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(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was twofold: to examine (1) how shared decision making was operating in a large urban high school, especially in the administrative areas of personnel, finance, staff development and curriculum and instruction and (2) why shared decision making was operating in the manner it was.

A descriptive case study was conducted of the school’s organizational and administrative processes to determine staff involvement in decision making. Four central office department heads, two assistant principals, four department chairpersons, six teachers, four Faculty Council members, and four parent members of the Planning Council were interviewed to determine perceptions of shared decision making at the subject school. Data gathered from the different stakeholders were transcribed from tape recordings and entered into participant-by-involvement matrices. School documents were reviewed, and data retrieved were entered into documents used as sources of data matrix. The participant-by-involvement matrices and documents used
as sources of data matrix were then stacked comparing involvement of stakeholders in the administrative areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. Data emerged from these stacked matrices which provided the findings from which conclusions were drawn.

The data indicated that there was no model for shared decision making in operation within the school system or at the school level. Disjointed activities and responsibilities in the guise of shared decision making were parcelled out by the division superintendent to the schools to be implemented.

Opportunities for stakeholder participation were better organized and managed in the areas of staff development and curriculum and instruction. However, the same was not true in personnel and finance, as activities were isolated and disjointed; and stakeholder involvement was selective rather than inclusive.

The reason shared decision making activities were better organized and managed in the areas of staff development and curriculum and instruction was the superintendent mandated stakeholder participation in the two areas and the building principal extended the mandate to the school. While there was no mandate to include stakeholders in personnel and financial decisions, the building principal attempted to include selected stakeholders in isolated activities.
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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Background

At a time when the prevailing public opinion questioned the country’s educational systems, national reports, state legislatures, parents, and politicians demanded an overhaul in the manner in which schools operated (Murray, Tinny, Lasseter, Atkins, & Puckett, 1993). A concomitant demand for accountability was evident as parents, politicians, and business leaders voiced concern with the product of public schools. Decentralization, restructuring, and local control initiatives expanded rapidly throughout the country. The shifts to decentralization, restructuring, and local control were manifested in concepts of school based management which were designed to democratize school governance through shared decision making. Shared decision making was an attempt to shift the responsibility of making decisions about school management to each local school and provide parents, students, and teachers an opportunity to have input in decisions which affected how their schools were operated (Faucette, 1992).

School leadership looked to business and industry for those concepts which had shown promise in improving productivity. Educational reformers examined the work of W. Edwards Deming and his contemporaries to
develop frameworks to reconstruct their school systems. What reformers gleaned from the Deming model was a decreased level of organizational bureaucracy, thus providing the opportunity for all employees to participate within the decision making process (Madsen & Silkey-Larsen, 1993).

Prior to shared decision making, teachers had been both formal and informal school leaders. As coaches, mentors, department heads, and program coordinators, they shaped the school’s unofficial processes for making decisions. Within a restructured organization, the decision making role of teachers expanded and became more formal. The contributions of teachers were no longer merely tolerated but now were expected and actively sought. Shared decision making provided the opportunity for leadership skills to emerge among teachers (Kirby & Bogotch, 1993).

Shared decision making, as a restructuring process, assumed a variety of forms and processes within schools, according to the needs and purposes of each situation. There appeared to be no one best model. The myriad of approaches required a new vision which allowed for the development of interpersonal, intrapersonal, managerial, and educational leadership skills at various levels within the school organization (Madsen & Silkey-Larsen, 1993).

School based management represented an effort to reduce bureaucracy, decentralize and restructure the organization, and shift
responsibility to the school site. Shared decision making, a frequent companion to school based management, democratized school governance and gave teachers, students, and parents a leadership role in school decision making. Anticipated results of this shared decision making were to involve stakeholders in decisions which affected them and to reach quality decisions which would improve parent and teacher morale (Faucette, 1992).

The degree of autonomy for making various types of decisions was dependent upon the philosophy and goals of the school system, the limitations imposed by the central office, and the initiative and willingness of teachers and other staff members to become involved, as well as the restrictions imposed by the building principal. Building principals determined the utilization level of shared decision making, the areas of school operation in which shared decision making would be implemented, and the degree that stakeholders would be involved in the decision making process.

Statement of Problem

The perception of high failure rates, low test scores, and growing illiteracy helped create public and political distrust and lack of confidence in public schools. Parents and politicians demanded change and pressured schools and school systems to be more accountable. In an attempt to answer critics, public schools looked to such reforms as site-based management and shared decision making. As a result, shared decision
making emerged as a cornerstone of educational reform. States such as Georgia, Texas, and Florida went so far as to mandate school boards to implement site-based, shared decision making models (Bondy, 1994).

Mandates by local school boards and state governments created a maze of uncertainty for local school administrators. School administrators were required to implement site-based, shared decision making programs, but few were given adequate direction, training, or the autonomy to do so. Principals were often encumbered by central office bureaucracy, the lack of any standard model, restrictive guidelines and limitations imposed by the school system, and a basic insecurity and uncertainty regarding their part in the process and implementation of this program. Some felt threatened by the new philosophy, fearing loss of authority or power (Stover, 1989).

While mandated to implement such initiatives as shared decision making, principals were often left to do so on their own initiative. Consequently, models differed. The lack of planning, education, and understanding underscored Myron Tibrus's description of the failing of the educational process (Aguayo, 1990). He stated that political leaders and school boards made pronouncements and goals for education which were shallow because implementation of such initiatives had not been fully thought through. School boards required implementation of such initiatives as shared decision making but limited local schools with restrictive goals,
lack of a clear vision of the initiative, and lack of direction and training of personnel (Dobyns & Crawford-Mason, 1991).

The problem investigated by this research was generated by the fact that little is known about how shared decision making is operating in schools and models are widely varied. The New York model identified parents as the primary stakeholders with the objective to increase parental involvement in the local schools.

The Live Oak, Florida, model identified teachers and administrators as primary stakeholders, and the objective of the model was to include teachers in the decision making process along with school administrators in the areas of curriculum and staff development.

The Bloomington, Minnesota, model identified an elected council of parents, teachers, support staff members, and the principal as the stakeholders. The objective of the model was to include the identified stakeholders in school improvement decisions.

This study addressed two questions:

1. How was shared decision making operating in a large urban high school?

2. Why was it operating as it was?

The study was limited to stakeholders involved in the decision making process and decisions they made in four critical areas of school
management: personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction as shown in Table 1.

Procedural Plan

A descriptive case study was conducted of the four critical areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. The high school in the study was entering its fourth year of implementation of shared decision making. The study was conducted from February to May of the 1995-96 school year.

Data were gathered through structured interviews with stakeholders and examination of documents describing the processes utilizing shared decision making. The researcher was the principal of the school. Stakeholders interviewed were central office staff, assistant principals, teachers, department chairpersons, Faculty Council members, and parent members of the Planning Council who had input into the operation of the school and had a vested interest in the outcomes at the school.

Faculty Council and Planning Council members were interviewed because the division superintendent mandated the two organizations established in each school as integral to his shared decision making initiative. The Faculty Council—eight teachers and the principal—had the primary responsibility for providing direction for improvement in school climate, curriculum and instruction, staff development, and school budget
TABLE I

STUDY DESIGN: CRITICAL AREAS, ACTIVITIES, STAKEHOLDERS, AND ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL AREAS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Who to Screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>How to Identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>How to Assign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and Planning Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE</td>
<td>Allocation of Funds</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Review Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of Funds</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Allocate Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>Manage Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td>Assess Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Prioritize Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Design Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Staff Development Committee</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Assess Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM/</td>
<td>Review and Revise</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Design and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Adapt</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify Resources</td>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor Student</td>
<td>Faculty and Planning Council</td>
<td>Provide Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and was, therefore, a key group in shared decision making.

The Planning Council was comprised of fifteen members: the building principal, eight teachers on the school’s Faculty Council, and six parent or community members. Its purpose was to develop, revise, and maintain the
school’s strategic plan. As such, it was involved in discussions and
decisions concerning school climate, finance, personnel, and curriculum and
instruction.

**Justification**

This in-depth case study focused on structures and processes for
implementation of shared decision making. It identified critical areas of the
school’s organization for implementation of shared decision making
activities, individuals involved, and types of decisions made. From this
investigation and description, a school or school system contemplating
shared decision making will have better information to make decisions
concerning the implementation of a shared decision making model.
This study will further provide data for improving the existing shared
decision making model at the subject school.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical Evolution of Educational Management Practices

The shared decision making model that was investigated in this study had roots in the private sector. The development of educational management practices mirrored those of business and industry. Consequently, the principles of this shared decision making model that were studied originated from the work of W. Edwards Deming and his Total Quality Management model, a model developed to increase and produce "quality" in all aspects of a business organization (Walton, 1986).

During an early stage of development of business and industry in America, the imperative for efficiency in production was the basis of theory in management. Adam Smith (1921) described the concepts of organizational practice used in a pin plant as division of labor; workers each performed a specific job function on a production line. Because each concentrated on one function, the pin factory was able to produce more pins than if each man had undertaken the complete and total task of pin making.

Classical theorists believed that the ills of any organization could be solved through the principle of organizational and scientific management (Callahan, 1964). Frederick Taylor (1911) was an early theorist who
believed that by studying a task, the one best system of doing work could be determined. The idea that efficiency depended upon scientifically selecting and training workers, developing a science for each element of work, and providing for an equal division of work responsibility between management and labor was the essence of industrial organization.

At the turn of the century, industries were highly structured and tightly organized. Each department, unit, or layer had a specific job function. Employees were trained to specialize in their unit of work, and each job function was spelled out and highly supervised. Efficiency and economy were the driving forces that propelled management (Fayol, 1916). All decisions and communication flowed from the top down. Executives were rarely seen and never questioned by employees. Obedience by the workers was owed to the legally established order and extended to the person exercising authority (Weber, 1947).

The early structuralist and scientific management philosophy had a strong influence on education. The concepts of hierarchical control, division of labor, goal definition, and formal rules were mirrored in the way schools and school systems were organized and operated. Organizational charts for school systems reflected a hierarchy of control and unity of command. Authority was highly centralized and all decisions originated with the central office and flowed downward to the local school principal, assistant
principals, department heads, and finally teachers. Teachers were viewed as the on-line workers who were told what to do and what was expected of them to carry out their jobs as directed without question (Callahan, 1964).

Division of labor occurred with departmentalization for subject area teachers, custodians, and administrators and was especially evident in the organization of schools, which was by levels. Employee selection was evidenced by certification requirements. Rules of behavior were established in the form of teacher handbooks and manuals containing policy, guidelines, and practices (Callahan, 1964).

While the strong authoritarian management style flourished through the 1930s, a more humanistic approach to leadership began to emerge. The once highly structured and organized authoritarian manager was being replaced by a manager with a more humanistic and organic approach (Murray, 1993).

Abraham Maslow (1943) developed the theory that human motivation was critical to the success of an organization. Maslow defined a hierarchy of needs in which individuals were initially concerned about the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter. As these needs were met, workers became more concerned with higher level needs such as the need to be recognized for good work and the need to achieve. While the hierarchical structure of organizations remained in place, change occurred in how management
viewed and treated employees. Management recognized that employees were a part of a social unit and, as such, had social needs.

Frederick Herzberg (1968) further attempted to explain human behavior. Herzberg theorized that individuals worked more efficiently if they felt secure in their jobs, were given responsibility, and enjoyed a sense of achievement. He suggested that employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction did not follow a continuum. Five factors influenced employee attitude in a positive direction: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. Different factors affected employee dissatisfaction. Herzberg concluded that salary, interpersonal relationships, personal life, job security, and status were some of the factors that created employee conditions that could lead to dissatisfaction (Gorton, 1983).

Following Herzberg’s work, several studies were conducted to determine the effect of employee motivation on production. Sergiovanni conducted a study of three thousand teachers and found that achievement, recognition, and responsibility contributed to staff satisfaction. Work itself was a potential source of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Zakrajsek, 1979).

The National Education Association conducted a nationwide survey in 1980 to determine teacher attitudes towards education. From the study it was found that thirty-five percent all public school teachers were dissatisfied
with their jobs and suggested they would quit or retire if they could. The reasons cited for this dissatisfaction were incongruity of school goals and policies, fragmentation or being drawn in different directions by the school work they were performing, and a lack of support from administration (Gorton, 1983).

Likert (1967) attempted to explain employee behavior as a result of the organization’s management structure. Likert suggested that employees would be more effective if management paid more attention to their human needs. He recognized the tension between conventional management and employee groups. In his social system model, Likert emphasized employee participation in the organization and maintained that an organization must insure employee interaction within all aspects of the organizational structure. He stressed three basic concepts: (1) supportive relationships, (2) group decision making, and (3) high performance work norms (Hanson, 1991).

The team management concept, which was an outgrowth of Likert’s social system model, became popular among schools across the country. The human organization concept interlocked teachers with department heads, central office staff, and building administrators in a team approach. The purpose was to provide a more diverse knowledge base in dealing with problems and to get teachers involved in managerial decisions (Hanson, 1991).
While Likert and others attempted to explain leadership as a dynamic entity affected by the social systems that surrounded and interacted with organizations, perhaps the greatest influence on modern leadership and organization was initiated by the work of W. Edwards Deming. Deming’s concept of Total Quality Management had a far reaching and profound effect on business, industry, and education. His premise can be summarized by the idea that "quality" is the driving concept upon which management, production, sales, and service must be based. Quality begins in the board room with leadership and must permeate the entire organization in all facets of its operation (Aguayo, 1990).

The quest for quality in all phases of administration and production is continuous and involves all employees of the organization. Deming’s philosophy called for organizations to produce quality goods and services and by so doing develop loyal customers (Aguayo, 1990). In the production of goods and services and the quest for quality, Deming recommended that those individuals closest to production should make decisions concerning the quality of the goods produced. He referred to this realignment as "flattening out the organization" while elsewhere it may be called decentralization (Madsen, 1993). The results of flattening the organization produce total transformation of the organization. Authority to make decisions is shifted downward to those closest to production who perceive the need for change.
(Tewel, 1991).

The transformation of management as a result of Deming's philosophy surfaced in the administration of public schools. The decentralization of schools occurred on a widespread educational front. Sidney L. Faucette (1992), superintendent of Virginia Beach City Public Schools, in his position paper entitled "Resolution of Support for School-Based Management and Shared Decision Making," wrote that school bureaucracy needed to be slimmed down and that the organization needed to be decentralized with more responsibility shifted to the local school site. The result of his decision concerning decentralization placed more authority and power to make decisions in the hands of the local schools. However, to further the implementation of shared decision making, Faucette required that the local schools flatten their administrative hierarchy as well, placing more decision-making authority in the hands of the teachers. Teachers were to be included in certain areas of decision making: personnel, budget, staff development, and curriculum and instruction.

Shared decision making called on the principal to involve teachers in decisions regarding their schools and share the accountability for school success. Under the site-based management plan proposed by Faucette, Virginia Beach schools were to establish a faculty council consisting of the principal and seven faculty-elected teachers. The purpose of the faculty
council was to address concerns relating to instruction, implement school goals and objectives, and review student progress (Faucette, 1992).

Social and Economic Influences that Shaped Shared Decision Making

Growing public unrest with public schools and a sudden economic downturn spurred initiatives which resulted in educational reform emphasizing site based management and shared decision making. Both forces inadvertently contributed to generating public interest and concern for education which led to implementation of site based management and shared decision making initiatives in public schools (Murray, 1993; Walton, 1986).

The initial force that focused national attention on the perceived decline of American public education was the governmental report A Nation at Risk (1983). The report was presented by the National Commission on Excellence in Education and commissioned by the Secretary of Education, Terrell Bell. The purpose of the report was to define problems in American educational institutions and to provide solutions to those problems. While the commission accomplished that goal, the recommendations which came from this report put extreme pressure on public educators to take school restructuring seriously (Murray, 1993).

As a result of the report, state governments reacted by becoming more involved in decisions concerning educational reform. Between 1983
and 1990, states mandated numerous regulations and policies affecting some aspect of school reform (Ornstein, 1991). Forty-five states enacted increased graduation requirements; twenty states raised college entrance requirements; six states added computer literacy to their required curriculum; six states lengthened their school year and eleven states lengthened their school day (Ornstein, 1991).

The second type of reform generated by A Nation at Risk (1983) addressed teacher professionalism. Forty-eight states introduced changes aimed at teacher preparation programs which included thirty-four states adding admission testing to their teacher education programs. Twenty-one states required exit testing for prospective teachers, and thirty-three states required testing for initial certification. In other states, educational and testing requirements were added for principals. More than twenty-five states introduced improvement or leadership programs or centers to help principals improve leadership and managerial skills (Ornstein, 1991).

The third type of reform implemented by states involved curriculum. States emphasized increased math and science requirements for graduation. Virginia changed its requirements from two math and two science credits for graduation to a total of five combined credits for math and science. Computer and technology programs were recommended as well as business, community, and school partnership initiatives (Ornstein, 1991).
The second wave of educational reform resulted in states requiring restructuring of schools and school systems as a reform tool. Decentralization was the means by which the restructuring of school systems occurred. Nearly every major school system had undergone some form of decentralization. The chief assumption associated with decentralization was that of removing constraints on schools, enabling staffs to make more effective decisions about instructional matters. Site based management and shared decision making share the assumption that reducing controls prompts school staffs to exert a greater initiative to better tailor action to the needs of the students (Bimber, 1994). This wave of reform looked to those closest to the action for help in providing answers to educational problems. Models of site based management and shared decision making varied widely, but most included some or all of the following groups: students, parents, community members, business community, teachers, administrators, and central office staff (Ornstein, 1991).

Consequently, the public concern created by A Nation at Risk (1983) resulted in attempts by state governments to improve schools which produced legislation requiring state boards of education and their school districts to search for methods to improve. Again, the search for educational improvement led to an examination of the philosophy and
practice of business and industry.

About the same time as the report *A Nation at Risk* was making waves in educational circles, economic reports were being published documenting the decline of American business and industry. Quarterly and yearly financial statements detailed a large decline in revenues. Leading economic indicators hit a thirty year low (Gustin, 1980).

The United States' automobile industry, housing, and small businesses were hardest hit. American car manufacturers were on the verge of financial ruin. Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler had lost large portions of their car and truck markets to Japanese competition. Chrysler's production and sales deteriorated to the point of near bankruptcy. In 1980 alone, 152 Chrysler dealerships folded (Gustin, 1980). Americans gave up the large American cars for smaller fuel efficient compact cars. U.S. car production hit its lowest level in twenty-two years, selling hardly 500,000 cars a month, down by one third of their previous year's production. Meanwhile, the Japanese car sales were setting records. Almost twenty-seven percent of the new cars bought in America were imports (Gustin, 1980).

What caused this reversal in the acceptance of Japanese products? After World War II, a major rebuilding of the Japanese culture and its industry were undertaken by the allies. American industrialists were sent to Japan to help with the revitalization of the country. Among these was W.
Edwards Deming, a statistician invited to Japan by General MacArthur’s headquarters staff to help with the rebuilding process. Deming introduced the concept of "quality," which he and others developed for the War Production Board. Their goal was to improve the management and distribution of war materials. Although this concept of "quality" had been introduced in Japan and was proving to be successful, the American business managers ignored it. What Deming was teaching in post-war Japan was virtually unknown in the United States (Dobyns & Crawford-Mason, 1991).

American industry was still laboring under the mass production philosophies of Frederick Taylor and Max Weber. Quality, in the post war era, took a back seat to mass production. Quality control meant if there were defects found in a product at the end of the production line, the product would be reworked or thrown out and the loss built into the profit margin (Walton, 1986).

Through the work of Deming and others, Japanese industries developed a model of management, production, and distribution referred to as T.Q.C. or Total Quality Control. The adherence to quality in all phases of production and sales paid large dividends for the Japanese. Barely twenty-five years after being decimated by war, the Japanese became a major force in the world economic market (Dobyns & Crawford-Mason, 1991).
"Total Quality Control or Management," as it is now referred to, employed by Deming was a multi-faceted approach which provided for quality of work, service, information, process, people, company, and objectives (Walton, 1986). Deming insisted that traditional models of organization be dismantled, believing the highly structured, top-down organization of management was too mechanistic and did not take into account the human quotient or employee involvement in the process (Dobyns & Crawford-Mason, 1991). Deming further demanded that the quest for improvement had to be continuous in product production and service. For improvement to be continuous, the workers had to be involved in decisions concerning the quality of the product and the quality of the process (Dobyns & Crawford-Mason, 1991).

