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(ABSTRACT)

This study attempts to examine administrative programs
and events in the tenure of Superintendent Dr. Larry D.
Coble, who served the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School
District in North Carolina from 1989-1993. The central focus
of this investigation addresses four basic questions. First,
were the goals set by the superintendent achieved?
Specifically, were his goals of offering new leadership,
providing openness in the administration, ensuring quality
education for a neglected population, and addressing teachers
major concerns achieved? Second, did reorganizing the system
(a) enhance decision-making, and (b) improve students' test
scores? Third, did the superintendent successfully deal with
the controversial issues of (a) site-based management, and
(b) tracking. And fourth, was the superintendent's
interaction with subordinates effective?
An attempt was made to answer the four basic questions of this study as a means of assessing the superintendent's leadership role. This assessment may serve as a log for superintendents and other educators. Further, this study may be used to provide information and cues for bridging the programmatic gaps that can develop during the change from one administration to another.

The research done in the course of this investigation is based on qualitative techniques, which are used to explore objective and subjective factors in Dr. Coble's leadership role. This study has resulted in a narrative that addresses the complexity and daily demands of the superintendent's role. While many of the interviewees had specific information concerning the superintendent's tenure in his position, this information was fragmentary. There was a need to synthesize these fragmented parts in order to arrive at a more holistic view of the superintendent's leadership for the district.

Data for this study came from a variety of sources, including interviews with school board members, the superintendent, principals, and teachers. In addition to interviews, data were obtained from official board minutes, graphic representations of information, tables, news releases, official audits, a questionnaire, personal observations, and the superintendent's own agenda.
This study consists of five chapters: (1) Introduction, (2) Overview of Winston-Salem/Forsyth County, (3) Methodology, (4) The Narration, and (5) Conclusions and Recommendations. An extensive review of the literature concerning leadership and organizations is found in Appendix A.

In summary, the investigation of data shows that the superintendent, in general, was successful in achieving his goals. He was constrained by the school board in founding a special school through his goal of ensuring quality education for the neglected population of students. Also, it was revealed that reorganization did not improve students' test scores and the critical issue of site-based management caused internal management problems. The goal of the elimination of tracking was achieved, and it was discovered that the superintendent was effective in communicating with subordinates.
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PREFACE

This study evolved as a result of the guidance and supervision of a former advisor, the late Dr. Lloyd Andrew. Dr. Andrew, a faculty member in the Educational Administration program area at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, encouraged all of his students to explore one or more facets of leadership. Although at the outset, the goal of this research was not to study leadership per se, the consultations with Dr. Andrew, and his motivation, led to the idea of examining the leadership styles of superintendents in the Winston-Salem/Forsyth School System (WS/FCSS) from 1976-1993. This time table is relevant because the researcher served in the central office in the Winston-Salem/Forsyth School System beginning in 1980 and continuing through 1996.

As the study was outlined, it became apparent that studying the leadership of three superintendents over a seventeen year period was too broad and the material too massive to permit thoughtful analysis. Consideration was, therefore, given to the idea of examining the impact of one superintendent in the hope that such a study would be manageable. Experience in working closely with three superintendents over the past thirteen years, and serving as Personnel Manager of the Elementary Division, placed the writer in an excellent position to examine and explain how a
leader can change an institution. Acquiring this knowledge prompted the writer's decision to undertake the study of Dr. Larry D. Coble, Superintendent of the WS/FCSS, from 1989 to 1993.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This study comprises an examination of administrative programs and events during the tenure of Superintendent Dr. Larry D. Coble, who served the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School District from 1989-1993. Superintendents face very complex challenges, including balancing federal and state guidelines and mandates, school board and community pressures and issues, escalation of racial problems, teenage crime, drugs, and substance abuse, teen violence and pregnancy, child abuse, advancing technology, internal and external conflicts and politics, budget cuts, student achievement, and their own goals and objectives.

