, C.T.A.

Jack Rannells, Teacher, St. Helena High School
Our school will cooperate with the tenure survey in schools under 850 A.D.A. I will appoint a member of our faculty to distribute, collect and mail to you the survey forms which you are to send.

_______________________Principal
_______________________School
_______________________City

__________No. teachers in this school or district.
St. Helena, California
April 27, 1941

Dear Fellow Principal:

Enclosed you will find a tenure questionnaire for each teacher in your school; enclosed also is a stamped manila envelope for your convenience in returning the questionnaires.

We would appreciate the early return of these papers in order that they may be interpreted and given consideration before the close of the school year.

We are suggesting the following procedure for distribution and collection of these papers; however, please feel free to use the method most convenient for yourself and your school.

**Suggested Procedure**

1. Appoint a member of your faculty to handle the distribution, collection, and mailing of the questionnaires.

2. As soon as convenient, have the teachers supply the desired information in a faculty meeting.

We wish to thank you for your interest in this problem. A copy of the results of this study will be sent you at a later date.

Very truly yours,

H. M. McPherson,
District Superintendent
Napa Union High School,
Napa, California

Member, Tenure Committee,
State Council C.T.A.

Jack Rannells, Teacher,
St. Helena Union High School
St. Helena, California
Letter to Teachers, Accompanying Each Questionnaire

Survey of Teacher Security in Small Schools
(under 850 A.D.A.)

Dear Fellow Teachers:

The 1940 Tenure Census recently completed by the Tenure Committee of the C.T.A., shows that teachers in the schools under 850 A.D.A. are definitely not receiving protection under the present optional tenure law. Adjustment of the present law, so that it will be fair to all teachers, all districts and all children, is inevitable. Whether you now have tenure or not, you owe it to your fellow teachers and yourself to furnish such information as will be helpful in presenting a clear cut picture of the situation as it is today in the small schools.

Will you please take the three or four minutes necessary and fill out the accompanying survey form? The results of this survey will be put into the hands of the Tenure Committee of the C.T.A. for study and interpretation. No signature is necessary on this sheet and you may mail it directly to us if you wish. Thank you.

H. M. McPherson, Supt., Napa Union High School District, Member C.T.A. Tenure Committee

Jack Rannells, Teacher, St. Helena High School
Please circle correct answers unless otherwise indicated

1. Do you have tenure? Yes No.
2. If so, year granted________.
3. Sex? M F
4. Enrollment of your school________.
5. Total years of teaching experience________.
6. Years in present position________.
7. Type of school in which you teach? High school elementary
8. Type of teaching credentials you hold? Special General Administrative
9. Indicate the highest degree you now hold. None Bachelor Master Doctor
10. Do you have any administrative responsibility? Principal Vice-principal Dean Department Head Counselor
11. Please circle the bracket in which your present salary falls: $1320-$1499; $1500-$1999; $2000-$2499; $2500-$2999; $3000 or over.
12. How many persons are dependent on you?________.
13. Do you own, or are you buying, your own home. Yes No
14. Do you own, or are you buying, other real estate in the community in which you teach. Yes No
15. To how many lodges, service clubs, church, social and other active community groups do you belong?____
16. How many semester units of summer session or extension work have you completed since you began teaching?________.
17. When did you last attend a summer session or receive credit for extension work?________.
18. Since accepting your present position have you seriously considered moving into a school which has an enrollment of over 850 A.D.A. Yes No
19. If your answer is YES on 18 will you please check below the reason which prompted you to do so:
   A. To secure tenure  C. To teach a Specialty  
   B. Higher salary scale  D. Professional advancement
   E. To live in a large community
   F. Other reasons________
20. Does or would tenure in your present position make you satisfied to remain in the community? Yes No
21. Have you, during your teaching experience, felt the need of some definite protection of your position? Yes No

22. Below are listed several possibilities advanced as improvements in the security problem in schools not subject to the present compulsory tenure law. Please check the one which you believe would be most desirable in your school.

A. Make no change at all. A______
B. Do away with all tenure laws. B______
C. Apply present compulsory law to all schools and make dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers easier. C______
D. Term contracts of 3, 4 or 5 years. D______
E. Indefinite tenure with dismissal only upon recommendation of administrator and unanimous vote of trustees. E______
F. Other possibilities. F______

Please complete and return to the member of your faculty in charge of collection or mail directly to:

Tenure Committee
St. Helena High School
St. Helena, California
Master Sheet for Question Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Permanent Teachers</th>
<th>Probationary Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION 3: Sex?
Appendices B

Pertinent Tenure Legislation
Teacher Tenure Legislation Pertinent to this Study

Following are extracts from the California School Code; sections which apply to the schools reported in this study, Division V, Part III, Chapter I, Article I:

Section 5.401. Persons in positions requiring certification qualifications may be elected for the next ensuing school year on or after the first day of May, and each person so elected shall be deemed re-elected from year to year except as hereinafter provided.