Consequently, workers had to be educated. Deming pictured the corporation as a mighty wrench which was alive, changing, adapting, finding new and better ways of doing the same job (Aguayo, 1990). The constituent parts (employees) must be brought to life and the power of the mind must be harnessed. Productivity came from the efforts of everyone in the organization. Management’s job was to see that the organization did not get in the way of production but was to eliminate barriers and encourage each individual to develop himself to his fullest potential (Aguayo, 1990).

As a result of Deming’s influence, the Japanese further expanded the
notion of employee satisfaction and participation in the production process. Japanese industries utilized and harnessed the intelligence of their workers. Small groups of workers would meet, on their own, and make suggestions for improving the system. These informal groups offered important knowledge to improving processes of manufacturing and quality of product. The groups eventually evolved into what were commonly known as "quality circles." The idea of quality circles spread rapidly throughout Japanese industry. American workers were every bit as knowledgeable as their Japanese counterparts and also made suggestions to management for improvement; however, American management did not listen (Dobyns & Crawford-Mason, 1991).

It was not until the recession of the 1980s had set in that business and industry in America found their methods of management, production, sales, and the entire concept of customer service were inferior to the Japanese. Many of the major business and industrial companies began to look to the Japanese to find ways to improve management and production. What they found was W. Edwards Deming and the philosophy that "quality" was the most important concept in production, sales, and service (Walton, 1986).

Ford Motor Company lost 1.6 billion dollars in 1979 due to the recession and car buyers switching to a smaller, more compact, fuel-
efficient cars imported primarily from Japan. Ford executives were hard pressed to find solutions to the economic tailspin. Management teams were sent to their different competitors to find answers. They found that the Japanese were producing better built cars more cheaply than Ford. The Deming concept of "quality" permeated Japanese car manufacturing. Finally in 1983, Ford asked Dr. W. Edwards Deming for help. Soon afterward Deming became their principal consultant (Aguayo, 1990).

In 1984 Henry Ford II announced Ford’s new mission statement and values. Two highlights of the new direction taken by Ford were more emphasis placed upon quality in all phases of manufacturing and the recognition of employees as the resource necessary to accomplish this mission. The Ford motto became "Quality Is Job One" (Walton, 1986).

Ford implemented much of Deming’s philosophy as it tried to avert financial ruin, and in an attempt to produce the first "quality" cars with the consumer in mind designed and introduced the Ford Taurus and Mercury Sable. These were the first cars produced under the Deming principles of quality. All divisions of car management, manufacturing and selling were brought into one process rather than attempted separately. Employees were encouraged to participate in improving all aspects of car production (Walton, 1986).

The Ford Motor Company made some dramatic improvements. Ford
warranty-repair frequency dropped 45 percent, and "things gone wrong" reported by new car buyers decreased 50 percent. Within the same period, Ford's market share rose 19.2 percent (Walton, 1986).

While Ford Motor Company was experiencing difficult times and attempting to recover its lost market share, the Harley Davidson motorcycle company was also suffering the same fate. After losing a large portion of their motorcycle market to the Japanese, they too looked for help. The executive vice-president and other top members of management visited several of their Japanese competitors' plants. As a result of their visits and the information gleaned from the Japanese methods of management and production, Harley Davidson was reorganized. The first big change was in the management structure. The traditional hierarchal structure was replaced by one in which teams composed of employees and management shared the responsibility for creating an efficient operation (Willis, 1986).

Staff jobs were cut; no plant supervisors were assigned to determine quality. Each group was responsible for the quality of the product it produced. Blame and failure could not be placed upon other departments or processes. All line workers were responsible for inspecting and making basic adjustments to their machinery. Area managers supervised their divisions fully and completely. On-line workers had a voice in setting realistic quotas, based upon actual production capacity and needs,
developing a sense of ownership in meeting goals (Willis, 1986).

Ford and Harley Davidson were two of the first major American companies to adopt the philosophy of "quality" espoused by Deming and adopted by the Japanese. Quality circles or employee participation in the decision making process became a pivotal concept for each company. Quality circles were an important source of ideas for improving efficiency, trimming waste, and increasing productivity (Willis, 1986). Consequently, the idea of flattening the organization and providing for employee participation in the decision making process emerged in American business and industry (Aguayo, 1990).

**Major Initiatives of Shared Decision Making in Schools**

High failure rates, low test scores, high drop-out rates, and growing illiteracy were problems facing public schools as reported in *A Nation at Risk* (1983). The report cited needed reform in academics, teacher professionalism, and school restructuring. It recommended that restructuring take the form of decentralization. This recommendation to decentralize and the switch in business and industry from hierarchical-centered management to group-centered management set the stage for change in the way schools did business.

While most Americans agreed that education must improve, few seemed to agree on how that improvement should occur. Proponents of W.
Edwards Deming’s Total Quality Management contended that managerial techniques used in public schools had been ineffective for years. They also believed that states should allow schools to become more self-governing (Dobyns & Crawford-Mason, 1991).

Denis Doyle, a senior fellow of the Hudson Institute, and his colleagues Bruce Cooper and Roberta Trachtman, members of the Fordham University Graduate School, conducted a study of spending in Milwaukee Public Schools and found that for every dollar spent in the classroom, two dollars were spent on the management of funds. Their conclusions suggested that government should spend less on bureaucracy and more on students. They recommended that states should consider allowing schools to become self-governing and that the individual schools should be funded directly from the state (Dobyns & Crawford-Mason, 1991).

The movement to self governance was manifested in site based management and shared decision making. These initiatives gained prominence as schools around the nation attempted to decentralize. State governments became involved in educational reform and required more of public schools. Some states mandated specific change (Bondy, 1994).

School-based management included a process of involvement which democratized school governance and provided for shared decision making. Shared decision making empowered those involved in the educational
process of running the schools and advocated teacher input in decision making (Hoy & Tarter, 1993).

Shared decision making required major changes in roles for both administrators and teachers. Hoy and Tarter (1993) suggested that certain conditions must be present for teachers to be involved in the shared decision making process. They theorized that staff members accepted some decisions because they were indifferent to the outcome. However, in decisions in which they had a personal stake or when they had the expertise to contribute to the decision, they became involved.

The successful transformation of American education presented a comprehensive agenda, and the centerpiece of the reform movement strongly advocated teacher involvement in decision making. Effective involvement of teachers in school decision making posed many questions, such as who was involved, when, to what extent, and in what issues (Rice & Schneider, 1994).

In an effort to decentralize and to involve teachers in the decision making process, the Virginia Beach City Public Schools implemented a model of shared decision making in all of its schools. All 92 schools, including elementary, middle, and high schools, were required to implement a shared decision making model for the 1992-93 school year. Each school was required to form a Faculty Council of the building principal and eight
teachers, elected by popular vote of the school staff. Each member served a
two-year term, except the principal who was a permanent member. The
principal could be the council chairperson or relinquish leadership to a
popular majority vote by council (Faucette, 1992).

Faculty Council heard concerns in the areas of school climate, finance,
curriculum, and staff development. Consensus was used to make decisions.
However, the principal had veto power which, if used, had to be
documented and sent to the district superintendent (Faucette, 1992).

There was no order of representation for council members. All
answered to and received concerns from the entire school staff. Issues
could be sent to any member of council, administrator, or be initiated by a
council member. Meetings were required to be held monthly (Faucette,

The New York State Commissioner of Education introduced a far
reaching plan which called for shared decision making with parental
involvement. This plan was called "A New Compact for Learning" and
mandated that parents participate as partners with professional staff in
school governance. While many schools encouraged parent participation in
such activities as PTAs, booster clubs, and tutoring, few envisioned placing
parents in an authority structure for decision making (Westervelt, 1994).

A study was conducted of the New York schools over a seven-month
period to investigate the role and motive of parents in the decision making process. It was found that parental involvement stemmed less from dissatisfaction with schools and more from a desire to be involved, to gain understanding and knowledge about the system, and to ensure their children were successful. While parents were involved in the decision making process and brought about fundamental change within schools, the study found that parents were not clear in understanding their role and did not view themselves as decision makers. The study underscored the fact that parents must be clear about their role in the shared decision making process. The study also found that local schools must have more autonomy in governing themselves. Superintendents and principals must be willing to share power and form partnerships with parents (Westervelt, 1994).

A shared decision making model was implemented by Hubert Olsen Junior High School in Bloomington, Minnesota. The model provided for an elected school site council of eleven members: two parents, two support staff, six certified staff, and the principal. Each council member served a two-year term except the principal who was a permanent member. The council met twice weekly during a common planning period. Each council member represented a constituent group and was required to meet twice monthly to get input. Three standing committees also operated within the school. Budgeting, staffing, and policy committees were required to report
to council recommendations for school improvement. All decisions were then made by the council (Westervelt, 1994).

A case study of shared decision making was conducted of several public schools in Live Oak County, Florida. The motivation for the implementation of shared decision making did not come from the stakeholders but from national reports, regional problems, and state legislation (Bondy, 1994).

Funding was secured from the Florida State Department of Education to begin the school improvement leadership program. A team from each school, usually a principal and a teacher, received training in problem identification and group dynamics. Programs for staff development were initiated with the goal of training staffs to understand teacher-administrator cooperation. Teachers were allowed to identify classroom problems and design teaching strategies to overcome these problems (Bondy, 1994).

A Live Oak County Shared Decision Making Steering Committee was responsible for the implementation of the shared decision making model. The committee consisted of eight school members: two associate superintendents, three directors, and three principals. Also included were eight union representatives (all teachers), two parents, and a school board member. The function of the committee was to consider and prepare schools in the district for shared decision making (Bondy, 1994).
From the different models described, it was evident that site based management shared decision making models were as diverse as the schools or school systems that implemented them. While some were successful, many were not. Priscilla Wolstetter (1995) visited 44 schools in 13 different school districts interviewing more than 500 people including school board members, superintendents, principals, teachers, and parents. She found that when shared decision making failed, decision making was centered in only one group or council, principals worked from their own agendas, shared decision making was adopted as an end in itself, and decisions were made in the same manner with the power vested in the group. Very little had been done to incorporate the entire faculty into a decision making process that affected their work or to improve the present process of making decisions.

Conversely, when shared decision making was successful, the focus was on continuous improvement in functional and process skills in areas related to curriculum and instruction, there was a reward for staff members whose behavior achieved school goals, information was free flowing as administration attempted to incorporate a broad range of constituents, principals were selected who could facilitate and manage change, and the district’s guidelines were used as a focus of reforms especially in curriculum and instruction (Wohlstetter, 1995).

Education has drawn from the experience and success of business
and industry those management concepts that were useful and could be implemented in public schools. Site based management shared decision making initiatives were developed from industry and implemented in many large public school systems. The new management technique placed decision making into the hands of those closest to the action. Teachers were asked to be more involved in decisions that affected them.

Research indicated no one model of shared decision making would satisfy every need. Schools and school systems implementing shared decision making needed to examine the different models to determine their particular needs, goals, and objectives. Specifically, research indicated that identifying stakeholders and their involvement in decisions were critical to the development and understanding of this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Overview

This was a descriptive case study of shared decision making as implemented in a large urban high school. The critical administrative areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction were studied to determine how shared decision making practices were implemented and operating.

A qualitative research approach was used for this study. Qualitative research provides for the extraction of data and information from a natural setting. The most often studied natural settings are social units such as schools, groups, and individuals. The information that was derived from this study provided a descriptive picture of shared decision making as operating at the subject high school (Bogden & Biklen, 1982). This case study focused on investigating the processes of shared decision making rather than outcomes.

The case study is a method for gathering data in qualitative research, involving collecting evidence by studying a specific subject or topic. Methods used to collect evidence for this study included interviews of central office personnel, assistant principals, department chairpersons,
teachers, faculty council members, and parent members of the school Planning Council and review of official documents (Yin, 1994).

This investigation of shared decision making included a pilot study which was conducted at a neighboring high school in the same school district which implemented the same shared decision making practices. The purpose of the pilot study was to narrow the scope of the research and to focus the study.

Data gleaned from the pilot study set the stage for the investigation of shared decision making at the subject school. These data were used to construct questions for interviews of central office personnel, assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, Faculty Council members, and parent members of the Planning Council, and to identify critical areas of school management for observation and document review.

The data obtained from interviews and document review were condensed and entered initially into individual data matrices. From these data matrices, the researcher was able to extract findings and conclusions about shared decision making practices at the school being studied.

**Background of the Shared Decision Making Model**

The high school in this case study was located in a school system which had mandated that a site based, shared decision making model be implemented. The initial model was presented to the school board in
December of 1991 by the school superintendent. The purpose of the implementation was to restructure the school system, provide for parent and community participation, include teachers in the decision making process, and improve student achievement.

The superintendent recommended that each school, kindergarten through 12th grade, establish a Faculty Council, consisting of eight teachers and the building principal, as well as a Planning Council, consisting of the eight teachers on the Faculty Council, the building principal, and five community or parent members. The Faculty Council and Planning Council were the means by which staff and community involvement were to be achieved. Teachers were allowed a collective voice through Faculty Council, but no comprehensive program for shared decision making provided for total staff involvement.

Under the plan, the two school councils were established within the high school. The Faculty Council was to involve teachers in decisions concerning student achievement, job satisfaction, and school climate. The Planning Council was to involve parents and community members in decision making at the school site. Their primary function was to make decisions concerning the school’s strategic plan (Faucette, 1992).

The superintendent’s plan for teacher involvement was seen as a tight-loose plan. The plan dictated that a Faculty Council and Planning
Council were to be established in each school and that teachers were to have input into decisions in specific areas. However, his plan did not prescribe or delineate student achievement, job satisfaction, school climate, or the extent of staff participation. These issues for involvement were not explained and no structure, parameters, or directions were given to incorporate them into a shared decision making model. The superintendent’s plan did not prescribe any other teacher involvement in the shared decision making process; thus, principals were left to their initiative and discretion in determining where and how shared decision making would occur. Principals could limit or expand the shared decision making process to suit their needs or dispositions.

The areas for teacher input into decisions that the superintendent’s plan outlined were already found in the schools’ organizational structure. Student achievement was interwoven with concepts and responsibilities outlined in curriculum and instruction. Job satisfaction and school climate concerns were found in all four administrative functions of personnel, staff development, finance, and curriculum and instruction.

While the plan dictated the purpose, number, and classification of members on the Planning Council, it did not delineate or explain how the Planning Council was to operate. The charge given the Planning Council was to develop, assess, and modify the strategic plan. The purpose of the
strategic plan was to recommend strategies and objectives to improve student achievement, learning conditions, school climate, and community involvement (Faucette, 1992).

All principals were required to attend in-service activities in August 1992, prior to implementation of the plan in September of that same year.

Administrators were introduced to concepts of shared decision making and consensus building during a three-day workshop. They were then directed to implement the model and charged with training their staffs in consensus building. While principals were trained to understand basic concepts of shared decision making and consensus building, implementation of the shared decision making model, beyond working with the school Planning Council, was left to the building administrator. Principals, working with faculty councils, implemented their vision of the proposed shared decision making model. Consequently, Faculty and Planning Councils differed in the type, range, and autonomy of decisions they made.

As a result of differences in models from school to school and the uncertainty of principals about implementing shared decision making, all Faculty and Planning Councils were surveyed in the summer of 1993 for the purpose of improving the process. The superintendent then presented a revised model of shared decision making to the school board in October of 1993. In this presentation, the superintendent mandated principals to
implement the shared decision making process at each school site. He underscored the necessity of administrators collaborating with faculty to bring the plan to fruition.

The Faculty Council was responsible for assisting the administration with current administrative matters, especially those involving finance, personnel, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. All schools were required to establish Faculty Councils which were to meet monthly.

**Pilot Study**

Permission was requested from the principal of a neighboring school to conduct a pilot study at that site. The study included interviewing six randomly selected teachers and four randomly selected department chairpersons. The purpose of the exercise was to narrow the scope of the study, test the interview questions, and practice interview techniques. This high school was chosen because it is in the same school system as the subject school and the conditions for implementation of shared decision making were similar.

The pilot study identified differences in shared decision making practices at the pilot school and the school under study, the participation of additional stakeholder groups such as Faculty Council, and provided the researcher practice in interviewing subjects. A result of the pilot study included a narrowing of the scope of the study to the administrative
responsibilities of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction, adding the Faculty Council and the Planning Council as stakeholder groups, and learning how to cue questions when answers were incomplete.

**Demographics**

The high school under study, one of ten in the school district, is located in an urban section of a large southeastern city. It was built in 1964 and was thirty-two years old at the time of the study. The construction was traditional for the time, patterned as a box with one side open; all classrooms were located on the ground floor.

The school was built to house a comprehensive high school program, offering the traditional subjects of English, mathematics, science, social studies, art, music, vocational education, and physical education. Although originally designed for twelve hundred fifty students, after two renovations, the addition of forty classrooms, including science and technology laboratories, the school, at the time of the study, housed approximately two thousand students.

Originally, the school served a middle class, blue-collar working community. However, with changing migration patterns and aging housing structures, the community lost its appeal, and older townhouses and condominiums became federal housing units. At the time of the study, forty
percent of the students were considered indigent and qualified for free lunch or textbooks. The ethnic makeup consisted of sixty percent Caucasian, thirty-six percent African-American, and four percent Asian or other.

The average daily attendance was second lowest in the city, averaging 92.39 percent for the 1993-94 school year. Student test scores, at the fifty-second percentile, were slightly above the national average, as identified by the composite scores for eleventh grade students on the a nationally normed test of proficiency and achievement.

There were one hundred twenty-eight teachers and five administrators on staff at the time of the study. One hundred seven were Caucasian; twenty-six were African-American. Eighty-six were females; forty-seven were males. The average length of teaching experience was 13 years.

**Interview Procedures**

The researcher, who was principal of the subject school, and a randomly-selected, tenured teacher conducted interviews of the different stakeholders. The researcher interviewed central office staff, school administrators, and parent members of the school Planning Council. The tenured staff member conducted interviews of teachers, department chairpersons, and faculty council members. The purpose of the interviews was to determine each group’s perception of and participation in shared decision making at the subject school.
The teacher who was selected to conduct interviews of teachers, department chairpersons, and Faculty Council members was randomly chosen. All staff members with ten or more years of teaching experience and respected by the staff were identified and given a number. The researcher then entered a table of random numbers, selecting one. By utilizing the respected, tenured teacher to conduct the interviews, the researcher reduced the likelihood of subjects responding to questions in order to please the researcher. This precaution was deemed necessary to eliminate the possibility of edited responses, if interviewed by the school administrator (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavich, 1990).

Training was provided for the researcher and staff member in interview techniques by a research specialist employed by the school system. The following items were discussed and explained:

- Discussion of each question on the interview protocols and the objective of each question
- Reason for and types of probes to use with the questions
- Suggestions for giving examples to further explain questions or "to tell a story"
- Discussion of how to set up and tape record the interviews
- Transcription of the taped interviews
- Explanation of classified and certified staff members
• Clarification of decision making on the departmental level vs. school level

The school system's practices of shared decision making provided for parent and community involvement in decision making through the school Planning Council, whose purpose was to develop and maintain the strategic plan. Their views on decision making were crucial because they made decisions concerning curriculum and instruction and staff development. The Planning Council consisted of fourteen members, four of whom were parents or community members and were interviewed for the study.

The vehicle for staff participation in the shared decision making process was the Faculty Council, comprised of eight teachers elected every two years. Because the school was in its second cycle of Faculty Council, sixteen teachers had the opportunity to participate in the decision making process. Teachers served a two year term and none of the teachers on the first cycle volunteered to run again. Of the sixteen past and present members of Faculty Council, four were randomly chosen and interviewed.

Five administrators were assigned to the school, the principal and four assistant principals. Two assistants had less than one year of experience at the school. The other two assistant principals had at least two years experience at the school, were familiar with the decision making process, and were therefore interviewed to determine their perception of shared
decision making.