Most superintendents come to a system with an agenda, if only in part. Because they are somewhat disadvantaged if there is no record of past history, communicating current information to future administrations can promote knowledge of continuing programs and can expedite the advancement of new programs. Superintendents of Winston-Salem Forsyth County have, in the past, relied on either their own investigations, which consume much valuable time, or on information given to them by their subordinates. In this process, the superintendent runs the risk of receiving mixed, fragmented, or incorrect information.
It is not assumed that the superintendent has to rely solely on packaged historical data prepared for him, but he must, however, understand the inside culture of the organization. According to a study by Deal and Kennedy (1985) the primary but informal means of communication within an organization are found within a hidden hierarchy of power inside the company. Working the network effectively and reliance on inside accounts are also significant to a new superintendent.

Statement of Purpose

This narrative describes the educational scene of one superintendent's administration, offering one account to a future superintendent and thus connecting information between the two. This document has the potential for eliminating the loss of knowledge, providing continuity for worthwhile programs, and allowing incoming superintendents to evaluate past contributions with future developments, thus bridging the gap between two administrations. This study specifically examines the administrative leadership of the superintendent who served the WS/FCSS from 1989-93 (See Figure 12). A primary goal of the study was to provide a narrative that documents the superintendent's contributions and evaluates his effectiveness.
Primary Research Questions

Four primary questions and their related issues provided the framework for conducting this study:

1.Were the goals set by the superintendent for the district, achieved? Specifically, were the goals of: (a) offering new leadership, (b) providing openness in the administration, (c) ensuring quality education for the neglected population of students, and (d) addressing teachers' major concerns, achieved?

2. Were the superintendent's efforts to reorganize the system, successful? Specifically, did reorganization, (a) enhance decision making, and (b) improve test scores?

3. Did the superintendent deal with controversial issues? Specifically, how did the superintendent deal with the issues of (a) site-based management, and (b) tracking?

4. Was the superintendent's interaction effective with his subordinates? Specifically, how did the superintendent deal with crisis events in the areas of: (a) curriculum and instruction (b) exceptional children, (c) support services, (d) elementary personnel, and (e) salaries?

Limitations of the Study

There are limitations that may have affected these findings:
1. Some board members were reluctant to address sensitive issues.

2. The research is limited to the degree to which the superintendent was willing to share what he actually felt.

3. Some administrators could have felt too threatened to respond freely.

4. Local achievement test data were computed differently after 1991-92; therefore, a comparative analysis of scores cannot be made for the four years of the Coble administration: 1989-1993.

5. All research and analyses within this study were conducted by the author, who was herself, a full time employee on the superintendent's central office staff during the years of Dr. Coble's tenure. Her proximity to and involvement in the actions and events described in this study provide both the strength and potential weaknesses of this study.

Definition of Terms

Administrative Subordinates - Administrative personnel employed in the school system whose position directly or indirectly is responsive to the office of the superintendent.
Leadership - The behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal.

Participatory Management - A democratic type of leadership patterned after Ouchi’s organizational leadership called participatory management (Ouchi, 1981).

Qualitative Method - Van Maanen (1983) believed that this method is an umbrella term covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate, and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world.

School Improvement Teams - A committee nominated by the staff/principal under the empowerment of site based management.

School System - Title given to each of the 142 local school districts in North Carolina as determined by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

Site-Based Management - School (as opposed to school system) empowered authority granted by the General Assembly of North Carolina.

Story - The investigated data explaining the four questions on the superintendent’s tenure from May, 1989, to December, 1993.
Superintendent’s Tenure - The superintendent served from 1989-1993.

Organization of the Study

The research study is presented in a five chapter format. Chapter 1 provides the introduction, the purpose of the study, the research questions addressed by the study, limitations of the study, and the definition of terms. Chapter 2 describes the context for the study, specifically, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, and some of the events leading up to Superintendent Coble's appointment. It also includes a description of the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County school district. In Chapter 3, the qualitative methodology by which this research was conducted is described, and the data selection and sources are discussed. These include extant records and documents, and interviews with significant figures during Dr. Coble's administration. This reservoir of communications, information, and audits presented the frame for the questions that generated this study. The middle school division was not discussed because of the magnitude of occurrences that took place in that division. Results of the inquiry into the four research questions dealing with Superintendent Coble's leadership are presented in Chapter 4. The material is presented in a narrative format. Chapter 5 contains conclusions and the author's recommendations for
effective leadership. Appendix A presents a review of the literature concerning leadership and organizations. Appendix B contains the sources for the four research questions. Appendix C illustrates figures supporting the study. Appendix D presents tables developed from the superintendent’s questionnaire and Appendix E contains the questions asked of principals during Dr. Coble’s internal investigation of the Elementary Division of Personnel. Appendix F contains exhibits depicting a summary of the four primary research questions.
CHAPTER 2

An Overview of Winston-Salem/Forsyth County

Context for the Study

Winston-Salem/Forsyth County is located in the Piedmont Region of North Carolina. Its location, at the foothills of the Blue Ridge mountains, tempers the weather, obstructing harsh and extreme weather conditions from the city, thus making the climate conducive for living, tourism, and recreation.