Section 5.402. Any certified employee not under permanent tenure who shall fail to signify his acceptance within twenty days after notice of his election or employment shall have been given him or mailed to him by United States registered mail with postage thereon prepaid, to such employee at his last known place of address, by the clerk or secretary of the governing board of the school district, shall be deemed to have declined the same.

Section 5.500. Every employee of a school district of any type or class, who after having been employed by the district for three complete consecutive school years in a position or positions requiring certification qualifications, is re-elected for the next succeeding school year to a position requiring certification qualifications shall, except as hereinafter otherwise provided, at the commencement of said succeeding school year, be classified as and shall become a permanent employee of the district.

Provided that nothing in these parts shall be construed to give permanent classification to a person in the evening school who is already classified as a permanent employee in the day school; provided further, that in case a teacher obtains permanent classification in the evening school and later is eligible for the same classification in the day school by reason of having served the probationary period therein, he shall be given his choice as to which he shall take. Nothing
in this section contained shall be construed to affect the classification of any employee as it exists at the time this act takes effect.

Section 5.501. Every employee of a school district of any type or class, having an average daily attendance of less than 850 pupils, who, after having been employed by the district for three complete consecutive school years in a position, or positions, requiring certification qualifications and is re-elected for the next succeeding school year to a position requiring certification qualifications, may be classified by the governing board of the district as a permanent employee of the district. If said classification is not made the employee shall not attain permanent status and may be re-elected from year to year thereafter without becoming a permanent employee until said classification is made.

Section 5.505. Excepting in districts situated within, partly within, or coterminous with the boundaries of a city, or city or county, where the charter, if any, of such city, or city and county provides an age at which employees, including certified employees of such districts, shall be retired, when a permanent employee reaches the age of sixty-five years, or if a permanent employee has reached the age of sixty-five years, the permanent classification of such employee shall cease and thereafter employment shall be from year to year at the discretion of the governing board; provided that any certificated employee who is not re-employed under the provisions of this section, and who has not completed the requirements for full retirement salary, shall be deemed to have been retired on account of physical disability within the meaning of the provisions of this code relating to retirement of certificated employees of school districts. Provided that the effective date of this section shall be September 1, 1937.

Division V, Part III, Chapter VII, Article II:

Section 5.650. No permanent employee shall be dismissed except for one or more of the following causes: immoral or unprofessional conduct, commission or aiding or advocating the commission of acts of criminal syndicalism, as prohibited by Chapter 188, Statutes of 1919, or in any amendment thereof,
dishonesty, incompetency, evident unfitness for service, physical or mental condition unfitting him to instruct and/or associate with children, persistent violation of or refusal to obey the school laws of California, or reasonable regulations prescribed for the government of the public schools, by the State Board of Education or prescribed by the governing board of the school district employing said employee, or conviction of a felony or of any crime involving moral turpitude.

Section 5.651. Upon the filing of written charges, duly signed and verified by the person filing the same, with the governing board of the school district, or upon a written statement of charges formulated by the governing board, charging that there exists a cause or causes, for the dismissal of a permanent employee of said district, the governing board may, upon majority vote, except as hereinafter provided, if it deems such action necessary, give notice to the said permanent employee of its intention to dismiss him at the expiration of thirty days from the date of service of such notice, unless said employee demands a hearing as hereinafter provided. Such notice must not be given between May 15 and September 15 in any year; it must be in writing and served upon the employee personally or by United States registered mail addressed to such employee at his last known address. A copy of the charges filed together with a copy of this Article shall be attached to the notice. If the employee does not demand the hearing hereinafter provided for, he may be dismissed at the expiration of such thirty day period.

Section 5.652. Governing boards of school districts shall not act upon any charges of incompetency other than incompetency due to physical or mental disability unless during the preceding term or half school year prior to the date of the filing of such charge, and at least ninety days prior to the date of such filing, the board or its authorized representative shall have given the employee against whom the charge is filed, written notice of such incompetency, specifying the nature thereof with such particularity as to furnish the employee an opportunity to correct his faults and overcome his incompetency.
Section 5.653. Upon the filing of written charges, duly signed and verified by the person filing the same with the governing board of a school district, or upon a written statement of charges formulated by the governing board, charging a permanent employee of said district with immoral conduct, or conviction of a felony or of any crime involving moral turpitude the said governing board may, if it deems such action necessary, immediately suspend said employee from his duties and give notice to said employee of his suspension, and the thirty days after service of such notice, he will be dismissed, unless said employee demands a hearing as hereinafter provided. Said notice of suspension and intention to dismiss, must be in writing and served upon the employee personally or by United States registered mail addressed to said employee at his last known address. A copy of the charges filed, together with a copy of this Article, shall be attached to such notice. If said employee does not demand the hearing hereinafter provided for, within such thirty day period he may be dismissed upon the expiration of thirty days after service of such notice.