There were fifteen department chairpersons assigned to the school who provided a crucial link between the school’s administration and faculty. As quasi-administrators, these department chairpersons managed funds for their departments as well as observed and supervised teachers. These responsibilities provided the experience needed for thoughtful insight into the decision making process at the school. Four department chairpersons were randomly selected and interviewed.

The intent behind the shared decision making initiative was to involve teachers in decisions which affected them. Essential to the success of this initiative was understanding teacher perception of and involvement in shared decision making at the school site. Six teachers were randomly selected and interviewed regarding their perceptions of shared decision making.

The six teachers and four department chairpersons were randomly selected from representative groups. The school staff was divided into three groups: high involvement, moderate involvement, and low involvement. Only those teachers who had been at the school for three or more years were considered, because they had experienced both formal-decision making and shared decision making. They were placed into one of the three groups, high-medium-low, according to the number of activities in which they were involved. The principal and two assistant principals, each with a minimum
of two years' experience at the school site and knowledgeable of each teacher's involvement in school activities, charted the level of teacher involvement based upon the number of activities in which each teacher participated in one or more of the following areas: committee chairperson, committee member, department chairperson, Faculty Council member, club or activities sponsor, event sponsor, and attendance at school functions to determine the teacher's level of involvement (Table 2A). Teachers who participated in five or more activities were considered high involved. Teachers who participated in three or four activities were considered moderate involvement. Teachers who participated in two or fewer activities were considered low involvement.

Ninety teachers had three or more years of experience and were eligible to be interviewed. Of those, fifteen were found to be highly involved; twenty-seven were moderately involved; and forty-eight were considered as low involvement. Each teacher was then assigned a number from one to ninety, written on individual sheets of paper, and placed in one of the three groups according to their identified level of involvement. The researcher randomly drew two numbers from each group to determine the teachers interviewed. A total of six teachers was chosen. The department chairpersons were chosen in the same manner as the teachers. Fifteen department chairpersons had three or more years
TABLE 2A

STAFF INVOLVEMENT MATRIX

Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tea. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

experience at the school site and were eligible to be interviewed. Of the fifteen, six department chairpersons participated in five or more of the listed activities and were considered high involvement; eight department chairpersons participated in three or four of the listed activities and were considered moderate involvement: and one participated in one or two activities and was considered as low involvement. The department chairpersons were numbered from one to fifteen and separated into two groups of high involvement and moderate and low involvement combined. The moderate and low involvement groups were combined since there was only one identified department chairperson in the low involvement group. After the department chairpersons were numbered and placed into the two groups, the researcher randomly drew two numbers from each group.
total of four department chairpersons was chosen to be interviewed.

The randomly selected teachers and department chairpersons were interviewed in the areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. The interviews were taped, transcribed, and entered into data matrices. Confidentiality was provided for those interviewed. A tenured teacher conducted the interviews; a third party transcribed the interviews; names were not used in the transcription of responses. Each teacher and department chairperson was referenced by number.

**Personnel.** The area of personnel was studied with the purpose of investigating opportunities for shared decision making in recruitment, selection, and assignment.

To investigate limitations imposed by the school board as well as by the school site, the school board’s policies and regulations were reviewed. The Director of Personnel was interviewed to determine the parameters in which decisions were made and the types of decisions made. Appendix A contains a list of the questions asked the Director of Personnel to determine the parameters in which decisions were made.

School records, memoranda to the department chairpersons and teachers, and minutes of meetings were examined to determine parameters established by the school’s administration for shared decision making related
to personnel matters. Other supporting documents, such as interview logs of administrators, staff allocation work sheets, anecdotal records of administrators concerning personnel matters, and the school system’s transfer list, were studied.

**Finance.** School finance was studied with the purpose of investigating teachers’ participation in shared decision making in the areas of allocation and management of school funds. Teachers and department chairpersons were interviewed to determine their perceptions of involvement in financial decisions and their interest in being more involved in decisions concerning school finance.

Further, the study included a description of central office and local control of funds. Information from the school system’s Office of Finance was examined to determine limitations that existed due to state mandates, school system priorities, and school board regulations. Documents sent to the school from the central office concerning allocation and disbursement of money were studied. Interviews were conducted with key central office personnel regarding central office practices limiting the school’s control of funds. Documents identifying limitations imposed by the school’s administration on funds were included in the principal’s anecdotal notes concerning funding, memos, and fund statement sheets provided to the department chairpersons.
Staff Development. Staff development was studied to investigate participation in shared decision making in the areas of planning, implementation, and assessment. Teachers and department chairpersons were interviewed to determine their perception of involvement in decisions concerning staff development.

Responsibilities of the central Offices of Curriculum and Instruction and Planning and Research were studied to determine teacher participation in required city-wide staff development, as well as, the working relationship of both Offices with the school. Memoranda, directives, and brochures outlining the interaction of both central offices with teachers in staff development activities were collected and studied. Appendix A contains the questions used in interviews with key leaders in staff development to determine goals, objectives, and purposes for a system-wide staff development program.

Curriculum and Instruction. Curriculum and Instruction were studied with the purpose of investigating teacher participation in decision making in the areas of resource allocation, student achievement, and review and revision of curriculum. Parents, teachers, department chairpersons, and administrators were interviewed to determine their perception of or involvement in shared decision making in curriculum and instruction.

The role of the central office was studied with regard to direction and
responsibility for curriculum and instructional matters. The assistant superintendent of instruction was interviewed to determine his perception of central control and local initiative in decision making regarding curriculum and instruction issues.

Stakeholders involved in the study of curriculum and instruction were parents, teachers, department chairpersons, school administrators, and central office staff.

Approval for research that involved human subjects was secured from the Research Division at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Approval to conduct the study in the Virginia Beach City Public Schools was secured from the Office of Educational Planning.

Data Collection

Miles and Huberman (1994) stated that qualitative research depends upon the study and usage of words as a basic medium. Words were used in several different contexts to identify and describe data that were collected for this study. Data were collected from multiple sources including taped interviews and written documents. The areas of school management which were studied from which data were gathered included personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. Three separate interview instruments were developed. One set of questions was prepared for parents and teachers, the second set of questions was prepared for department
chairpersons and administrators, and a third set was prepared for selected central office personnel (see Appendix A).

Validity

In an attempt to insure the validity of the data, multiple sources and multiple methods of collecting evidence were used. Two key methods used to collect evidence were interviews and review of documents. Tapes of interviews were the major method used to gather data which aided in answering the research question how shared decision making was operating. These interviews were conducted using twenty-four stakeholders from six different stakeholder groups (Table 2B). Data were collected from four central office staff members, two assistant principals, four department chairpersons, six teachers, four faculty council members, and four parent members of the school Planning Council. Responses to questions concerning stakeholder involvement in decision making, perception of decision making, and authority to make decisions in the administrative areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction were compared within each stakeholder group as well as among groups. The second method of collecting evidence, also employed to enhance validity, was document review. Documents collected at the site were reviewed to determine stakeholder involvement in decision making. Documents such as central office and school memos, school board policy
TABLE 2B
Summation of Stakeholders Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Office Staff</th>
<th>Assistant Principals</th>
<th>Department Chairpersons</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Faculty Council</th>
<th>School Planning Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

manuals, school handbooks, and school newsletters were also used to determine reasons why shared decision making was or was not operating. Data retrieved from these documents were used to corroborate evidence collected from interviews.

**Data Management and Organization**

A database was developed to organize and manage information. By maintaining a comprehensive database and providing for a chain of evidence, the integrity of the study was maintained. Interview notes were organized in a precise manner. Interviews of all stakeholders were taped by the interviewer, either the researcher or a randomly selected teacher. The taped interviews were then transcribed by a secretary and returned to the researcher. A comprehensive, catalogued list was kept to manage the large number of stakeholders interviewed.
After the interviews were transcribed, the researcher extracted data from the interviews pertinent to the research questions concerning stakeholder involvement in shared decision making, perception of decision making, and authority to make decisions. These extracted data were taken from interviews and entered as exact quotations into participant-by-involvement matrices. Table 12 in Appendix C is an example of one such matrix which presents data taken from interviews of central office staff members. Seven questions were asked of four different central office staff members; consequently, there were twenty-eight different responses or cells in this particular matrix. Data retrieved from these interviews were organized by entering the quoted statements from each stakeholder into the cell which described stakeholder perception or participation in a shared decision making activity. Six participant-by-involvement matrices were constructed, one for each stakeholder group interviewed (Appendix C). All stakeholder groups had four participants, except teachers and assistant principals; six teachers and two assistant principals were interviewed. Assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, Faculty Council members, and Planning Council members were asked eight questions (Appendix A).

Documents pertaining to shared decision making and found at the school were reviewed, and the data collected were entered into a matrix of
documents (Appendix D). Documents provided hard copy data to corroborate evidence extracted from the stakeholder interviews and provided data identifying authority for decision making which helped answer the question of why shared decision making was operating in the manner it was.

The raw data found in the participant-by-involvement matrices were condensed. The matrices containing the six stakeholder groups were combined or stacked (Table 3) to allow the researcher to extract only data pertinent to stakeholder involvement in decision making in the administrative areas of personnel, finance, staff development, curriculum and instruction, and perception of and responsibility for decision making. These matrices were initially combined by examining the six stakeholder groups and comparing data within and across the six groups. Additionally, matrices were combined by methods of collection; i.e., data from interviews were compared to data retrieved from review of documents to substantiate conclusions. The combined or stacked matrices allowed the researcher to view all the data collected as it pertained to a single group or to view it comparatively across groups. Figure 1 shows how the chain of evidence can be traced.

Data Analysis

This section of the study contains the tools and their specific uses in analyzing the data collected.
### TABLE 3

**Stacked Matrix**

**Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Perception of SDM</th>
<th>Involvement in decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in personnel decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in finance decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in staff dev. decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in curr. and instruction</th>
<th>Responsib. for decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Planning Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1

STUDY FLOW CHART

Chain of Data

Pilot Study: Focusing the Study

Study

Interviews of Central Office Personnel, Assistant Principals, Department Chairpersons, Teachers, Faculty Council, and Planning Council

Transcripts

Contact Summary Form

Participant-by-Involvement Matrix

Matrices of Findings

Conclusion
1. **Contact summary form.** This form (Appendix B) was adopted (Miles & Huberman, 1994) to be used after interviews with central office staff members, assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, faculty council members, and parent members of the school Planning Council. The form contained information on each person interviewed, time and day of interview, name of interviewer, the administrative area of participation, and a brief summary of the interview. After using the form following interviews with two of the five stakeholder groups, the researcher found that the form was not needed; data were presented in more detail in the participant-by-involvement matrices.

2. **Document summary form.** This form (Appendix B) was adopted (Miles & Huberman, 1994) to facilitate quick assessment of on-site documents. The form identified the name of the document reviewed, the event or subject of the document, significance or importance, and stakeholder involved. These on-site documents included directives from the central office and building administration as well as agendas, minutes of meetings, reports, and policy manuals. The process of using the document summary form was discontinued after the researcher determined data analysis was being duplicated by the document summary matrix.

3. **Participant-by-involvement matrix.** A participant-by-involvement matrix (Appendix C) was constructed for each stakeholder group to
organize, condense, and facilitate retrieval of data concerning stakeholder involvement, perception of shared decision making, and authority to make decisions. The headings for the columns in each matrix were the actual questions asked of each stakeholder group (Appendix A). There were seven column headings for the central office staff, (1) purpose of department, (2) relationship with the local school, (3) change in relationship since 1992, (4) decisions in your area you make/school makes, (5) perception of shared decision making, (6) knowledge of shared decision making at the subject school, and (7) change in decision making since July 1995. There were eight column headings for assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, Faculty Council members, and Planning Council members. These headings were (1) concept of decision making, (2) involvement in decision making, (3) involvement in personnel decisions, (4) involvement in finance decisions, (5) involvement in staff development decisions, (6) involvement in curriculum and instruction decisions, (7) responsibility for decisions, and (8) change in decision making since 1995. The rows of the matrices identified each individual stakeholder by position or by number. Information was derived from the questions asked of each stakeholder group (Appendix A). Each stakeholder’s statement concerning perception of decision making, responsibility for decision making, change in decision making responsibilities, and involvement in shared decision making was entered into a matrix. The
participant-by-involvement matrices allowed the researcher to organize and categorize data on all participants.

4. **Stacked matrix.** To further identify, delineate, and corroborate findings, matrices of raw data were stacked or combined (Table 3) by stakeholder groups and by methods of data collection. Within these stacked matrices, data were compared among the six stakeholder groups of central office staff members, assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, Faculty Council members, and Planning Council members; and within each of these six stakeholder groups, stakeholder involvement in decision making was compared. Central office responsibility for decision making was compared to the subject school’s responsibility for decision making. A comparison was also made within and among stakeholder groups of assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, Faculty Council members, and Planning Council members to determine participation in shared decision making activities at the school. Similarities and differences in responses within and among groups were noted. The data retrieved from these comparisons identified themes and sub-themes concerning shared decision making. Data were also compared by methods of collection. Data retrieved from document review were compared to data retrieved from interviews. Where available, the data collected from document review corroborated data from interviews. There was no evidence that data
collected from document review clashed with data collected from interviews.

Data from documents also provided evidence answering the question why shared decision making was operating in the manner it was by detailing school board policy on the implementation of shared decision making. The themes and sub-themes that emerged from the stacking or comparison of matrices provided the data from which the tables of findings and conclusions were drawn.

5. **Matrix of documents.** A matrix of documents (Appendix D) collected at the site was constructed to identify data that were pertinent to shared decision making. The data extracted from the documents were used to corroborate evidence of how shared decision making was operating and also explain why shared decision making was operating in the manner it was. The rows of the matrix identified the name of each document collected and the columns identified the stakeholder, area of administrative involvement, and the description of the data.

6. **Tables of findings.** Four tables of findings (Tables 4, 6, 8, and 10) were constructed from data retrieved from stacked matrices of stakeholder involvement in decision making. Themes of stakeholder participation in and perception of shared decision making were extracted from these stacked matrices. Matrices of findings were constructed from themes and sub-themes which were retrieved from stakeholder involvement in decision
making in the areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. There were two columns in each table. The first column was identified as "stakeholder;" the second column was identified as "findings." There were six rows identifying stakeholders in each administrative area investigated except for finance; the table of findings for finance contained seven rows adding the stakeholder category of principal. The themes drawn from the stacked matrices and presented in the matrices of findings provided the basis from which conclusions were drawn.

7. **Tables of conclusions.** Four tables of conclusions (Tables 5, 7, 9, and 11) were drawn from the tables of findings of stakeholder involvement in personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. There were two columns in each table. The first column was identified as "stakeholder," and the second column was identified as "conclusions" which were drawn from the tables of findings in each administrative area. Again, there were six rows in each table except for the table of finance which included the category of principal and had seven rows. The rows identified the stakeholder group studied. A chain of evidence was established beginning with the initial interview and document reviewed, where raw data were extracted and entered into the participant-by-involvement matrices and document review matrix. This was then further refined by identifying themes and sub-themes which were extracted from the stacked matrices.
Condensed and organized, the themes were entered into tables of findings from which conclusions were drawn.

Summary

This case study was designed to determine how shared decision making was operating and why it was operating in the manner it was at a large urban high school. A pilot exercise was conducted at a neighboring high school which had implemented the same concepts to test the interview questions and to practice interview methods. The pilot study provided the researcher practice in interview techniques and in using cues to jog the memory of stakeholders.

Two assistant principals, identified central office personnel, and parent members of the school Planning Council were interviewed. Four department chairpersons and six teachers, representatively chosen from the sample population, were also interviewed. Specific questions were generated from the research questions and the thesis. Further evidence was gathered from written documents at the school site.

Using multiple sources and multiple methods of gathering evidence, and maintaining a chain of evidence by compiling an accurate data base, the validity of the data was improved.

By using the participant-by-involvement matrix and matrix of documents, certain variables which affected the shared decision making
process were identified. Stacked matrices allowed the researcher to compare data by similar groups and also allowed for cross group comparisons. This allowed the researcher to see patterns and focus on pertinent variables. As the variables became more refined and ordered and themes and sub-themes appeared, outcomes and conclusions were drawn.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Two questions were addressed in this study: (1) How has shared decision making been operating at the high school under study and (2) Why has it been operating in this manner? The data to answer these questions came from interviews with central office staff, school administrators, department chairpersons, teachers, faculty council members, and parent members of the school Planning Council (Appendix C). Data were also collected from documents reviewed at the school (Appendix D).

Tables of findings were constructed from the raw data in Appendix C and documents in Appendix D. Concepts and themes emerged from the findings. These concepts and themes were further organized, grouped, and entered into a table of conclusions for each area studied. Each conclusion was supported by data. **Question 1: How has shared decision making been operating at the high school under study?**

In addressing the question of how shared decision making has been operating at the school, data were presented in the administrative areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction; and stakeholder involvement was described within those areas.

**Stakeholder Involvement in Personnel Decisions**

The findings from data collected on stakeholder involvement in
personnel decisions are found in Table 4. Conclusions were drawn from these findings and are presented in Table 5. Both findings and conclusions were presented for the following stakeholder groups: central office staff, assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, faculty council members, and school Planning Council members.

Central Office Staff

Conclusion 1: The Office of Human Resources retained control of most major functions in personnel, including recruitment, screening, transfer, and management of personnel records and salaries.

The Director of Personnel stated that the main purpose of his department was to recruit and maintain a qualified teacher pool, although his department was also responsible for staffing other types of positions within the school system. When vacancies occurred in any subject area, the Office of Human Resources was contacted by either the building principal or the assistant principal in charge of the master schedule. The Director of Personnel or an associate gave the names of qualified applicants to the building administrator responsible for conducting interviews. The school administrators then interviewed these applicants.

The Director of Personnel explained that members of his staff were responsible for the maintenance of personnel records. He stated his staff’s responsibility was "recruiting and staffing of teachers, ensuring that salaries
### TABLE 4

**TABLE OF FINDINGS**

Stakeholder Involvement in Personnel Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Administration</td>
<td>1. The Office of Human Resources was responsible for recruitment and staffing of schools. (App.C, T.12)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Office of Human Resources was responsible for maintenance of personnel records. (App.C, T.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Office of Administrative Services was responsible for maintenance of salary schedules. (App.C, T.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The Office of Human Services provided a large applicant pool to schools when vacancies occur. (App.C, T.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The Office of Human Resources organized and managed processes of inter-school transfer of staff. (App.C, T.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principals</td>
<td>1. Assistant principals were responsible for the interview and selection process of staff during the summer of 1995. (App.C, T.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Selection of applicants for a specific vacancy was done by consensus of the administrators interviewing candidates. (App.C, T.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Assistant principals were involved in personnel issues from the ground floor, up. (App.C, T.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>1. Department chairpersons were part of the interview process and had input into the hiring of staff within their departments. (App.C, T.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recommendations for positions made by department chairpersons were adhered to. (App.C, T.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Department chairpersons were responsible for the assignment of teacher class schedules. (App.C, T.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Department chairpersons were asked to sit in on interviews. (App.C, T.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Some decisions made concerning staffing within a department didn’t involve department chairpersons. (App.C, T.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Data supporting this finding are in Appendix C, Table 12. All other references of this type refer to the appropriate appendix and table.
TABLE 4 (continued)

| Teachers                                      | 1. Teachers had input into what they taught within their departments. (App.C, T.15) |
|                                              | 2. Teachers had input into how things within the departments were organized and arranged. (App.C, T.15) |
|                                              | 3. Teachers didn’t have input or involvement in personnel issues or decisions. (App.C, T.15) |
|                                              | 4. Teachers who were coaches had input into the hiring of assistant coaches or other coaches. (App.C, T.15) |
|                                              | 5. Teachers were involved in the hiring of teachers, within departments, where coaching vacancies existed. (App.C, T.15) |
|                                              | 6. One department chairperson stated that teachers were not generally brought into personnel issues. (App.E, T.15) |

| Faculty Council                              | 1. Faculty council was not involved in personnel issues or decisions. (App.C, T.16) |
|                                              | 2. Faculty council members, who were also department chairpersons, were involved in selection and assignment of teachers. (App.C, T.16) |

| Planning Council 1. Planning Council was involved in personnel through development of the strategic plan. (App.C, T.17) |
| Planning Council 2. As a member of action teams recommendations were made to increase the hiring of minority teachers. (App.C, T.17) |

are correct and records are kept properly." Samples of documents related to records maintenance were found in the school. These documents included employee application forms, staff certification forms, and employee evaluation forms. Once these forms were completed by the appropriate staff, they were sent to the Office of Human Resources for processing and filing.