The Moravians settled in what are now the Salem and Bethabara sections of the city, and their history and culture have been preserved through the years. The city and county's location, its rich heritage, and culture have made a positive impact on the public school system's finances. Winston-Salem presently attracts thousands of tourists yearly from all over the world, bringing additional revenue to the city and to the schools. Tourists, industries, colleges and universities, the schools of medicine and law, trade and business colleges, the arts, the symphony, medical centers, close-by air terminals, and interstate highways all have served as major attractions for recruiting quality teachers into the system.

The unique management of resident industries, especially the "big five," RJR-Nabisco, Wachovia Bank and Trust, Piedmont Air Lines, Sara Lee, and Hanes, have created a chain
reaction for employment and purchasing power that channeled many tax dollars into the school system. The revenue received from industries raised the salary supplement of teachers to second in the state of North Carolina at the time of this study.

As of December, 1993, the County had the fourth largest student population in the state, with an enrollment of 39,842 students, and was one of the hundred largest school systems in the nation. About 5,550 people were employed by the system, and of these, 2,650 were teachers. Under the organizational plan of in 1984, there were 31 (K-5) elementary schools; 14 (6-8) middle schools, and 9 (9-12) high schools. In the elementary schools, curriculum specialists (persons who coordinate the language arts program), primary reading teachers (1/2 time certified teachers in grades 1-5), guidance counselors, art, foreign language, music, special education, bilingual and physical education teachers supplemented the regular classrooms programs. The average class size was 20-23 students for elementary schools and 23-26 for middle and secondary schools. A special school, the "Career Center" offered vocational and advanced placement (college level) courses for students enrolled in the high schools. Other special schools served exceptional students.
At the time of this research, the County had an integrated school system. Minority certified employment was 18% for the total district. Some school facilities were racially identifiable after the 1984 reorganization of schools. System-wide, 62% of the students were white and 38% were black. Special education services were available for children with special needs in the following categories: academically gifted, mentally handicapped, physically handicapped, speech/language impaired, autistic, homebound/hospitalized, learning disabled, multi-handicapped, visually and hearing impaired, pregnant, pre-school handicapped, and the severely/profoundly handicapped.

The total school budget for 1990-91 was about $185 million. Of this, 59% came from the state, 33% (including capital outlay) from local sources, 3% were federal funds, and 5% were food service funds. Per-pupil expenditures were budgeted at $4,500.

The Board of Education had nine members elected at large for four-year terms. Four or five members of the Board were elected in even-numbered years. The North Carolina General Assembly voted to reserve two seats for minorities.

Winston-Salem shared most of the problems found in other urban centers. Many of these problems were large dropout rates, absenteeism, teen pregnancy, lack of parental involvement, disparity between black and white students' test
scores, insufficient security system, and a soaring rate of crime and drug problems. There was also a resurgence of racial problems and the economics of small budgets to run a large school system. At the time of this study, the Board and community were highly expectant that its new superintendent would help the district seriously confront its problems, and would: (1) streamline its organization for making key decisions; (2) introduce state mandated site-management; and (3) reduce the ill effects of academic tracking, if not eliminate it altogether.

The Background Preceding Dr. Coble’s Administration

When Dr. Coble began his tenure as superintendent, the WS/FCSS had experienced the leadership of three superintendents over the preceding seventeen years. Each superintendent was markedly different in his behavior and management style. In the Adams' administration, from the July 1, 1976, to June 30, 1982, members of the central office staff indicated that Dr. Adams was accountable and powerful in his leadership, and moved the district forward. However, Dr. Adams reported that he was often in disagreement regarding issues with the school board (C. Hammer, June 27, p. 1). He differed with the board regarding the redistricting plan that many persons in the community regarded as a veiled attempt by the board to resegregate
schools in the system. Dr. Adams claimed he wanted to manage the system, but the school board would not allow him to do so. Dr. Adams left the school system to become superintendent in Indianapolis, Indiana in 1982 (C. Hammer, July 27, 1982, p. 15).