Section 5.654. When any employee who has been served with notice of the governing board's intention to dismiss him, shall demand such hearing, the governing board shall have the option either to (1) rescind its action, or (2) file a complaint in the superior court of the county in which the school district or the major part thereof is located, setting forth the charges against such employee and asking that the court inquire into such charges and determine whether or not such charges are true, and if true, whether or not they constitute sufficient grounds for the dismissal of such employee, under the provisions of this code, and for judgment pursuant to its findings.

If the board elects to file a complaint such complaint must be filed within thirty days from the date of the employee's demand for hearing. If the complaint be not filed within such period the board's action shall be deemed to be rescinded and all charges dismissed.

The employee within ten days after service upon him of the summons, and a copy of the complaint may demur to such complaint or may file an answer, to which the governing board may demur. If the employee
shall fail to answer or demur within such ten day period, or any extension thereof, made by stipulation or order of court, his default shall be entered and judgment shall be entered by the court declaring the right of the governing board to dismiss such employee. Both the complaint and the answer shall be verified. Demurrers to the complaining or answer may be upon any of the grounds specified in the Code of Civil Procedure for demurrer to a complaint or answer, and procedure on such demurrer shall be the same as in any civil proceeding. When the employee has filed his answer to such complaint, either party may, upon five days notice to the other, move the court to set the matter for trial. Such proceeding shall be set for trial at the earliest possible date and shall take precedence over all other cases, except older matters of the same character and matters to which special preference may be given by law. Upon motion by either party, or on its own motion, the court may appoint three disinterested persons over twenty-one years of age as referees, to ascertain the facts and report their findings to the court. The persons appointed as such referees must be persons of suitable experience and educational qualifications, and in sympathy with the merit system for employing teachers.

Section 5.661. Should an employee be dismissed under this Article for immoral conduct or conviction of a felony or crime involving moral turpitude the governing board shall transmit to the state board of education and to the county board of education which issued the certificate or certificates under which the employee was serving at the time of his dismissal, a copy of the reporter's transcript of the hearing accompanied by a request that any certificate or certificates issued by said county board of education to the employee dismissed, be revoked in the event that the employee is not reinstated upon appeal.

Section 5.666. Any certificated employee having permanent classification in any district who may be transferred from such district to another district, the governing board of which shall be composed of the same persons as the first district, shall retain such permanent classification in the district in which such permanent classification has been
attained in the district to which said teacher is transferred.

Section 5.667. The division, unionization, unification or consolidation of any school district or districts, or any change in school district boundaries or organization, shall not affect the classification of certificated employees already employed by any school district affected and such employees shall have the same status with respect to their classification, including time served as probationary employees, in the schools of the district after such division, unionization, unification or consolidation, or change in school district boundaries or organization as they had prior thereto; provided, however, that in case the unionization, unification or consolidation of two or more school districts shall result in a district in which, under the provisions of this code then in effect, the certificated employees are entitled to probationary and/or permanent classification, the employees of such union, unified or consolidated district shall be entitled to, and shall be given, such classification, on the same basis as certificated employees in other districts of like average daily attendance.

The provisions of this section, and all rights hereby granted, shall apply to any such division, unionization, unification or consolidation of school districts, or change in school districts boundaries or organization, made at any time subsequent to January 1, 1931, to the same extent as changes made subsequent to the effective date of this section, and the provisions hereof shall be, and shall be construed to be retroactive to January 1, 1931.

Division V, Part III, Chapter VII, Article IV:

Section 5.680. Governing boards of school districts shall have power and it shall be their duty to dismiss probationary employees during the school year for cause only, as in the case of permanent employees.
Section 5.681. On or before the fifteenth day of May in any year the governing board may give notice in writing to a probationary employee that his services will not be required for the ensuing year.

Such notice shall be deemed sufficient and complete when delivered in person to such employee by the clerk or secretary and the governing board of the school district or deposited in the United States registered mail with postage prepaid, addressed to such employee at his last known place of address.

Division V, Part III, Chapter VII, Article VII.

Section 5.710. Whenever it becomes necessary to decrease the number of permanent employees in a school district on account of a decrease in the number of pupils attending the schools of such district, the governing board may dismiss so many of such employees as may be necessary at the close of the school year. In making such dismissals employees shall be dismissed in the inverse of the order in which they were employed; provided, however, that no permanent employee may be dismissed under the provisions of this section while a probationary employee is retained or employed to render a service which such permanent employee is certificated and competent to render.