The Director of Personnel explained that his office was responsible for the involuntary transfer of employees within the school system. He further explained that the school system’s needs outweighed the needs of individual
### TABLE 5

#### TABLE OF CONCLUSIONS

Stakeholder Involvement in Personnel Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>1. The Office of Human Resources retained control of most major functions in personnel, including recruitment, screening, transfer, and the management of personnel records and salaries. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principals</td>
<td>1. Assistant principals assumed an important role in staff selection, including the identification of vacancies, interviews, and final selection of personnel. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>1. Department chairpersons became more active in the interview and selection process for vacancies within their departments, but their role remained advisory to the administration. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Department chairpersons gained significant control of teacher scheduling within their departments in collaboration with the assigned assistant principal. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1. A majority of teachers gained access to selected personnel decisions through input to department chairpersons and assistant principals regarding scheduling. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The involvement of teachers in the interview and selection process was limited to the department chairpersons. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Teachers involved in coaching gained significant access to personnel decisions by advising the administration on the selection of coaches. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td>1. Faculty Council was not involved in personnel decisions. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Council</td>
<td>1. The Planning Council was not involved in personnel decisions; however, through involvement on action teams, council members influenced personnel decisions by recommending that more minority staff members be hired. (T.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

schools; consequently, involuntary transfer of employees was necessary.

While his office directed the process, each building principal affected could exert minimal influence, requesting exceptions to the involuntary transfer process. The Office of Human of Human Resources compiled and
distributed throughout the school system a list of staff members who were identified as involuntary transfer candidates. A person was considered for involuntary transfer when his position or department was overstaffed and that person was the last one hired in that specific school and in the specific subject area in question.

In summary, the Office of Human Resources marginally supported shared decision making. They were solely responsible for the development of an applicant pool, maintenance of personnel records, and management of the process for inter-school transfer of employees. However, local school administrators interviewed and recommended people for positions within the school.

Assistant Principals

Conclusion 1: Assistant principals assumed an important role in staff selection, including the identification of vacancies, interviews, and final selection of personnel.

Assistant principals were involved in the identification of teacher vacancies and in the interview and selection process to fill those vacancies. Assistant Principal One detailed his involvement in decision making in the area of school personnel. He explained that in the absence of the principal he was responsible for conducting and hiring school personnel during the summer of 1995. He took anecdotal notes on each candidate interviewed.
Copies of notes on twelve candidates were provided to the researcher. Assistant Principal One also stated, "I conducted all interviews.... I had department chairs involved in interviews and, generally, another administrator [the other available assistant principal] shared that decision making with me."

Assistant Principal Two described her involvement in personnel decisions as "from the ground floor up." As an example of her involvement, she explained that upon receipt of the Involuntary Transfer List she determined the number of positions the school would need and immediately started calling teachers who were available for transfer. She stated, "We called teachers at home and tried to get the best teachers." She further described the process of decision making used in selection of personnel as consensus. She recalled an incident in which she, the principal, and a second assistant principal were involved in interviews for a particular teaching position. The principal had one candidate in mind, while both assistant principals chose another candidate. She went on to say, "I don’t want to say we overruled the principal," but it was a consensus.

In summary, both assistant principals actively participated in decision making in the area of personnel through their involvement in identifying vacancies, recruiting, transfers, and interviewing and selecting personnel. While there were four assistant principals, two were assigned the
responsibility of developing the master schedule which included the identification and staffing of personnel vacancies.

Department Chairpersons

Conclusion 1: Department chairpersons became more active in the interview and selection process for vacancies within their departments, but their role remained advisory to the administration.

Department Chairpersons One, Two, and Four explained that they were involved in the interview and selection of candidates for positions within their respective departments. Department Chairperson One stated, "Year before last we had an opening in my department. One of the teachers retired, so I was called in during the summer to interview...." Department Chairperson Four further stated, "The first year I was chosen department chair I was asked to sit in on several interviews." Department Chairperson Two was more emphatic, "I was on the selection committee when the interviews were made....In the case of my department the recommendations made were specifically adhered to."

Conclusion 2: Department chairpersons gained significant control of teacher scheduling within their departments in collaboration with the assigned assistant principal.

Department Chairpersons Two and Three and Assistant Principal One described how department chairpersons were involved in constructing each
department’s master schedule. Department Chairperson Three stated that she was responsible for the assignment of all new teachers to her department. Veteran teachers had the opportunity to give input concerning their class assignments, if they chose to do so.

Department Chairperson Two stated, "I think it [the individual teacher’s schedule] is wide open...to make suggestions and what their needs and interest[s] would be."

Assistant Principal One, in describing the department chairperson’s responsibility for teacher schedules, stated, "As long as it [the recommended teacher’s schedule] is within the recommendation of the department chair, we go for it."

In summary, statements made by the two department chairpersons and the assistant principal detailed department chairperson responsibility for departmental teachers’ schedules. They involved teachers in the scheduling process by giving them the opportunity to request specific class assignments.

Teachers

Conclusion 1: A majority of teachers gained access to selected personnel decisions through input to department chairpersons and assistant principals regarding scheduling.

Teacher One explained that the department had undergone changes.
Different classes would be taught, and teachers had input into who would teach those classes. Furthermore, Teacher One stated, "We were able to have our input in that [how class changes occurred and affected individual teachers] and how we would like things to change."

Conclusion 2: The involvement of teachers in the interview and selection process was limited to the department chairperson.

Four of the six teachers interviewed stated that they had not been involved in any decisions concerning recruitment, selection, or any other personnel issue. Teacher One stated, "...for the most part, personnel matters are not discussed with teachers [only department chairpersons and administrators are involved]."

Conclusion 3: Teachers involved in coaching gained significant access to personnel decisions by advising the administration on the selection of coaches.

Teachers Four and Five explained that their opinions were asked in the recruitment and selection process of teachers who would fill coaching positions. Teacher Four stated, "I have been involved in hiring assistant coaches." Teacher Five stated, "My advice has been asked, particularly when coaches were being hired."

In summary, teachers were not included in personnel decisions, with one exception: Teachers involved in coaching had input into hiring coaches.
Faculty Council

**Conclusion 1:** Faculty council was not involved in personnel decisions.

All four faculty council members interviewed explained that as council members they had not been involved in any decisions concerning personnel issues. Council Member One stated, "I have not been involved in that process whatsoever."

Faculty Council Members Two, Three, and Four said they were not involved as well; however, Faculty Council Member Three, who was also a department chairperson, stated that as department chairperson she had been involved in the interview and selection process when vacancies occurred within her department.

In summary, faculty council members were not given the opportunity to participate in personnel decisions.

Planning Council

**Conclusion 1:** The Planning Council was not involved in personnel decisions; however, through involvement on action teams, council members influenced personnel decisions by recommending that more minority staff members be hired.

Participation of school Planning Council members in personnel decisions depended upon their membership on action teams. Action teams were established by the Planning Council to determine and establish
strategies and objectives for school improvement in the areas of school climate, communication, curriculum, and staff development. Participation in decision making was evident for those Planning Council members who served on action teams which made recommendations in curriculum and inadvertently affected school personnel decisions. Planning Council Member One explained that he was a member of an action team which worked on the school's strategic plan. He explained that as a member of the action team, one of the team's responsibilities was to list the school's internal and external strengths and weaknesses. As a result of this work, the action team recommended to the Planning Council that more minority teachers be hired.

Council Member Three also stated, "As a council member we discussed and developed strategies to hire more minority teachers."

Planning Council members Two and Four stated that they were not involved in decisions concerning personnel. Council Member Two explained that he thought that was the responsibility of another group. His group already had a plate full of issues.

In summary, the Planning Council members were involved in personnel decisions only if they were members of a specific action team, but as council members did not participate in personnel decisions.
Stakeholder Involvement in Financial Decisions

The findings on stakeholder involvement in decision making in school finance are in Table 6. Conclusions were drawn from these findings and are in Table 7. Both findings and conclusions were constructed from data (Appendix C) gathered from the following stakeholder groups: central office staff, assistant principals, department chairpersons, Faculty Council members, and Planning Council members.

Central Office Staff

**Conclusion 1:** The Office of Administrative Services retained control of division budgetary and financial management processes for schools and central office.

The assistant superintendent stated that his department was responsible for budget development, which included the implementation and monitoring of system-wide financial procedures, purchasing, and payroll management and distribution. He explained that the school system established procedures, guidelines, and deadlines for spending of all funds. Two sets of documents at the school identified those procedures and deadlines: (1) school board policy manual and (2) the school system’s accounting manual. Both documents detailed rigid and non-flexible procedures for handling money.

The school board policy detailed financial responsibility, holding the
## TABLE 6

**TABLE OF FINDINGS**

Stakeholder Involvement in Financial Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Central Office Administration | 1. The Assistant Superintendent of Finance and the Office of Administrative Services were responsible for system wide budget development, finance, payroll, and capital improvement. (App.C, T.12)  
2. Since the implementation of the required shared decision making process of 1992, more staff was included in the financial decision making process at the site. (App.C, T.12)  
3. More funds have been allocated to the individual schools since 1992. (App.C, T.12) |
| Principal                 | 1. The building principal had the authority to make decisions concerning school finance. (App.C, T.12)  
2. The principal had to comply with state regulations and school board policy when dealing with money. (App.C, T.12)  
3. The building principal was the final authority in school financial matters. (App.C, T.12)  
4. The principal allocated $10,000 to the faculty council. (App.C, T.13) |
| Assistant Principals      | 1. Assistant principals were not responsible for the school’s budget. (App.C, T.13)  
2. As part of the administrative team assistant principals helped set dollar amounts for departmental allocations. (App.C, T.13)  
| Department Chairpersons   | 1. Instructional departments were allocated money by the principal. (App.C, T.14)  
2. Department chairpersons had total discretionary power in spending department funds. (App.C, T.14)  
3. Department chairpersons could request more funding if needed. (App.C, T.14) |

---

1 Data supporting this finding are in Appendix C, Table 12. All other references of this type refer to the appropriate appendix and table.
### TABLE 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teachers who wished to be involved were included in Faculty Council financial decisions. (App.C, T.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teachers would like to be more involved in some financial decisions. (App.C, T.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Council</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Faculty Council was responsible for distribution of excess funds. (App.C, T.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Faculty Council members and teachers were involved in the financial decisions within their instructional departments. (App.C, T.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Some Faculty Council members were not involved in financial decisions. (App.C, T.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Planning Council</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The school Planning Council was not involved in financial decisions. (App.C, T.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Issues brought before the Planning Council had financial implications. (App.C, T.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Planning Council was responsible for the strategic plan which dealt with policy issues. (App.C, T.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building principal accountable for all financial procedures and transactions at the school site. The school system’s accounting manual prescribed the exact policy, procedures, and methodology to follow in managing the school’s financial accounts.

The school’s instructional allocation worksheet was provided to the researcher which identified the subject school’s yearly allocation of funds for the 1995-96 school year. This document was prepared by the Office of Administrative Services and described financial allocations by categories and amounts.
TABLE 7

TABLE OF CONCLUSIONS

Stakeholder Involvement in Financial Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>CONCLUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>1. The Office of Administrative Services retained control of division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>budgetary and financial management processes for schools and central office. (T.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1. The principal retained control of school finances and was delegated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increased responsibility by the central office to manage funds. (T.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>1. Assistant principals gained influence by advising the principal on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>departmental allocations, and one assistant managed funds for a special project. (T.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>1. While departmental allocations were established by the principal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>department chairpersons had complete autonomy in managing departmental funds. (T.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1. Teachers were included in departmental financial decisions and in a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one time distribution of block instructional funds. (T.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td>1. The Faculty Council gained some financial control through the management of a block of excess instructional funds which had been allocated by the principal. (T.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Planning</td>
<td>1. The Planning Council was not directly involved in financial decisions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>however, through the strategic plans and recommended actions, some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decisions had financial implications. (T.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, because of school board policy and the need for consistency and uniformity, the Office of Administrative Services retained decision making authority in distributing system-wide funds as well as in
establishing the policies, procedures, and guidelines concerning the system-wide management of funds.

Principal

Conclusion 1: The principal retained control of school finances and was delegated increased responsibility by the central office to manage those funds.

The Assistant Superintendent of Finance defined the role of the building principal as the ultimate decision maker at the school site. He further explained that the principal could not abrogate certain financial responsibilities. He stated, "The buck stops with the principals." The principal was bound by state regulations and school board policy to follow financial procedures in the handling of money. Specifically, the principal was responsible for proper management of all accounts at the school. The school system’s accounting manual indicated that the school’s financial accounts were to be reconciled by the end of each fiscal year.

The Assistant Superintendent of Finance explained that more money had been directly allocated to the local schools; as a result of the shared decision making initiative, the subject school’s allocation increased approximately three hundred percent to $118,000. This initiative was part of the superintendent’s plan to provide individual schools with the increased funds previously managed by central office departments. Furthermore, as a
result of the shift to shared decision making, principals were given more authority to make decisions concerning finance. New decisions made at the subject school included: (1) involving more staff members in the financial decision making process and (2) reallocation of funds to different accounts.

While instructional, staff development, equipment and repair, and administration funds could be re-allocated, library and special education accounts could not be re-allocated by the principal. The school’s allocation worksheet indicated that library funds, which were Title 4 funds, and special education funds, which were federally mandated, could not be moved out.

In summary, the principal was responsible for the management of the school’s funds. He could include more staff members in financial decisions and reallocate certain instructional funds. He provided opportunities for such.

**Assistant Principals**

**Conclusion 1:** Assistant principals gained influence by advising the principal on departmental allocations, and one assistant managed funds for a special project.

Assistant Principal One explained that he had not taken part in the budget process after the audit of 1995. The principal assumed total control. However, he noted that as a member of the administrative team, he helped establish dollar amounts for allocation of departmental instructional monies.
He stated, "In department funds there is really little involvement, unless they [department chairpersons] wish to request more funds."

Assistant Principal Two described greater involvement in school financial matters. As the building administrator responsible for management of the "High Schools That Work" grant, she had total discretion within grant guidelines in spending the grant money assigned to the school. However, she did mention that she always had all purchases and expenditures approved by the principal.

In summary, assistant principals had limited participation in financial decision making. The assistant principal responsible for the High Schools That Work grant was permitted to manage and spends those funds.

Department Chairpersons

Conclusion 1: While departmental allocations were established by the principal, department chairpersons had complete autonomy in managing departmental funds.

The building principal and two assistant principals determined the amount of instructional funds allocated to each department. All four department chairpersons interviewed recognized that instructional monies allocated to the departments were determined by the building principal or administrative team. Department Chairperson One stated, "So far in my department we have been allotted a certain amount of money. I have not
disputed that. I have just accepted what we have been assigned."

Department Chairperson Two stated, "I am given a budget. It is my total
discretion how to spend the budget." Department Chairperson Three stated,
"Generally we are told how much we are to be given...." Department
Chairperson Four stated, "....the administration makes the decisions to
where the monies will be allocated."

Department Chairperson Two explained that it was up to the
department chairpersons to determine how funds would be spent.
Department Chairperson Two stated, "I am given a budget. It is my total
discretion how to spend the budget." Department Chairperson Three
explained that after allocations were received, "It is up to us [department
chairpersons] to allocate it [money] to our own department."

In summary, departmental funds were allocated by the building
principal; however, department chairpersons had autonomy in managing
those funds.

Teachers

**Conclusion 1:** Teachers were included in departmental financial decisions
and in a one time distribution of block instructional funds.

Teacher One indicated that he felt the school administrators
determined how much money was allocated to the departments. Teachers
Four, Five and Six stated that they had not been involved in decisions
concerning school finances. Teacher One stated, "Principals determine how much money is allocated. Teachers do not have any input."

Teacher Two was more specific. The interviewee stated, "We would like to be more in charge of the spending for the High Schools That Work program; however, we have not been given the privilege." Teachers Four and Six indicated no involvement in financial decision making. When asked about involvement in financial decision making; Teacher Four stated, "I have not been involved in it all." Teacher Three stated that the department chairperson for the "School Within a School" program allowed the group to decide how money was to be spent. Teacher Three stated, "Our department chair lets us decide if we want to use the money for a project or do we want to use money for other things." Teacher Five explained that the department chairperson sought teacher opinion, stating, "My department chairman asked how money should be spent in my department."

In summary, teachers were included in discussions concerning the distribution of departmental funds; however teachers were not involved in the decisions concerning the distribution of instructional funds to departments.

Faculty Council

Conclusion 1: The Faculty Council gained some financial control through the management of a block of excess instructional funds which had been
allocated by the principal.

Faculty Council was allocated $10,000 in excess instructional funds by the building principal to be distributed among the staff. Faculty Council Member One discussed distribution of these monies and stated that Faculty Council voted on how to distribute the funds.

Teacher One explained that the Faculty Council requested teacher volunteers for a committee to distribute excess funds. He stated, "Several teachers were allowed to volunteer for that committee. I was one of those volunteers." A memorandum to the principal from the Faculty Council and committee chairperson identified the teachers who comprised the committee and set forth its recommendations for spending the money.

In summary, Faculty Council supported shared decision making by allowing teachers to participate in the process of identifying and distributing the excess instructional funds; however, faculty council members were not involved in the allocation or distribution of other school funds.

Planning Council

Conclusion 1: The Planning Council was not directly involved in financial decisions; however, through the strategic plan and recommended actions, some decisions had financial implications.

Although four Planning Council members interviewed indicated that they were not directly involved in decisions concerning allocation or
spending of funds, Planning Council Member One described a situation in which council might have an inadvertent effect on school financial decisions. He stated, "Most decisions, as a body, have financial repercussions. When you have strategies to achieve, we have to take into account what it will cost." He explained that recommendations made by council concerning additional programs or personnel could increase expenditures and affect school finance.

In summary, the Planning Council was not involved in financial decisions except indirectly through recommendations for specific programs or strategies which might have financial implications.

Stakeholder Involvement in Staff Development Decisions

The findings gathered from data concerning stakeholder involvement in decisions concerning staff development are in Table 8. Conclusions were drawn from these findings and are in Table 9. Both findings and conclusions were constructed from data collected from the following groups: central office staff, assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, and members of Faculty Council and Planning Council.

Central Office

Conclusion 1: There was a major shift in responsibility and control of staff development from the central office to the school.

The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction stated, "Right
### TABLE 8

#### TABLE OF FINDINGS

**Stakeholder Involvement in Staff Development Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Central Office Staff       | 1. There was a shift in philosophy in staff development. Money and responsibility for decision making was shifted to the local schools from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the Office of Planning and Research. (App.C, T.12)¹  
2. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the Office of Planning and Research were minimally involved in staff development programs and activities. (App.C, T.12)  
3. Upon request of the principal, the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the Office of Planning and Research were used in a support capacity for the subject school’s implementing initiatives which required staff development programs or activities. (App.C, T.12) |
| Assistant Principals       | 1. Assistant Principal One monitored the strategic plan which directed and provided for staff development. (App.C, T.13)  
2. Assistant Principal Two was a member of the Staff Development Action Team. (App.C, T.13)  
3. The school’s administration directed staff development activities. (App.C, T.13) |
| Department Chairpersons    | 1. Department chairpersons encouraged and included teachers to participate in staff development activities. (App.C, T.14)  
2. Some department chairpersons were not involved in staff development activities. (App.C, T.14)  
3. Department chairpersons were asked to submit topics of interest and concern to the Staff Development Action Team. (App.C, T.14)  
4. Any staff member, including department chairpersons, could give a presentation in a staff development activity if it were pertinent to the topic. (App.C, T.14) |

¹ Data supporting this finding are in Appendix C, Table 12. All other references of this type refer to the appropriate appendix and table.
### TABLE 8 (continued)

| Teachers | 1. Staff development action teams were made up of teachers. (App.C, T.15) |
|          | 2. Teachers planned and conducted staff development activities. (App.C, T.15) |
|          | 3. Most decision making at the school that involved teachers occurred in staff development. (App.C, T.15) |
|          | 4. Teachers were surveyed on staff development activities. (App.C, T.15) |
|          | 5. Not all teachers were involved in staff development decisions. (App.C, T.15) |
|          | 6. Teachers were members of the action team that directed staff development activities. (App.C, T.15) |
| Faculty Council | 1. Faculty Council members were also members of the Staff Development Action Team. (App.C, T.16) |
|          | 2. Choice of topics for staff development was limited. (App.C, T.16) |
|          | 3. Faculty Council members worked on staff development activities. (App.C, T.16) |
|          | 4. Not all Faculty Council members were involved in staff development decisions. (App.C, T.16) |
| Planning Council | 1. Planning council members were also members of the Staff Development Action Team. (App.C, T.17) |
|          | 2. One member of council acted as facilitator in staff development activities. (App.C, T.17) |
|          | 3. The Curriculum Action Team of the Planning Council recommended "reading to learn" strategies be offered in staff development. (App.C, T.17) |
|          | 4. Members of the planning council discussed training and staff development for professional and classified staff. (App.C, T.17) |
|          | 5. Multi-cultural training was recommended by the Planning Council. (App.C, T.17) |
|          | 6. Not all Planning Council members were involved in staff development decisions. (App.C, T.17) |

now the relationship [with the local schools] has been very loose. It depends upon the principal and whether or not that person wanted guidance, input, or suggestions....There has been a shift....A little over 50% [of staff development money] has gone to the schools." The school's
TABLE 9
TABLE OF CONCLUSIONS
Stakeholder Involvement in Staff Development Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>1. There was a major shift in responsibility and control of staff development from the central office to the school. (T.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The role of the central office changed from initiating planning and providing staff development to supporting school-based programs. (T.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principals</td>
<td>1. The role of the assistant principal was increased to include direct responsibility for planning and coordinating staff development activities and programs. (T.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>1. While department chairpersons had no responsibility for staff development decisions, they influenced decision making by individually participating and encouraging teachers within their department to participate in staff development activities. (T.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1. Teachers had opportunities for participation in staff development decisions through structured input, membership in action teams, and direct involvement in the activities. (T.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td>1. The Faculty Council had no role in staff development activities; however, some members, through their membership on the Staff Development Action Team, did gain some involvement in staff development planning and coordination. (T.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Council</td>
<td>1. The Planning Council, through the strategic plan and resulting action team on staff development, influenced the staff development program. (T.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial worksheet for the 1995-96 school year indicated that $5000 had been allocated to the school for staff development. Prior to the fall of 1992, staff development activities and funding were centrally managed and
conducted, and no monies were allocated to the schools specifically for staff
development activities. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the
Office of Planning and Research had been entirely responsible for staff
development. However, with the implementation of shared decision making
in 1992, staff development became the responsibility of the local schools.

The Director of Planning and Research also indicated that her
responsibilities and funding of staff development activities had been shifted
to the local schools. Specifically, school’s implementing strategic planning
and test improvement programs were responsible for funding and providing
their own staff development activities. She stated, "Prior to 1992, any
program that we instituted was funded centrally." Since that time the local
schools have been required to fund the projects they initiated. The funding
for staff development projects, programs, and activities in curriculum and
instruction, test improvement, and strategic planning was included in the
initial $5000 assigned to the staff development account.

**Conclusion 2:** The role of the central office changed from initiating planning
and providing staff development to supporting school-based programs.

The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction explained
that his department existed to assist schools with implementation of staff
development activities; however, the prerogative to enlist his department’s
help was left to the discretion of principals of the individual schools.
The Director of Planning and Research also described the change in her office's working relationship with the local schools in conducting staff development activities. She stated, "We are in much more of a support role than we were before 1992....Our office is working individually with schools to implement their [each school's] own individual [strategic] plan."

In summary, the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the Office of Planning and Research acted in support of staff development activities in strategic planning, test improvement, and curriculum and instruction at the subject school. Responsibility and funding for staff development activities, previously assigned to both departments, were shifted to the local schools.

Assistant Principals

Conclusion 1: The role of the assistant principal was increased to include direct responsibility for planning and coordinating staff development activities and programs.

Assistant Principal One explained that he was responsible for the implementation of the strategic plan. The implementation of the strategic plan required the establishment of action teams in several critical areas. One of these was the Staff Development Action Team which was responsible for identifying topics for and conducting staff development activities at the school. In his capacity of overseeing the strategic plan, Assistant Principal One was the director of activity for all action teams, including staff
development. As such, his responsibilities included monitoring the activities and progress of the Staff Development Action Team.

Assistant Principal Two was assigned to the Staff Development Action Team, and as a member provided administrative leadership in staff development activities. She described one instance of securing a speaker for the school’s initial staff development program. In discussing the program with a staff member of African-American descent, the assistant principal asked the staff member to recommend a speaker. The staff member became excited about the possibility and recommended a nationally renowned motivational speaker who addressed multicultural topics. The assistant principal went on to explain that she had no regrets about securing the speaker for the program and appreciated the referral. Documentation of the assistant principal’s involvement included letters written to neighboring schools requesting their participation in the staff development activity; a signed contract with the guest speaker, identifying the time and place of the activity; and remuneration for the speaker’s services.

In summary, assistant principals were assigned specific duties which required their involvement in staff development activities. They not only participated in the activities but in some cases supervised and directed them.

Department Chairpersons

Conclusion 1: While department chairpersons had no responsibility for staff
development decisions, they influenced decision making by individually participating and encouraging teachers within their department to participate in staff development activities.

Three of four department chairpersons interviewed described involvement in staff development activities. Department Chairperson One explained that over the years he had encouraged teacher involvement and participation in different types of departmental activities which included updating teachers on present trends in curriculum. Department Chairperson Three stated that department chairpersons were asked to submit topics for staff development activities. Department Chairperson Four stated that staff development was open to all staff members to participate and that she had been a member of various committees and worked on the Staff Development Action Team.

In summary, department chairpersons were involved in staff development decisions by encouraging teacher involvement in staff development activities, asking for teacher suggestions for staff development topics, and by being a member of the Staff Development Action Team.

**Teachers**

**Conclusion 1:** Teachers had opportunities for participation in staff development decisions through structured input, membership on action teams, and direct involvement in the activities.
Three of the six teachers interviewed indicated that they were involved in staff development programs or activities. Teacher One was the most descriptive in explaining his involvement; he stated, "I am on the staff development committee which is made up of teachers. We are allowed to plan and run in-service programs that will be given. In that respect, I feel that is where teachers have the most input. We can decide what topics will be covered, how long the program will be, and when they will be." Teacher Two stated that the staff had been given surveys to solicit feedback on staff development programs. Teacher Four also described involvement of teachers in staff development activities. Teacher Four stated, "We have action groups. We have met several times over the past several years. We come up with suggestions for activities." Assistant Principal Two described teacher involvement in staff development activities. She stated, "They [teachers] can join a [staff development action] team. They can have input."

In summary, teachers had the opportunity to be involved in staff development decisions, if they chose, by either joining the Staff Development Action Team or by presenting or contributing to staff development activities.

Faculty Council

Conclusion 1: The Faculty Council had no role in staff development activities; however, some members, through their membership on the Staff
Development Action Team, did gain some involvement in staff development planning and coordination.

Faculty Council Members One, Two, and Four explained that as Faculty Council members and members of the Planning Council they chose to be involved in the Staff Development Action Team. Council Member One stated, "Being a member of the Staff Development Action Team, I have probably been more involved in it ... than most faculty members." Faculty Council Member Two stated, "I was on the staff development action committee. We worked on in-services and so on." Faculty Council Member Four described involvement on the action team stating, "I have worked on the staff development team of Faculty Council, and we have worked on bringing in speakers and planning in-service programs."

In summary, faculty council members who wished to be involved in staff development decisions as action team members, participated in staff development decision making.

Planning Council

Conclusion 1: The Planning Council, through the strategic plan and resulting action team in staff development, influenced the staff development program.

Planning Council Member One stated that as a Planning Council member he chose to be a part of the Staff Development Action Team, and as part of the action team, he helped establish goals for staff development
within the school. Planning Council Member Two, who was a member of
the curriculum committee, stated that his committee worked on curriculum
objectives but a result of their work was the recommendation for a staff
development activity in reading development. Planning Council Member
Three explained that the Planning Council discussed training for professional
and classified staff. He stated, "Yes. Again, as members of council, we
discussed training for staff, professional and custodial." Planning Council
Member Three also stated, "I do remember that multicultural sensitivity
training was suggested. In fact, we had a guest speaker...who lectured the
school." Documentation of the Planning Council’s involvement in staff
development decisions was found in a recommendation they made for multi-
cultural training as an objective in the school’s strategic plan.

In summary, the Planning Council provided the organizational structure
and direction for staff development activities.

Stakeholder Involvement in Curriculum and Instruction Decisions

The findings gathered from data concerning stakeholder involvement
in curriculum and instruction decisions are in Table 10. Conclusions were
drawn from these findings and are in Table 11. Both findings and
conclusions were constructed from data gathered from the following groups:
central office staff, assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers,
and members of the Faculty Council and the Planning Council.
### TABLE OF FINDINGS

Stakeholder Involvement in Curriculum and Instruction Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Central Office    | 1. The Office of Planning and Research was responsible for the testing program throughout the city. Their responsibilities included distributing and collecting tests from schools, receiving tests scores, and providing analysis of test results. (App.C,T.12)\(^1\)  
                      2. The Office of Planning and Research acted in support of local school initiatives. (App.C, T.12)  
                      3. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction identified resources to help teachers deliver the curriculum. (App.C, T.12)  
                      5. The responsibility for curriculum development was shared with the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the local schools. (App.C, T.12)  
                      8. Textbook adoption remained the sole responsibility of the Office of Curriculum and Instruction. (App.C, T.12) |
| Assistant Principals | 1. The responsibility of Assistant Principal One was organization and supervision of the department chairpersons. (App.C, T.13)  
                                2. Assistant Principal One was responsible for organizing department chairperson meetings which included the discussion of grades, lesson plans, and testing. (App.C, T.13)  
                                3. Assistant Principal Two initially organized and was a member of the Rigorous Studies Program. (App.C, T.13) |
| Department Chairpersons | 1. Department chairpersons encouraged teachers to join curriculum and textbook committees. (App.C, T.14)  
                                          2. Department chairpersons were involved in presenting curriculum and instructional initiatives within their departments. (App.C, T.14)  
                                          3. Department chairpersons were members of curriculum committees. (App.C, T.14) |

\(^1\) Data supporting this finding are in Appendix C, Table 12. All other references of this type refer to the appropriate appendix and table.
### TABLE 10 (continued)

| Teachers | 1. Teachers were involved in the organization of curriculum initiatives. (App.C, T.15)  
2. Teachers were involved in the recruitment of students for new curriculum initiatives. (App.C, T.15)  
3. Teachers were involved in the scheduling of classes for new curriculum initiatives. (App.C, T.15)  
4. Teams of teachers worked together on curriculum initiatives. (App.C, T.15)  
5. Teachers had opportunities to join curriculum and instruction committees. (App.C, T.15)  
6. Teachers chose not to be involved in curriculum and instruction decisions. (App.C, T.15) |
| --- | --- |
| Faculty Council | 1. Faculty council members were involved in textbook adoption. (App.C, T.16)  
2. Faculty council stated that the textbook committees had high teacher involvement. (App.C, T.16) |
| School Planning Council | 1. School Planning Council members were involved on curriculum committees. (App.C, T.17)  
2. The Planning Council recommended appropriate class placement of students and the inclusion of drug education in the curriculum. (App.C, T.17) |

**Central Office**

**Conclusion 1:** Central Office lost some control of curriculum initiatives as schools gained the responsibility to propose curriculum change with central office approval directly to the school board.

The responsibility for developing curriculum and instruction initiatives and the revision of present initiatives was shifted from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction to the individual schools. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction described his department's
### TABLE 11

**TABLE OF CONCLUSIONS**

**Stakeholder Involvement in Curriculum and Instruction Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>1. Central Office lost some control of curriculum initiatives as schools gained the responsibility to propose curriculum change with central office approval directly to the school board. (T.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Central Office retained control of citywide assessment, textbook adoption, and continued collaborating with the schools on instruction and student achievement improvement. (T.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principals</td>
<td>1. Assistant principals gained involvement in school management of instruction by participating in curriculum and instruction decisions, through the supervision of department chairpersons, and management of new curriculum initiatives. (T.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>1. The role of the department chairperson in instruction did not change. (T.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1. Some teachers gained involvement in curriculum decision making. (T.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td>1. The Faculty Council was not involved in curriculum and instruction decision making; however, individual members, through membership on curriculum committees and through recommendations made by action teams, influenced curriculum decisions. (T.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Council</td>
<td>1. The Planning Council was not involved in curriculum and instruction decision making; however, individual members, through membership on curriculum committees and recommendations of action teams, influenced curriculum decisions. (T.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

relationship with the local schools as having changed. He explained that principals now determined the relationship with his office and that if principals needed instructional help, they would call on curriculum specialists.
whom they knew. He stated, "The formal relationship between the
department and schools has changed." More curriculum originated at the
local school level.

Documents at the school indicated that curriculum initiatives were
being explored. The researcher was provided with minutes from a Rigorous
Studies Committee meeting. Rigorous Studies was an initiative which
organized all the academic offerings, advanced studies courses, and co-
curriculum activities such SAT preparation classes available to college bound
students and placed them under one program. The Rigorous Studies
Committee met and discussed issues concerning the organization of
academic classes and activities for students in the academic tract.

Conclusion 2: The Central Office retained control of citywide assessment,
textbook adoption, and continued collaborating with the schools on
instruction and the improvement of student achievement. The Assistant
Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction stated that the one area that
was still a "top down decision...was textbook adoption." His department
maintained the responsibility for organizing the process of textbook
selection, involving personnel in the selection process, and the final decision
for recommendation of textbook adoption to the school board. He also
stated that although schools may originate curriculum and instruction
initiatives, his department was responsible for "carrying the curriculum
objectives to the school board" for approval. He explained that while schools could develop new curriculum and strategies, his department was responsible for organizing, formatting, and presenting all objectives to the school board for approval. His department also identified resources to help teachers deliver that curriculum.

In summary, the Office of Curriculum and Instruction retained its responsibilities in textbook adoption while working with schools in curriculum development and revision. The Office of Planning and Research retained responsibility for managing the standardized test program and test improvement.

Assistant Principals

**Conclusion 1:** Assistant principals gained involvement in school management of instruction by participating in curriculum and instruction decisions, through the supervision of department chairpersons, and through the management of new curriculum initiatives.

Assistant Principal One stated that one of his primary responsibilities was the organization and supervision of the department chairpersons. As such, it was his responsibility to direct and supervise the group in decisions concerning curriculum and instruction. During meetings of department heads, instructional issues such as grading, lesson plans, testing, written objectives, and classroom observations of teachers were discussed.
Supporting documents at the school included agendas of departmental meetings and instructional materials distributed by Assistant Principal One to the department chairpersons.

Assistant Principal Two described her responsibilities in curriculum and instruction as organizing and managing the "Rigorous Studies" program. She stated that the program was designed to organize the academic offerings so that college bound students could have a programmed approach and be provided with all the classes and services the school had to offer.

In summary, Assistant Principal One was responsible for the organization and administration of department chairpersons meetings, and Assistant Principal Two was responsible for the organization and management of the Rigorous Studies program which provided an organized and sequential program for academic students.

Department Chairpersons

Conclusion 1: The role of the department chairperson in instruction did not change.

All four interviewed department chairpersons indicated involvement in decisions concerning curriculum and instruction. Department Chairperson One stated that he encouraged department members to join some of the curriculum committees such as the Textbook Adoption Committee. Department Chairperson Two indicated involvement in instructional decision
making through leadership of the department. She stated, "I have been pretty instrumental in (giving) my department directions." Department Chairperson Three described her involvement in curriculum matters stating that most of her involvement had been on citywide curriculum and instructional projects (such as textbook adoption or curriculum reform) rather than within the school.

Department Chairperson Four explained that most of her involvement had been as a member of a curriculum committee but that she had not been involved "in curriculum matters in quite some time."

In summary, department chairpersons supported shared decision making by participating on textbook adoption committees, providing leadership through their roles as department chairpersons, and by participating on curriculum committees.

Teachers

**Conclusion 1:** Some teachers gained involvement in curriculum decision making.

Two of the interviewed teachers detailed extensive involvement in instructional activities. Teacher Two stated, "I presently am serving on the ‘FAMS’ [Ford Academy of Motor Science] Committee, as well as ‘The High Schools That Work’ Committee. I also serve on the ‘Rigorous Studies’ Committee." He later stated, "Together we came up with the ‘FAMS’
curriculum that this school would follow. We recruited our students and worked on trying to schedule them [students] in classes."

Teacher Three explained that her involvement in decision making came as a teacher in the School Within a School Program. She further explained how the team worked together, making decisions that would revamp or reorganize the program from year to year. In a discussion about decision making, she stated, "[Decisions] are really up to the teachers and administrators. Last year we even asked students for some input."

Assistant Principal Two described extensive teacher involvement in the development of the Rigorous Studies Program. She explained that teachers were asked to volunteer to investigate and study ways to better organize academic classes and services offered to students. Approximately twenty teachers volunteered. After initially organizing the structure, all responsibilities were turned over to the teacher committee.

Teacher Four stated that he had the option to be on a curriculum committee but chose not to be involved. Teachers Five and Six both stated they were not involved in decisions about curriculum and instruction.

Documents such as the school newsletter and a memorandum from the principal to teachers indicated that all teachers were requested to join a school action team such as curriculum and instruction.

In summary, all teachers had the opportunity to be involved in
decisions about curriculum and instruction. These opportunities included membership on the Curriculum Action Team and such individual curriculum committees as Rigorous Studies and FAMS.

Faculty Council

Conclusion 1: The Faculty Council was not involved in curriculum and instruction decision making; however, individual members, through membership on curriculum committees and through recommendations made by action teams, influenced curriculum decisions.

Faculty Council Members One and Two explained that they were members of committees which adopted new textbooks for the school system. Faculty Council Member One stated, "I have been involved in textbook revision committees, textbook adoption committees which have some bearing on curriculum."

Faculty Council Member Three stated that she was involved within the department in curriculum recommendations which had been implemented. (Curriculum recommendations that had been implemented at the subject school were Rigorous Studies, FAMS, High Schools That Work, and School Within a School.)

Faculty Council members who were teachers made daily decisions about curriculum and instruction within their own classes. Faculty Council Member One stated, "As far as instruction is concerned, I make my own
decisions in how I teach."

In summary, Faculty Council was not involved in curriculum and instruction decision making; however, individual members were involved in curriculum and instruction activities as members of textbook adoption committees, and as teachers making daily decisions in their classrooms.

Planning Council

Conclusion 1: The Planning Council was not involved in curriculum and instruction decision making; however, individual members, through membership on curriculum committees and recommendations of action teams, influenced curriculum decisions.

Planning Council Member One described his involvement in curriculum development, "I was involved in curriculum development. Last year it was through the Aids Awareness Club. We worked on curriculum to be submitted." In describing his involvement, Planning Council Member Two said, "I was on the curriculum committee and saw some of the strategies and objectives [implemented]." Planning Council Member Three stated, "We have looked at placing students in appropriate classes and in courses based on their academic ability. We have also looked at courses that kids would need in terms of tracking students for placement. Not all kids go to college."

In summary, the Planning Council members were involved in
curriculum decision making as members of the action teams and curriculum committees.

**Question 2:** Why was shared decision making operating in the manner it was?

There are two reasons why shared decision making was operating in the manner it was.

**Reason 1:** The division superintendent mandated that shared decision making activities be implemented in the schools.

Shared decision making occurred between the central office and the subject school in the areas of staff development and curriculum and instruction because they were directed to do so by the division superintendent. This directive was in response to the school board’s mandate to decentralize the school system and was included in the January 1992 superintendent’s presentation to the school board, "The Superintendent’s Resolution of Support for School Based Management and Shared Decision Making." This resolution provided the framework for decentralizing the school system and transferred the authority and responsibility for decision making and financial support in staff development and curriculum and instruction to the local schools.

Within the resolution the superintendent stated, "The entire instructional department must be committed to its advisory relationship with
the school board and superintendent, to its support role with the school
board and superintendent, to its support role with staff at the school site,
and its interrelationship with staff development." As a result, the central
office departments were directed to act in a support capacity.

Documentation which supported the transferred authority included the
following: the superintendent's resolution, the subject school's 1995-96
financial allocation worksheet, statements by central office department
heads, and a statement made by one of the subject school's assistant
principals. (See data in Appendix D, Table 18.)

The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
acknowledged the shift in responsibility in his statement that more schools
are initiating change or adding new curriculum. However, he qualified the
degree of power shifted, stating that each new curriculum proposal had to
come to his office for perusal, approval, and formatting. He said, "We are
still taking [curriculum] objectives to the board for approval...[While his
department was no longer responsible for initiating new curriculum
objectives, it remained responsible for organizing and putting objectives into
proper format to be carried to the school board for approval]." He described
his relationship with the local schools as "...very loose. It depends upon the
principal and whether or not that person wants guidance, input, or
suggestions....The formal relationship between the department and local
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schools has changed."

The Director of Planning and Research explained her department’s role in staff development activities as test improvement and strategic planning; she stated, "We have a supportive role in helping schools implement the testing program and test improvement plan and helping to support strategic planning."

Evidence of the superintendent’s directive to implement shared decision making in the areas of staff development and curriculum and instruction was found in his proposal "Resolution of Support for Shared Decision Making." His proposal highlighted these as the two most critical areas necessary to achieve shared decision making, stating, "Staff development will address the training needs of employees to achieve school improvement initiatives. Training plans will be based on the identification of needs to carry out the division-wide strategic plan and the strategic plan of each school." In further support of this initiative, the superintendent directed the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the Office of Planning and Research to act in a supportive capacity to the individual schools.

The superintendent described the following goals for curriculum and instruction: "The school board must extend shared decision making from the boardroom to the classroom; the obstacles to creativity and innovation must be removed; school staffs must have high expectations for students in
the traditional subjects of reading, writing, arithmetic; and traditional values must be regained in the schools."

The proposal further described the superintendent’s vision of shared decision making as an evolutionary process through local school leadership in cooperation with its staff. The staff would participate in the decision-making process as a collective body called Faculty Council. Each school was to establish a faculty council, the purpose of which was to provide the school staff the opportunity to have input into decisions which affected them. Once established, the Faculty Council would partner the school administration in the area of staff development decisions.

**Reason 2:** The building administration believed in the shared decision making initiative, extended opportunities for involvement to the staff, and had confidence in the staff to assume those responsibilities.

Evidence which supported the building administration’s attempt to extend shared decision making opportunities to the staff was found in a review of school documents and statements from stakeholders.

Assistant Principal One, who in the summer of 1995 with another administrator [Assistant Principal Two] organized the interview and selection process for all vacancies and included department chairpersons in that process, stated, "I had department chairpersons involved in all interviews and generally another administrator [Assistant Principal Two] shared that
decision with me."

Department Chairperson Number One stated, "Year before last we had an opening in my department. One of the teachers retired, so I was called in during the summer to [help] interview for that position....I have been a part of the interviewing panel to make that decision on hiring. I did have input on the hiring." Department Chairperson Number Two stated, "I was on the selection committee when interviews were made....In the case of my department, the recommendations made [by me] were specifically adhered to." Department Chairperson Number Four stated, "The first year I was chosen as department chair, I was asked to sit in on several interviews."

Statements made by one of the school’s assistant principals, a department chairperson, and a teacher indicated their involvement in and the attempted inclusion of teachers by the administration in some areas of financial decision making. Assistant Principal Two stated, "Last year the principal took $10,000....He met with faculty council....They decided where the money was going to go, how it was going to be spent, and the teachers had input." Department Chairperson Three stated that they [teachers] had an opportunity to participate in financial decisions and that, "once in a great while, there may be something that involved the whole staff, where they are polled through a survey, probably through faculty council." Teacher One
confirmed the school administration's attempt to include teachers in financial decisions: "We had a committee that was available to use extra funds that we were supposed to get. Several teachers were allowed to volunteer for that committee.... That was the only thing teachers have been involved in, concerning financial decisions."

Faculty Council was involved in decision making in staff development was because the subject school's principal took an active leadership role in developing and maintaining a strategic plan requiring Faculty Council participation and establishing action teams designed to address issues of curriculum and instruction, one of the crucial areas identified for school improvement. Faculty and Faculty Council participation in action teams was actively solicited and encouraged by the school administration in the school's newsletter and memoranda and in statements from a faculty council member requesting faculty involvement on one of the school's action teams.

The school's administration fostered and promoted Faculty Council's participation in curriculum and instruction by encouraging and permitting faculty council to address curriculum and instruction issues, by encouraging faculty council members to participate on school-wide curriculum committees, and by involving Faculty Council on the school's curriculum action team.

Documentation which supported the council's participation included
Faculty Council Member Four’s statement indicating active involvement in curriculum and instruction decisions and definitive input in any and all faculty decisions involving curriculum and instruction. Documentation of the school administration’s attempt to extend decision making was found in two school newsletters and in memoranda promoting involvement in school action teams. Evidence of Faculty Council participation in curriculum and instruction decisions was found in the school’s strategic plan which listed names of all action team members, including two Faculty Council members who were listed on the school’s curriculum and instruction action team.

The school administration’s support of the Planning Council’s involvement in staff development and curriculum decision-making was evidenced by the school administration’s empowering of the Planning Council to make decisions on those issues and by authorizing the Council to establish action teams in both areas to investigate and recommend strategies and objectives for school improvement.

Further evidence of the administration’s support of the Planning Council’s involvement in staff development and curriculum decision making was found in statements made by Planning Council Members One, Two, and Three. Planning Council Member One described his first involvement in staff development as a facilitator in one of the first action team meetings. He stated that he was asked to help the Planning Council during its
organizational process to develop goals and objectives for staff development. Planning Council Member Two stated that he was on the curriculum committee and saw some of the strategies and objectives recommended by the group implemented. One of the strategies discussed by the curriculum committee that was implemented at the subject school was the Reading to Learn initiative. Planning Council Member Three was even more specific in his explanation of involvement in curriculum decisions. He stated, "We looked at placing students in appropriate classes....We also looked at courses kids need in terms of tracking [vocational courses]....Not all kids go to college."

The building principal had confidence in the staff to assume the responsibilities for decision making. Evidence of the principal’s confidence in the staff was found in a review of documents and statements made by staff members.

The principal’s confidence in and empowerment of assistant principals, as well as his belief in sharing decisions with the assistant principals, was found in the documents at the school and in statements made by both assistant principals interviewed concerning their responsibilities in the areas of personnel, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. For example, the principal assigned Assistant Principal One the responsibility of organizing and managing the Planning Council. The
responsibility was important because it required coordinating the efforts of teachers, department chairpersons, parents, and school administrators in the construction of the school’s strategic plan. Additional documentation of confidence in the assistant principals was found in the school’s faculty handbook under duties assigned. Each assistant principal was assigned specific responsibilities requiring decision making in the areas of personnel, staff development, and curriculum and instruction.

A personnel responsibility assigned to both assistant principals was the development and construction of the master schedule. This responsibility included identification of vacant teaching positions, identification of present staff to be involuntarily transferred, identification of involuntary transfers eligible for positions at the subject school, and the interview and selection of new or involuntarily placed candidates.

As indicated in statements made by both participating assistant principals, each fully understood the confidence placed in them in these areas by the principal. Assistant Principal One stated, "I am trusted to make decisions the principal normally makes....This summer in the absence of the principal....I conducted all interviews."

Evidence supporting the principal’s confidence in both assistant principals’ abilities to make effective, credible decisions in staff development was found in the responsibilities assigned each. Assistant Principal One was
assigned the responsibility of managing the school’s Planning Council. This assignment was critical to staff development because it required construction and maintenance of the school’s strategic plan, the blueprint for school improvement, and identified problems, strategies, and objectives for improvement of staff development at the school. In describing his responsibilities in staff development, assistant principal one stated, "I am involved (in staff development) because I monitor the blueprint for the strategic plan. One of our primary areas for improvement in the strategic plan is staff development."

Assistant Principal Two was assigned the responsibility of supervising the staff development program for the school which had specific staff development responsibilities. One of the responsibilities was organizing the school’s initial in-service activity. In that capacity, she was responsible for securing a speaker and providing a program on multi-culture awareness.

As evidenced in assigning shared decision making duties in personnel and staff development, supporting documentation of the principal’s confidence in the assistant principals in the area of curriculum and instruction was found in the duties he assigned each. Assistant Principal One was entrusted with the responsibility of managing, supervising, and evaluating all department chairpersons, as documented in the following statement: "One of my responsibilities is to administer and supervise all
department chairpersons. In that capacity, many issues and responsibilities that we discuss and decide are curriculum issues. Grading, lesson plans, and testing are just a few categories that we discuss." Evidence for this assignment of duties was found in completed observations and evaluation forms, departmental meeting agendas, and working documents distributed to each department chairperson.

Assistant Principal Two was assigned responsibility for supervising the English and special education departments in which she observed and evaluated each teacher, approved instructional allocations, and provided materials and resources for both departments. Other instructional duties included initiating and supervising the school’s rigorous studies program, a program which organized academic offerings and activities for college-bound students.

Evidence for this involvement and participation was found in the minutes and agendas from departmental meetings, as well as completed observation and evaluation forms.

Evidence of the school administration’s confidence in the ability of department chairpersons to make decisions, as well as their belief in sharing and extending the model decision making process, were found in the school’s faculty handbook, statements made by department chairpersons concerning their duties and responsibilities, and a statement made by one of
the school’s assistant principals.

Additional evidence of the building administration’s confidence in the department chairperson was found in the school’s faculty handbook which listed the following assigned duties: to preside at department meetings, to instruct all department members on curriculum guides, to review individual teacher planning, to maintain current inventory of equipment and materials, to assist administrators in providing for continual in-service programs, to develop and coordinate the annual plan of instructional improvement, to observe teachers’ classes within departments, and to monitor grade books and lesson plans.

Evidence of acceptance of the leadership role by department chairpersons was found in statements made by three chairpersons who were interviewed.

In addition to the building administration’s confidence in the ability of department chairpersons in the area of personnel, the building administration evidenced equal confidence in the area of financial decision making by assigning them the responsibility of managing departmental funds. Documentation of this was found in statements made by department chairpersons, an assistant principal, departmental budgets, and related memoranda.

Department Chairperson Number Four stated, “Each department chair
is asked to give a budget for the next year. We discuss these matters with our department and find out their needs financially. Then, the budgets are given to the administration, and the administration makes the decisions as to where the monies are allocated, and then we have a say as far as negotiations." Department Chairperson Number Two described a more rigid approach to managing departmental funds: "I am given a budget. It is my total discretion how to spend the budget." Department Chairperson Number Three described the approach as follows: "Generally, we are told how much we are to be given, and from there it is up to us to allocate it to our department. If we don’t have enough, we go back and ask for an increase."

Documentation of individualized departmental financial management that was provided the researcher indicated that each department developed a budget based upon its specific needs. Several departments, citing specific needs, requested additional funding, evidenced by written requests to the building principal from three individual department chairpersons. Each request detailed an exact amount needed and the purpose.

The building administration’s confidence in teachers and attempts to include them in the decision making process were evidenced by school newsletters, memoranda sent to teachers, and statements made by individual teachers.

Newsletters and a memo from the school administration requested
teacher participation in curriculum and in staff development activities. Teachers were actively encouraged to join one of the school’s four action teams which were organized to construct and revise the strategic plan and included curriculum and instruction and staff development issues. Statements made by several teachers also evidenced their involvement and participation in decision making in staff development and on curriculum committees. Teacher One stated, "I am on the staff development committee which is made up of teachers. We are allowed to plan and run in-service programs that will be given." Teacher Four described involvement in staff development stating, "We have action groups. We have met several times over the past several years. We come up with suggestions for activities." In discussing participation in curriculum activities Teacher Two stated, "Together we came up with FAMS curriculum that this school would follow. We recruited our students and worked on trying to schedule them in classes. We will go with FAMS next year." Teacher Three described involvement in curriculum activities stating, "...we worked on team teaching....What they learn in science is reinforced in geography. Working together as a team has really helped curriculum."

In summary, shared decision activities were operational because the division superintendent mandated the implementation and because the building principal believed in the concept and attempted to extend shared
decision making opportunities to the entire staff.
CHAPTER V

ANSWERS TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS, REFLECTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter was to answer the two research questions concerning the operation of shared decision making at the subject school while constructing an overview of the practices in operation. From the identified practices, the researcher made recommendations which were consistent with the conclusions.

How was shared decision making operating at the school under study, and why was it operating as it was?

There was no organized shared decision making model in place; shared decision making activities were parcelled out by the division superintendent. The building principal, in turn, delegated selected responsibilities to members of the staff. Assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers, Faculty Council members, and Planning Council members were included in shared decision making in certain areas of staff development and curriculum and instruction. Participation in decision making in the area of personnel was limited to the assistant principals and department chairpersons. While department chairpersons were involved in the interview process, their role in the selection process was in an advisory capacity. The role of assistant principals in financial decisions was limited.
by the responsibilities assigned to each. Department chairpersons were
delegated the responsibility of managing departmental funds and could
include teachers in that process.

Shared decision making practices were operating at the subject school
as a result of a mandate by the division superintendent and the principal’s
resolution to implement the mandate; however, the mandate for shared
decision making was devoid of any systematic, structured strategy.
Although activities in shared decision making were evident, there were no
data which provided a description of or program for implementation. The
lack of a description, preamble, goals, and objectives for implementation of
shared decision making meant that the implementation was not sufficiently
considered.

Reflections

The directive to implement shared decision making was unclear and
caused confusion among central office departments and within the subject
school because there were no delineated or established parameters. The
division superintendent was directed by the school board to decentralize the
school system. The division superintendent decentralized the school system
by the implementation of site based/shared decision making in the schools.
Responsibilities for staff development and developing curriculum and were
transferred to the school as central office was down-sized.
While an initiative to implement shared decision making practices was evident, no organized model was presented. Data indicated that the implementation of shared decision making was a secondary goal to decentralization.

Shared decision making was never fully developed by the school system or the school under study. While the division superintendent mandated the establishment of the Faculty Council and Planning Council as vehicles to implement shared decision making activities, his motive was not to institute a shared decision making model but to find a means and method for reducing the number and responsibility of central office staff.

The building principal perceived shared decision making as any attempt to include staff members in decisions in which they previously had not been included. Consequently, attempts to include the assistant principals and department chairpersons in the interview and selection process, department chairpersons in management of departmental budgets, and teachers in the spending of the $10,000 of instructional money were viewed by the principal as shared decision making practices. In essence, the principal delegated decision-making authority to stakeholder groups in areas in which they previously had not been involved.

The principal and assistant principals participated in shared decision making activities with the two school councils, Faculty Council and Planning
Council, in deciding school climate issues and strategies for strategic planning.

The ambiguous way in which shared decision making was practiced caused apprehension among central office personnel, especially in interaction with the subject school. Statements made by several central office staff members described the confusion and disorganization they observed. The director of one of the major departments who opined that the model was implemented in name only stated, "I believe people at the top have to believe in it. They have to live it. If you have a leader who espouses it but does not exercise...it, it becomes nothing but a slogan."

The Assistant Superintendent of Finance also characterized shared decision making as inconsistent. He stated, "There is no one pat plan for it [shared decision making]." In essence, building principals were permitted to construct their own models for shared decision making, according to their perceptions, initiatives, and confidence in the concept and in their willingness to relinquish decision making authority to their staffs.

The Assistant Superintendent of Instruction described the same perception of disorganization in explaining his department's new relationship with the local schools. He stated, "Right now the relationship [with local schools] has been very loose. It depends upon the principal and whether that person wants guidance, input, or suggestion." He further stated that
the model was "...inconsistent and erratic. I think in some schools it is implemented in name only."

The uncertainty and inconsistency of the shared decision making mandate filtered down to the local schools in the form of an unpredictable working relationship with the central office departments. Despite this inconsistency, the principal of the subject school attempted to implement and extend the model he perceived was required.

Two requirements of the superintendent's mandate for shared decision making were implemented at the subject school. The Faculty Council and the Planning Council were organizations in which teachers and community members had a voice in school decisions.

The building principal attempted to extend shared decision making opportunities beyond the two required councils and included department chairpersons in decision making opportunities in personnel and finance. In an attempt to further extend shared decision making, the principal included teachers and faculty council in the area of school finance, specifically in the distribution among the school departments of an allocated $10,000 in excess instructional monies.

The authority of the building principal appeared autonomous in extending shared decision making at the subject school. In reviewing data of shared decision making at the subject school, little or no consistency was
found in stakeholder involvement within the four administrative areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction.

Stakeholder involvement in personnel and financial decisions varied according to the level of authority. Assistant principals and department chairpersons were the only stakeholders permitted to participate in personnel decisions, although teachers who coached a sport were entrusted to hire coaches for vacancies. The same opportunity was not afforded teachers when teaching vacancies occurred. In fact, statements made by Department Chairpersons One and Four implied that the school’s administration actively attempted to omit teachers from that process.

The inconsistency of stakeholder involvement in financial decisions was evident among assistant principals, teachers, and Faculty Council members. Statements by members of each group indicated the lack of a systematic approach when making financial decisions. Assistant Principal One indicated no involvement in financial decisions, while Assistant Principal Two described responsibilities for management of a grant awarded the school. Of the six teachers who were interviewed, all described different levels of involvement in financial decision making, from moderate involvement to no involvement.

The two areas of school finance in which the school administration allowed stakeholder participation were in the distribution of instructional
funds to department chairpersons and in the allocation of extra instructional funds to the Faculty Council for distribution.

Each department chairperson was responsible for the management of the department's financial budget; each was encouraged to solicit his department's input. However, statements made by at least one department chairperson indicated that this decision was not mandatory; decisions could and were made without input of the department. Teacher involvement in departmental financial decisions depended upon the willingness of the department chairperson to share financial responsibility and in his confidence in the ability of the department to help make decisions.

The one-time allocation of $10,000 to the Faculty Council was an attempt by the building administration to extend shared decision making in school finance to the entire staff. While the effort was notable, no further opportunities for staff involvement occurred.

The two administrative areas which reflected unlimited staff involvement were staff development and curriculum and instruction. These two areas were recommended by the division superintendent in his shared decision making proposal as domains for individual schools to investigate in their study of school improvement. Interviews and documentation indicated the school's administration attempted to involve stakeholders in the two areas. Stakeholders were included on staff development and curriculum and
instruction action teams, and each stakeholder group was represented. Minutes of meetings and memos from action committees indicated that school administrators, department chairpersons, teachers, Faculty Council members, and Planning Council members were involved in staff development and curriculum and instruction decisions.

Regular meetings were held, agendas were provided, and representatives from each stakeholder group met with their action teams to discuss school issues in staff development and curriculum and instruction. Decisions made by the groups were written into objectives and strategies, placed in the strategic plan, and then implemented into the operation of the school. Administrative support for participation in the two areas was evidenced by repeated requests for involvement in the school’s newsletter and an individual memo sent to staff members by the building principal requesting involvement. Interviews of a cross section of stakeholders indicated that participation in decision making in staff development and curriculum and instruction had been more readily achieved than in the areas of school personnel and financial decision making.

The researcher, the principal of the subject school, was hired with the understanding that shared decision making would be implemented at the site. With this objective in mind for all schools, the division superintendent required a week-long in-service activity of all building principals for the
purpose of understanding the concept and implementation of shared decision making. However, there was no discussion or direction for implementation and no parameters were established. It was left to the ingenuity of each principal to implement this initiative.

Although the building principal did not fully understand the total concept of shared decision making, he attempted to implement activities beyond the basic requirements by delegating decision making authority to the different stakeholder groups. The most comprehensive decision making authority was delegated by the principal to his assistant principals. The assistant principals were empowered to make decisions that they had not been previously permitted to make. Each assistant principal interviewed indicated high involvement in decision making authority in all areas addressed except finance.

The transfer and sharing of decision making authority to assistant principals in the areas of school programs and operations resulted in the perception of a transfer of or reduction of the principal’s authority. The principal recognized this perceived loss of power; staff members who had previously confided in and discussed problems with him now sought the advice and support of the assistant principals.

Limitations created by this research occurred in two areas: 1. The researcher who was principal of the school had pre-conceived ideas of how
shared decisions making was operating, consequently, his perception of data could have been skewed and 2. some stakeholders interviewed provided answers they thought were expected.

In summary, shared decision making was practiced at the subject school in the four areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. Participation was selective and limited in the areas of personnel and finance but was inclusive of all stakeholder groups in the areas of staff development and curriculum and instruction.

Recommendations

Evidence collected and conclusions drawn detailed the need for improvements in shared decision making at the school under study. The following recommendations were meant to provide for improvements of the existing shared decision making practices at the school.

Recommendation 1: Develop a rationale for stakeholder participation in shared decision in the administrative areas of personnel, finance, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. Identify each stakeholder group, the scope of expected stakeholder involvement, the areas of stakeholder involvement, and limitations for stakeholder involvement in each area.

Recommendation 2: Involve representative members of all stakeholder groups--assistant principals, department chairpersons, teachers,
Faculty Council members, and parent members of the Planning Council—to determine further areas for involvement in shared decision making practices. Involve stakeholders in establishing parameters for shared decisions to provide a clearer understanding of each group’s role in the process. Stakeholders should be aware of activities and processes not previously involved in but in which they would like to have been involved.

**Recommendation 3:** Extend shared decision making to teachers in the area of personnel by including qualified teachers in the interview and selection process. Teachers should have a voice in the selection of applicants for vacancies within their departments. Teachers should be used as resources, offering knowledge and insight into working conditions and departmental needs.

**Recommendation 4:** Extend shared decision making in school finance to assistant principals, department chairpersons, and teachers. The three stakeholder groups work directly with departmental budgets and each other and know the financial needs and requirements of their departments.

**Recommendation 5:** Educate and prepare building administrators to understand the possible emotional effects of delegating power and authority to the different stakeholder groups. Principals may resent the perceived loss of power and authority and react negatively to the change in administrative roles.
**Recommendation 6:** Provide initial and on-going training for central office staff members as well as building principals on the implementation of the shared decision making model and the responsibilities of each department and its relationship and responsibilities to the local schools in that model.

**Recommendation 7:** Develop a system-wide task force to study each individual school’s shared decision making models as well as central office participation monitoring practices and make suggestions for continual improvement.

**Recommendations for Further Study.**

**Recommendation 1:** Study the role of the building principal in shared decision making. One of the most critical components of successful implementation of the shared decision making process is the building principal. Because the building principal was the researcher in this study, his role was not investigated.

**Recommendation 2:** Compare models of shared decision making to determine why the process may work in one model and not in another. This is important because each model has a different goal, affecting different stakeholder groups and the types of decisions made.

**Recommendation 3:** Conduct a comprehensive study of a primary stakeholder group, such as teachers or parents, to determine what role they
do play and what role they can play. Parents and teachers are two of the largest stakeholder groups directly affecting a child’s education and, in this study, are the least involved stakeholder groups in the decision making process.

**Recommendation 4:** Study the roles and responsibilities of central office departments in shared decision making models. Most decision making is top-down, and an inclusive shared decision making model would necessitate the knowledge and participation of central office departments.

**Recommendation 5:** Compare stakeholder groups in schools implementing shared decision making practices with those utilizing traditional decision making. Successful stakeholder-inclusion models such as shared decision making readily cite staff satisfaction and improved school climate as the direct result of implementation of these inclusive shared decision making concepts. Is there a difference—does shared decision making have an impact on student test scores—does shared decision making have an impact on democracy in the running of schools?
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APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

Parents, Teachers, and Faculty Council

1. What can you tell me about decision making in this school?

2. How have you been involved in decision making in this school?

3. How have you been involved in decision making in personnel matters?
   (cue: recruitment, selection, and assignment of teachers)

4. How have you been involved in decision making in financial matters?
   (cue: allocation and distribution of funds)

5. How have you been involved in decision making in staff development matters?
   (cue: defining, implementing, and presenting activities)

6. How have you been involved in decisions concerning curriculum and instruction.
   (cue: in student achievement, resource allocation, and curriculum revision)

7. Would you like to be more involved in the decision making process? If so, how?

8. Are there areas in the operation of this school in which you think decision making should be solely the prerogative of the administration? Of the professional staff? Of the classified staff?
9. Are there areas in the operation of the school in which decision making should be shared? Who should share in this decision making?

10. Has decision making changed in the last year? If so, How?
Interview Questions

Administrators and Department Chairpersons

1. What can you tell me about decision making in this school?

2. How have you been involved in decision making in this school?

3. How have you been involved in decision making in personnel matters?
   (cue: recruitment, selection, and assignment of teachers)

4. How are teachers involved in decisions concerning personnel matters?
   (cue: recruitment, selection, and assignment of teachers)

5. How have you been involved in decisions concerning financial matters?
   (cue: allocation and distribution of funds)

6. How are teachers involved in decisions concerning financial matters?
   (cue: allocation and distribution of funds)

7. How have you been involved in decision making in staff development?
   (cue: defining, implementing, and presenting activities)

8. How are teachers involved in decisions concerning staff development?
   (cue: in defining, implementing, and presenting activities)

9. How have you been involved in decisions concerning curriculum and instruction?
   (cue: in student achievement, resource allocation, and revision of curriculum)
10. Would you like to be more involved in the decision making process. If so, how?

11. Are there areas in the operation of the school in which you think decision making should be solely the prerogative of the administration? Of the professional staff? Of the classified staff?

12. Are there areas in the operation of the school in which decisions should be shared? Who would share in this decision making?

13. Has decision making changed in the last year? If so, how?
Interview Questions

Central Office

1. What is the purpose of your department or organization?

2. What is your relationship to the local schools?

3. How has this relationship changed since 1992?
   (cue: "since restructuring").
   (cue: in financing programs?)
   (cue: in staff development?)
   (cue: in curriculum and instruction?)
   (cue: in personnel matters?)

4. What decisions in your area of responsibility are left to the school site?
What decisions are directed centrally? Explain the reasons for each.

5. What is your perception of shared decision making as it is implemented?

6. What is your knowledge of shared decision making at the subject school?
   (cue: teacher involvement)
   (cue: responsibility for decisions)

7. Has decision making changed in the last year? If so, how?
APPENDIX B

Forms
Contact Summary Form

Sample

Contact type: Site: ____________

Visit: ____________ Contact person: ____________

Phone: ____________ Contact date: ____________

Today’s date: ____________

Written by:

1. What were the main issues or themes in this contact?

2. Summary of information on each of the target questions for this contact.
Document Summary Form

Sample

Site:______________

Document:__________

Date acquired:_______

Today’s date:________

1. Name or description of document:

2. Event or contact, if any, with which document is associated:

3. Significance or importance of document:

4. Brief summary of contents:
APPENDIX C

Participant-by-Involvement

Matrices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Purpose of department</th>
<th>Relationship to local school</th>
<th>Change in relationship since 1992</th>
<th>Decisions in your area you make, school makes</th>
<th>Perception of shared decision making</th>
<th>Knowledge of shared decision making at subject school</th>
<th>Change in decision making since July 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
<td>&quot;...recruitment and staffing of teachers, ensuring salaries are correct, and records are kept properly.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...be sure there is a large enough applicant pool.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...the people at the top have to believe in it. They have to live it themselves. If you have a leader who espouses it but does not exercise...it becomes nothing but a slogan.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I would say the ultimate decision for staffing does fall at the school site...so the principal would have that opportunity to make the final selection. Problems within the total district that necessitate moving a teacher means a principal will not get a choice...there are times when the overall needs of the school system override the site.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I believe the principals feel a greater freedom to involve staff in a selection. You are going to find a great disparity because they have the right to make decisions.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I would have to say I have never seen more creativity. The principals are striving to implement some of these creative ideas. I see much more staff involvement in decisions at the school level.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;While I still see a collegial approach to decision making, the principal will be held more accountable for decisions. You won't see an applause meter on the wall and make decisions on who is screaming the loudest.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Purpose of department</td>
<td>Relationship to local school</td>
<td>Change in relationship since 1992</td>
<td>Decisions in your area you make; school makes</td>
<td>Perception of shared decision making</td>
<td>Knowledge of shared decision making at subject school</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Finance</td>
<td>&quot;...responsible for system wide budget development, finance, payroll, purchasing, transportation, food services, operations, and capital improvement.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...principals have been given at least the right to make more decisions concerning financing... the right to have more involvement....&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Prior to 1992, the principals had somewhat limited involvement at best, input in the finances. While they did have some freedom to spend some limited funds...they were not given the flexibility of how they wanted to direct those funds.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...central office is responsible for budget development, finance, payroll, purchasing, transportation, food services, and capital improvement.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...there are limitations placed upon principals... they have to comply with state regulations as well as school board regulations.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The buck stops with the principals. I don’t think the principal can abrogate certain responsibilities.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I quite frankly feel we need to give the money to principals and at the end of the year see how they have managed their resources.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Purpose of department</td>
<td>Relationship to local school</td>
<td>Change in relationship since 1982</td>
<td>Decisions in your area you make: school makes</td>
<td>Perception of shared decision making</td>
<td>Knowledge of shared decision making at subject school</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent Curriculum Instruction</td>
<td>&quot;...is to develop curriculum for the school division, kindergarten through twelfth grade, in all subject areas and then to identify materials and resources to help teachers deliver that curriculum.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Right now the relationship has been very loose. It depends upon the principal and whether or not that person wants guidance, input, or suggestions.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;One of the major changes has been in the area of staff development and curriculum development.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We are still taking objectives to the board for approval... still pretty much the framework of the curriculum.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;My perception of shared decision making is it is inconsistent and erratic. I think in some schools it is implemented in name only. They have councils but principals are calling the shots. I think one of the difficulties we have is there are never any parameters. Some elementary schools started team teaching in the primary grades. Some started cross-level teaching in primary grades.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Relying on my knowledge, teachers are actively involved and feel a part of the decision making at subject school. The caution I would add is that teachers I have talked with about it are master teachers and teacher leaders, so I am not sure if this is universal. I would say, based on what I know, the teachers that wish to get involved are involved.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think the changes are slow and subtle. The interim superintendent had a style that was more structured. I think he brought that structure by the way he worked with the principals, and they in turn brought that structure by the way they worked in their facilities. I also think that with new leadership there was more clarity in certain policies and regulations. We began to develop an awareness of things we could not change. I think that had that continued, probably we would have had parameters.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Purpose of department</td>
<td>Relationship to local school</td>
<td>Change in relationship since 1992</td>
<td>Decisions in your area you make: school makes</td>
<td>Perception of shared decision making</td>
<td>Knowledge of shared decision making at subject school</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Research and Planning</td>
<td>&quot;My office has two major divisions. One is administrative--we are responsible for demographic projections, boundary zones, census, and those kinds of administrative numerical issues. We also have an instructional side in which we handle testing, assessments, program evaluation, program audit, and teacher planning.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We have a directive kind of responsibility when we are implementing state directives, like in the testing program specifically. We have a supportive role in helping schools implement the testing program and test improvement plan and helping to support strategic planning.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We are much more of a support role than we were before. Prior to 1992 this office was much more involved with the superintendent and school board related issues. Since 1992, our office was working individually with schools to implement their own individual strategic plan.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The school site has had increasing flexibility to implement 'every initiative. We try to give clear direction as to what needs to happen and when it needs to happen.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think largely that shared decision making has been very effective. A lot of schools allowed too much controversy at the beginning...and got themselves involved into too many issues that were not appropriate for shared decision making....&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I know the [subject school] has appeared to have a very easy time of it, probably because of careful planning at the beginning.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...we've put a halt to the central office strategic planning. The school board was in such disarray.... Some of the principals that were not in favor of shared decision making have openly reverted to traditional decision making.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal 1</td>
<td>&quot;I feel I have an opportunity to share in every decision [at subject school]. Our teachers, if they choose to participate in shared decision making, they do so.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I feel I am involved in every decision. My input is considered in everything; it is valued. I am trusted to make decisions the principal normally makes.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;This summer in the absence of the principal another administrator and I conducted all interviews. I had department chairpersons involved in all interviews and generally another administrator who shared that decision making with me.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I don't make those decisions any more. At the direction of the audit, the principal became more accountable for the budget. In departmental funds there is really little involvement unless they wish to request more funds. The administrative team sets the amount and the departments work with that.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...I am involved because I monitor the blueprint of the strategic plan. One of our primary areas for improvement in the strategic plan is staff development.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;One of my responsibilities is to administer and supervise all the department chairpersons. In that capacity many of the issues and responsibilities that we discuss and decide are curriculum issues. Grading, lesson plans, and testing are just a few categories that we discuss.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;As an administrator, I feel I have an opportunity to share with the principal every decision at subject school.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal 2</td>
<td>&quot;...The principal allows people in this school to make decisions. Teachers are allowed to bring concerns to the faculty council. The faculty council deals with teacher concerns about working conditions.&quot; &quot;There are certain decisions the principal is going to make. We had a bomb in this school. Decisions were made fast; get the police over here.&quot; &quot;...things that involve safety of the students, safety of the teachers are made by the principal.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I am part of the administrative team. The principal listens to what I have to say. He doesn't always take my advice, but he certainly does listen...&quot; &quot;He gets us together. Most of the time it is done very informally. We get a note in the mail box. [Come and talk to me about this, talk to me about that.]&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;From the ground floor up, as soon as the list for involuntary transfers came out, the other assistant principal and I had already sat down and figured out how many teachers we needed.&quot; &quot;We called teachers at home and tried to get the best teachers. Most of the hiring was done in June before I left.&quot; &quot;Selection of personnel is done by consensus. The principal, another assistant, and myself interviewed this one particular person. The assistant and I felt very strongly about one prospect for the job but also felt strongly about minority recruitment. I don't want to say we overruled the principal...it was a consensus.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I am allowed to spend money, but I always clear it through him! We have a federal grant in this building. I have complete authority to work with this grant. I know how much money is in there and have authority to spend it.&quot; &quot;Last year the principal took $10,000. He met with faculty council because everything is conducted through faculty council. They decided where the money was going to go, how it was going to be spent and the teachers had input...&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We have a committee here that deals with staff development from the school Planning Council. We had a dictate from the Planning Council—a mandate from the top down to work on reading to learn strategies.&quot; &quot;There was this one woman teacher who is very ethnic and she was in my office. I asked her to recommend a speaker. This woman jumped up and said, 'You have to get this man.' Well I'm going to tell you I have no regret in having him.&quot; &quot;Teachers can join an action team. They can have input.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I was a part of the rigorous studies program at [subject school]. That program better organized our academic classes and provided for a much better structure for our kids in progressing through all the academic classes.&quot; &quot;Teachers were every bit a part of discussing academic needs and offerings concerning rigorous studies. In fact, one of the teachers, Mr.[name of teacher] chaired the group and was mostly responsible for getting everything together and to the school board for approval.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...the principal allows people...to make decisions. There are certain decisions the principal is going to make. Things that involve safety of students, safety of teachers are made by the principal.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum, instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson 1</td>
<td>&quot;Decision making in subject school has been shared among different people such as department chairmen and also different committees, like the block scheduling committee....&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have been involved in decisions concerning teachers in my department. Also other decisions concerning the budget and so forth.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;So far in my department we have been allotted a certain amount money. I have not disputed that. I have just accepted the amount of the departmental allocation that we have been assigned.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, over the years I have involved teachers of the department with in-service activities, updating, and training for students on their jobs....&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We have encouraged our department to join in on some of these curriculum committees such as text book adoption so they can be part of the decision making process.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think that the main decisions that the principal needs to keep to himself are personnel matters.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;No. Professional staff should not solely make decisions. I think there needs to be a dialogue between the administration and teachers. &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Department Chairperson 2 | "It seems like there is priority given to soliciting a lot of feedback from the general staff before a decision is made." | "I have been on several committees that are head committees to make some decisions. My opinion has been one of many that has been solicited to decide policy...." | "I was on the selection committee when the interviews were made for vacant staff positions within my department. In the case of my department, the recommendations made were specifically adhered to." | "I am given a budget. It is my total discretion how to spend the budget."
"I think there is small opportunity for teacher input on financial matters." | "I have not taken the opportunity to be more involved."
"I think it is wide open for teacher involvement to make suggestions and what their needs and interest would be." | "I have been pretty instrumental in my department giving directions. I would say I am pretty involved in that." | "[The school administration is responsible for]....Setting guidelines from which the staff would function."
"[Teachers are responsible for]...Implementation of the policy. Such as the specific way the curriculum should be taught in the classroom once given the guidelines to follow." | "I do not think decision making has changed since July 1996. In the last two or three years I think it is a lot more input because of the site based approach." |
### TABLE 14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Concept of decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in personnel decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in financial decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in staff development decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</th>
<th>Responsibility for decision making</th>
<th>Change in decision making since July 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Department Chairperson 3 | "Well, they have delegated a lot of it to the individual department chairs who then can, if they choose, delegate it to their members. Some of it can be delegated and some of it can't."
|              | "As a department chair we are often asked to give our input to questions or decisions that are about to be made so that we have an input as to how it will affect the various departments."
|              | "The only involvement is if I have a requirement for a teacher when they come into the department. I assign them particular classes. Other than that I have no involvement."
|              | "I think teachers are given the opportunity. Whether they take advantage of it, I have no idea."
|              | "Generally we are told how much we are to be given and from there it is up to us to allocate it to our own department. If we feel that we don't have enough we can go and ask for an increase. If there happens to be a cut we are told there will be a cut and for what reasons."
|              | "I think a majority of teachers involved in financial matters is through their departments. Once in a great while there may be something that involves the whole staff where they are polled through a survey, probably through faculty council."
|              | "Well, we are asked what we would like to have. Certainly anybody that is interested in giving a presentation has been afforded the opportunity as long as it is pertinent to the matter under discussion."
|              | [Teacher involvement in staff development]
|              | "From time to time there are notices put out that there would be meetings and teachers are asked if there is anything that they would like to present and are afforded the opportunity to."
|              | "Generally the curriculum and resource allocation is handled through our supervisors through central administration more so than building wide. That is where most of my involvement is. It is in citywide projects instead of a building project."
|              | "I think the administration should always ask for input but there are some things the administrator has to make the decision on. Teacher staffing would be one thing."
|              | "If they are going to make the professional staff responsible, yes. Otherwise, as long as the building principal is the ultimate responsibility, then they cannot have sole responsibility to the staff."
|              | "Certainly there would be some areas where the cafeteria workers, custodians, and secretaries would be involved... Those are their areas of expertise."
|              | "I don't see any great change in it. It has been about the same since they started shared decision making."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Concept of decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in personnel decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in financial decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in staff development decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in curriculum/ instruction decisions</th>
<th>Responsibility for decision making</th>
<th>Change in decision making since July 1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson 4</td>
<td>&quot;...shared decision making is used here quite a bit...through faculty council and a very open administration.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Any concerns that I have had I felt very open to give them to faculty council in written form. We have an open door policy with the administration here so I have been able to discuss some concerns of mine with them.&quot;</td>
<td>The first year I was chosen as department chair, I was asked to sit in on several interviews of a teacher. Some decisions were made this past summer that I was not in on, and I did not know exactly what was going on within my department. I should have been advised to what was going on in my own department. Other than that, I have been asked about certain things in my department. &quot;I don't feel that teachers in general are brought into personnel matters. I think it is more a departmental thing and an administrative decision as far as personnel matters are concerned.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Each department chair is asked to give a budget for the next year. We discuss these matters with our department and find out their needs financially. Then the budgets are given to the administration, and the administration makes the decision as to where the monies are allocated. Then we have some say as far as negotiations. Most of the time it is a give and take situation.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I personally have not been involved with staff development. I could be, I guess, if I wanted to be. I have been on several of the various committees. I have worked on the action team.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have not been involved in curriculum matters in quite some time. Once upon a time I was on a curriculum committee...but I have not been a part of that as such.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think it is up to every teacher to decide how much they want to be involved, and if they are not involved, they need to understand that the majority rules. If a teacher sits back and does not do anything and then does not like the decision, it is up to that teacher to get involved.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I don't think anything has changed. I have become a little more vocal this year with a couple of things that I was concerned about. Some of the things I was concerned about changed and some did not...The process has not changed much.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>&quot;I feel like the principal controls decision making in this school. The principal decides what he wants. He gives us an opportunity to make suggestions on it. Some times it does not seem like suggestions are accepted. He pretty much has an idea what he wants to be done and that is pretty much what we do.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Several times we have been asked for input. But for the most part, we get things handed down to us.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;There has been some change in our department about different courses that would be taught. We were able to have our input in that and how we would like things to change. Pretty much those suggestions were accepted. But for the most part personnel matters are not discussed with the teachers.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We had a committee that was available to use extra funds that we were suppose to get. Several teachers were allowed to volunteer for that committee. I was one of those volunteers. The funds never came through. That was the only thing teachers have been involved in concerning financial decisions. Principals determine how much money is allocated. Teachers do not have any input.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I am on the staff development committee which is made up of teachers. We are allowed to plan and run in-service programs that will be given. In that respect I feel like that is where teachers have the most input. We can decide what topics will be covered, how long the program will be, and when they will be.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;[Teachers should be responsible for day to day decisions in their room] There is nothing that should be solely the decision of the principal.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I do not think there should be anything the principal should have the sole decision making of except in emergencies.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I do not feel any group should be completely on their own.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"At the beginning, we were sort of under a dictatorship because we did not want anyone to feel like no one was in actual control. And then the reigns were loosened a little bit, and we began more shared decision making. People felt like they had a little more input. Actually since last year I would say it has not changed. It has stayed about the same."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Concept of decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in personnel decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in financial decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in staff development decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</th>
<th>Responsibility for decision making</th>
<th>Change in decision making since July 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>&quot;Sometimes I think decision making is very slow. For instance, the Tech Prep movement could have happened a little faster if it would have been told to us that we needed it. I am not always an advocate of shared decision making in all situations. Maybe not drag our feet too much.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I presently am serving on the FAMS Committee as well as the High Schools That Work Committee. I also serve on the Rigorous Studies Committee.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have not been involved.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We would like to be more in charge of the spending for the High Schools That Work program, however, we have not been given that privilege.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Basically we have been given surveys that ask our input. I do not think I have had much input in on that. If there is an in-service, I go to it.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Together we came up with FAMS curriculum that this school would follow. We recruited our students and worked on trying to schedule them in classes. We will go with FAMS next year.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I believe decisions should be made by the administration solely when it is in the best interest of the school. The staff should deal with decisions involving school climate, safe schools, and some minor disciplinary matters.....&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The custodial staff should make decisions concerning them such as tasks of work, etc....&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>&quot;From my point of view and especially working in the program I work in, we are able to come up with a lot of ideas and toss those around. We are able to make a lot of decisions from the ideas we come up with. It is sort of empowering to know you have that kind of effect on what is going on with your teaching.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;With the School Within a School, setting up the program and how the program runs from year to year are decisions that are really up to the teachers and administrators. Last year we even asked students for some input. I guess with School Within a School teachers get to share in the decision making.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I haven't been involved.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;With School Within a School, our department chair let's us decide if we want to use the money on a project or do we want to use the money for other things....&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I can't say I have been involved in any decisions concerning staff development.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Especially with the School Within a School, in curriculum we worked on team teaching. We did that last year and will do it again this year. What they learn in science is reinforced in geography. Working together as a team has really helped on the curriculum.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think we are all here to work together so we need input from a lot of different areas.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think decision making should be shared among the whole staff. I think some areas are limited and everyone does not need to decide on the type of meals we have or who cleans what rooms, but for the most part I think it should be shared.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 4   | "Not a whole lot. I am not actively involved with the decisions made. I tend to concur with whatever comes down." | "We have questionnaires. We always have the option to drop notes off with administrators or with faculty council." | "I have been involved in hiring the assistant coaches. Strictly extra curriculum, no curriculum involvement." | "I have not been involved in it at all." | "We have action groups. We have met several times over the past several years. We come up with suggestions for activities. In terms of implementation, I have not been involved." | "I have had the option to be involved on curriculum committees. However, I have not elected to become involved in that aspect...." | "I am quite happy with my limited role of involvement."
  "I think everybody should be involved in decision making in some way."
  "I can't think of any area that should be left to professionals alone."
  "Almost anything happening in this school should be a shared decision. Allocation of funds, classroom management, administrative decisions.....If it affects everyone in the building, then everyone should have a voice...." | "Not that I have noticed." |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Concept of decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in personnel decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in financial decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in staff development decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</th>
<th>Responsibility for decision making</th>
<th>Change in decision making since July 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>&quot;My principal does ask me about my opinion about certain situations and about teachers and coaches sometimes before they are hired and how they are working out in school.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;By my opinion being asked if a person is qualified to coach or teach. In my department my department chairperson asks for my opinion about certain situations. So I feel I am involved in decision making.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;My advice has been asked of when particularly coaches were being hired and teachers in my department.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;My department chairperson asked how money should be spent in my department.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I haven't been.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I haven't.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I would like to be more involved in the area of scheduling....I would like to be involved in master scheduling as far as the number of classes that are involved together in physical education. Maybe even change the structure where we have one week of PE and one week of health.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Administrators should make decisions in emergency situations.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>&quot;I don't know if there really is any.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I haven't.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not at all.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not at all.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not at all.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I would like to be involved, but I don't see that happening.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think everything has always been the prerogative of the administration in this school.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think everything has always been the prerogative of the administration in this school.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum, instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council 1</td>
<td>&quot;We use the process of shared decision making through faculty council.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I am involved in faculty council, and we have been allowed to vote on issues that have been brought to us. In addition to this, when I was not a member of faculty council, I always had the opportunity to address any concerns, putting them in front of the previous faculty councils.&quot;</td>
<td>I have not been involved in that process whatsoever.</td>
<td>&quot;Faculty council has been used to voting where extra funds should be distributed. In addition, we have been allowed within our departments to decide where we would like funds to be spent. We usually go with the majority consensus.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Being a member of the Staff Development Action Team, I have probably been more involved in it than most faculty members. However, our choices of topics have been limited. I feel that the administration has decided on certain topics they want addressed; ... therefore, that is what we do address.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have been involved in textbook revision committees, textbook adoption committees which have some bearing on the curriculum. As far as instruction is concerned, I make my own decisions in how I teach.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Administrators can see things in a perspective where teachers may not. They have more information about certain topics. They have more experience.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The process is still the same. We still use the faculty council. I do not think too many people go to faculty council to have their voice heard any longer. In that way I think it has changed...I think people have become a little bit gun shy. They are afraid of retribution.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council 2</td>
<td>&quot;[Subject school] has had a good faculty council and administration that has been supportive of decision making. Generally it has been open and willing to share decisions.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I was on faculty council. I know firsthand of what decisions we helped make and ones we didn't.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not much in personnel. I suppose in assisting with teacher assignments in the department. Who will teach what grade levels and that sort of thing. I have been involved in some of the interviewing and recruiting.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We have a budget within the department. We have been able to select and make our priorities within the department so we can order ahead what we want. Within the department we have a lot of input in the budget.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...I was on the Staff Development Action Team. We worked on in-services and so on.&quot;</td>
<td>I haven't done so much there with curriculum, instruction. We have adopted new textbooks, and we are waiting for downtown to approve it.</td>
<td>&quot;I think administrators should... make decisions that teachers are not equipped to make or do not have the information needed to make the decision.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think building administrators need to handle all personnel issues within the building and reprimands.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Faculty Council 3 | "There is a process available. We have a faculty council, and we have department chairs. Topics are brought before these committees for their input." | "I have been involved in faculty council and am a department chair as well. My input has been asked for in various occasions. I have made my position known."
| "...in my department usually I am asked to sit in on an interview with a prospective teacher, and after the interview my input is asked for. I give my opinion."
| "Again as a department chair we are given a budget, and I am involved in the process of using this money in the department. We go through the budget and decide what information is necessary for the department. It is a departmental decision."
| "Personally I do not think I have been involved to a great extent in this topic."
| "As a teacher in my department we have made several recommendations for course offerings... and some of the suggestions and recommendations have been followed."
| "I am always interested as a teacher to be involved in decisions that directly affect me and my department. One way I would like to be more involved is to spend more time with the principal about course offerings. "The more you can involve the staff in decision making in the areas that affect them, the better school you will have."
| "When a decision is made by a group, someone is unhappy. There are times when I feel the principal should say this is the decision and we will go with it."
| "I do not see any difference in the decision making process in the last year."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Concept of decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in decision making</th>
<th>Involvement in personnel decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in financial decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in staff development decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</th>
<th>Responsibility for decision making</th>
<th>Change in decision making since July 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council 4</td>
<td>&quot;Decisions are sometimes made by administrators, teachers, and sometimes by department heads. Various decisions are made in different ways.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I am on Faculty Council. I have been involved in decision making in the things that come before us, questions and problems that come before council.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have not been involved in any of that.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have not been involved in allocation and distribution of funds.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have worked on the Staff Development Team of Faculty Council and we have worked on bringing in speakers and planning in-service programs....&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have worked on some curriculum committees city-wide....I cannot remember anything specific now. If it came through faculty council within the last year or so, I may have had some input.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think in terms of how we run our classroom and the ways we decide to teach things. I think we should be allowed to use our own judgement on how we go about teaching a class--Not have that determined by an administrator.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I do not think it has changed in the last year. I think we have been doing things in the same way for the last few years since we have had the site-based management.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Member 1</td>
<td>&quot;The decision making in this school in my estimation is primarily a function of how receptive the decision makers are to input in the decision making. I think the school Planning Council is an excellent medium. The faculty and other staff members are very receptive to other members of the Planning Council.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Primarily, my involvement in this school is through the planning action team process. By that process I was initially involved in many activities. I was involved in each of the planning action teams, trying to help each with facilitation of the process itself. Later on I focused on one action team.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Specifically each of the Planning Council members is involved in the entire teacher planning process for the subject school. Part of that process is through the mission statement. In that process specific goals were identified, and I believe specific goals were the recruitment of minority teachers.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Most decisions, as a body, have financial repercussions. When you have strategies to achieve, we take into account what it will cost.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Initially my involvement with staff development matters was in facilitating some of the first action teams. My involvement developed into goals for the Staff Development Team.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I was involved in curriculum development. Last year it was through the AIDS Awareness Club. We worked on a curriculum to be submitted.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think the level of my involvement is about right for myself personally. I think with the atmosphere at the subject school, I could be as involved in decision making as I chose.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I believe decisions need to be made in a timely manner. I think that there are decisions that have to be made on the spot. I think the school is very receptive to input.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Member 2</td>
<td>&quot;Personally, I feel that input has been solicited from me and brought into discussions....I feel very comfortable discussing and interfacing with the principal of [subject school].&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I was on the curriculum committee, and we took a look at several issues that were a part of the strategic plan, specifically SAT scores....As a result, suggestions were sent to the Planning Council. So I feel that I was a part of that whole process.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I think that was a different group. I was in the curriculum group....Curriculum did have a platter full of issues so I was not able to get involved in those other decisions.&quot;</td>
<td>I am familiar with some of the financial matters. As far as being involved in decisions concerning financial matters, no, because I do not think any came up before the strategic planning committee. Strategic planning is more involved with policy and specific steps to obtain those policy objectives. Financial matters were not a part of that process.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I feel that [as a member of the Curriculum Committee, I have a concern in the area of reading, and I submitted it....] After some additional discussions, I was able to be satisfied with my concern. I felt the Planning Council accommodated the input from the parents.&quot;</td>
<td>I was on the Curriculum Committee and saw some of the strategies and objectives....I feel I was involved in decision making in the area of curriculum.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I would like to be more involved. I have gotten a positive response, and that is one of the reasons I have elected to run for the school board. I would like to be more involved in decision making processes. Parents can have good input if they are willing to put in the time.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;There has been an open door policy with me. The principal has had an open door policy with me.....I think there has been a lot of good changes in the high school as a result of the decision making process. Site based management, shared decision making, will be successful if the principal is given the authority to do what is needed for the kids and his staff. We will end up with one of the best schools in the nation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Member 3</td>
<td>&quot;I believe that decision making at this school is decentralized for the most part. Some teachers have the ability to make decisions that affect their classrooms. I also know that the Planning Council has been able to make some decisions school wide in terms of teacher selection, course offerings, and other related decisions.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;As a member of the Planning Council, I have been on action teams that developed and implemented decisions regarding the school.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;There are several decisions that were made by my action team. The one that is most important to me that I can think of right now is when we went to the middle school and looked at their socially promoting students who were not academically prepared for high school.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, as a council member we discussed and developed strategies for hiring minority teachers.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not really involved in financial decisions.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, again as a member of council, we discussed training for staff, professional and custodial staff.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I do remember that multicultural sensitivity training was suggested. In fact we had a guest speaker who is an African American consultant that lectured at school to the staff.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We have looked at placing students in appropriate classes and in courses based on their academic ability. We have also looked at courses that kids would need in terms of tracking students for placement. Not all kids go to college.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Concept of decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Involvement in personnel decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in financial decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in staff development decisions</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum/instruction decisions</td>
<td>Responsibility for decision making</td>
<td>Change in decision making since July 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Member 4</td>
<td>&quot;In my experience as a Planning Council member, some decisions concerning the strategic plan are made jointly with parents, teachers, and administrators.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I have been involved in decisions regarding the strategic plan and as a member of the Communication Action Group, I was personally involved in recommending forms for use of the marque...&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;No.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not to my knowledge.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I did not participate.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;No.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, if I can help the school in any matter, I want to. I am offering myself as a resource to help in anyway I can.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;From where I am standing and looking into the school I can't see any change.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Documents Used as Sources of Data

Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Area of Administration Affected</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Application Forms</td>
<td>Teachers, Office of Human Resources</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Standard form for teacher employment. Identifies teacher demographic information as well as instructional areas of certification and interest. Once completed, form is sent to Office of Human Resources for processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Certification Forms</td>
<td>Teachers, Office of Human Resources</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Standard form for teacher re-certification. Form identifies classes or activities teacher completed for re-certification points. Form is sent and processed by Office of Human Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation Forms</td>
<td>Administrators, Teachers, Office of Human Resources</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Completed teacher observation and evaluation forms. Once completed by the school’s administration, the teacher evaluation form becomes a part of the teacher’s permanent record and is sent to the Office of Human Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Transfer Forms</td>
<td>Teachers, School Administration, Office of Human Resources</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Standardized forms which allow and provide for inter-school transfer of staff. Identifies teacher areas of certification and grade level teaching preference. Also identifies additional duties teacher is willing to undertake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Transfer List</td>
<td>Office of Human Resources, School Administration</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>List sent to all building principals by the Office of Human Resources indicating teachers who are eligible and must be transferred because of overstaffing in their subject areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal Notes</td>
<td>Teachers, Assistant Principal One</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Notes taken by Assistant Principal One of all candidates interviewed for vacant positions at the subject school during the summer of 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Policy 2-44</td>
<td>School Administration, Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>Personnel, Finance, Staff Development, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>School board policy which provided for the position of department chairperson on the high school level and gave building principals authority to assign duties and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Policy 3-51</td>
<td>Office of Administrative Service, Building Principals</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Detailed responsibility for financial decisions at the school site. Identified the building principal as ultimate authority for financial decisions at the local school level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Policy 4-02,62,1.63</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Personnel, Finance, Staff Development, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Described duties and responsibilities of the classroom teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Policy 2-42.1, 2-43.1</td>
<td>Faculty Council, Planning Council</td>
<td>Personnel, Finance, Staff Development, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Provided for both organization (Faculty Council and Planning Council) to be the vehicles for achieving shared decision making at the school level. Described parameters and initiatives each organization was empowered to decide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 18 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal, School's</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual provided by the Office of Administrative Services describing financial duties, responsibilities, and procedures for school principals to follow in handling school funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Subject School's Yearly Allocation Worksheet** |
| **All Stakeholders** |
| **Finance**          |
| Subject school's yearly financial allocation provided by the Office of Administrative Services and designating the distribution of funds into instructional, administrative, staff development, equipment and repair, special education, and library categories. |

| **Memoranda from Faculty Council** |
| **Faculty Council, Principal, Teachers** |
| **Finance**                          |
| Recommendation sent to the principal from the Faculty Council and Faculty Council's Finance Committee identifying priorities in spending the $10,000 allocated by the principal to the council. |

| **Letter of Invitation** |
| **Assistant Principal Two** |
| **Staff Development**      |
| Letter sent by Assistant Principal Two to all local schools inviting them to participate in a multi-cultural awareness staff development activity. |

| **Letter of Confirmation** |
| **Assistant Principal Two** |
| **Staff Development**      |
| Letter sent to the keynote speaker by Assistant Principal Two confirming the speaker's commitment, time, place, and amount of remuneration for staff development program on multi-cultural awareness. |

| **Minutes of Rigorous Studies Meeting** |
| **Assistant Principal Two, Committee of Teachers** |
| **Curriculum and Instruction**          |
| Minutes of meeting which identified a curriculum initiative the school was attempting to implement. Committee was composed of Assistant Principal Two and fifteen teachers. Recommended the re-structuring of the school's academic programs to better prepare those students in the college bound curriculum. |

| **Agendas of Departmental Meetings**    |
| **Assistant Principal One, Department Chairperson** |
| **Curriculum and Instruction**          |
| Agendas prepared by Assistant Principal One of at least three departmental chairperson meetings. Identified grading, classroom observation, lesson plans, and curriculum initiatives. |

| **Samples of Instructional Materials** |
| **Assistant Principal One, Department Chairperson** |
| **Curriculum and Instruction**          |
| Handouts of written materials prepared by Assistant Principal One for distribution at department chairpersons' meetings. Materials included explanation of grading procedures and time lines for turning in grades, teacher observation schedules and procedures, and explanation of new programs and initiatives. |

| **School Newsletter, October 4, 1996.** |
| **All Stakeholders** |
| **Staff Development, Curriculum and Instruction** |
| The school newsletter was prepared by the school's administration and distributed to all staff members. It stated, "Action Team Meetings. Schoolwide Action Team meetings will be held on Thursday, October 5, at 2:15 p.m. Select a committee which interests you and join an Action Team which will allow you to participate in the shared decision making process." |

| **Memoranda from Principal, September 26, 1996.** |
| **Principal, Department Chairperson, Faculty Council, Teachers** |
| **Staff Development, Curriculum and Instruction** |
| Memoranda from the principal to all staff members encouraging staff members to participate in the development of the school's strategic by joining one of four action teams. It stated, "We want you to join in the strategic planning process. Action teams in communication, climate, curriculum and staff development will meet of October 5, 1996." |

| **Superintendent's Proposal for Shared Decision Making** |
| **All Stakeholders** |
| **Personnel, Finance, Staff Development, Curriculum and Instruction** |
| The proposal was submitted to the school board in December of 1991 for review. It mapped out how the school system would be decentralized and authority transferred to the local schools. It stated, "Under site based management, the following two councils should be established at each school: (1) Faculty Council consisting of teachers and the principal of the school and (2) Planning Council (consisting of) teachers, parents, and the principal." |
| School's Faculty Handbook | School's Administration, Department Chairpersons, Faculty Council, Teachers | Personnel, Finance, Staff Development, Curriculum and Instruction | Listed responsibilities for Assistant Principal One, "Department chairpersons, master schedule, senior class, ... and strategic planning." Listed responsibilities for Assistant Principal Two included, "Master schedule, Staff Development Committee, ... and Rigorous Studies Committees."

| School's 1995 Financial Audit | School's Administration | Finance | The subject school's financial audit for the 1994-95 school year detailed methods and procedures for improving the management of money at the school. One suggestion stated, "The principal will approve all expenditures and sign all vouchers and checks."

| School's Strategic Plan | All Stakeholders | Personnel, Finance, Staff Development, Curriculum and Instruction | Orchestrated by Assistant Principal One, the plan provided for identifying short and long range strategies and objectives for school improvement. Identified the Planning Council as the group responsible for managing the plan and also identified the four areas of school improvement: curricula, staff development, communication, and climate. Members of the four action teams were listed.

| Financial Allocation to Departments | School's Administration, Department Chairpersons, Teachers | Finance | Instructional allocations for each department were predetermined by the principal according to the number of students served and specific needs of each department. Allocations were distributed by Assistant Principal One during the August departmental meeting. |
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