Dr. Zane Eargle, the second of the three superintendents identified, came to the school system November 3, 1982. He was reported as being soft-tampered. Dr. Eargle perceived Winston-Salem/Forsyth County to be extremely political (R.K. Underwood, July 31, 1988, p. 1). This superintendent had served two school districts before coming to Winston-Salem/Forsyth County: as superintendent of Danville City Schools, Danville, Virginia, and Gastonia City Schools, Gastonia, North Carolina. He claimed that Winston-Salem/Forsyth County was the most political of all the systems he had served (R.K. Underwood, July 31, 1988, p. 4). Dr. Eargle left the district on a positive note, July 31, 1988 to become president of Pheiffer College in Misenheimer, North Carolina.

Dr. Larry D. Coble, a native of Guilford County, graduated from Campbell University in 1969. He began his career as a teacher in 1969 and became a principal in 1974 in Greensboro, North Carolina, and later in High Point, North Carolina. From 1978 to 1980, he was a consultant, first for Creative Leadership Systems in Greensboro, North Carolina.
and then with the North Carolina Testing Program, in Greensboro, North Carolina.

Dr. Coble became a superintendent in 1980 in the Polk County School System, which served about 1,500 students. In 1981, he took the position as superintendent in the city schools of Rocky Mount, North Carolina, in Nash County, which had about 5,500 students. He next served as superintendent of the Durham County school system, which had about 18,000 students, from 1985 to 1989. In 1989, Dr. Coble was one of four finalists for school superintendent in Winston-Salem/Forsyth County. He was selected from a pool of forty-two other candidates and then from among eleven semi-finalists. On February 13, 1989, Dr. Coble accepted appointment as superintendent of the WS/FCSS. He joined the system May 1, 1989.

The 9-0 vote by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Board of Education was unanimous in hiring Dr. Coble ("Appointments," Board Minutes, February 13, 1989). His contract was for three years and two months. The salary offered was the second highest in the state for a school superintendent. The climate of excitement and anticipation ran high throughout the district as all waited for his arrival, because it was expected that he would lead the district toward much needed change.
Dr. Coble left Durham County schools with a good reputation. In an article, in the *Winston-Salem Journal*, February 10, 1989, the Chairman of the Durham County Board of Education said concerning Dr. Coble, "I think he is one of the best in the state" (R.K. Underwood, February 10, 1989, p. 1). Another board member said that Dr. Coble got along well with everyone from the janitor to the principal. The black principals reported that he did well dealing with black leaders. Joy Baldwin, the president of the Durham County Association of Educators believed, Dr. Coble made a tremendous effort to make himself available. In that same regard, she held that, if he had a shortcoming, it was in spreading himself too thin even though one principal thought he was responsible in dealing with problems (R.K. Underwood, February 10, 1989, p. 4).
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

This study uses qualitative methodology to "tell the story" of the leadership of Dr. Larry D. Coble who led the WS/FCSS as superintendent for four years and six months from May, 1989 to December, 1993. Based on the description of Van Maanen (1983) qualitative research is an umbrella term covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate, and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world. Burgoyne (1985) stated the belief that an important characteristic of the qualitative approach is that it seeks to provide researchers with a holistic view of organizations and situations. Giorgi (1970) believed that individual or organizational behavior is perceived not as the outcome of a finite set of discrete variables some of which should be rigorously controlled, but rather as lived experience of social settings. Giorgi also claimed that the focus of qualitative studies has to do with understanding the individual's life world (Giorgi, 1970).

Qualitative research does not necessarily exclude quantitative techniques. Burgoyne argued that qualitative methods are often associated with the collection and analysis
of the written or spoken text or the direct observation of behavior. Most of the contributors to this subject seem to agree that the countable should be counted (Burgoyne, 1985).

In this study it was decided to employ the naturalistic approach for qualitative research. Patton (1990) explained that the naturalistic inquiry approach seeks to employ qualitative methods aimed at understanding naturally occurring phenomena in their naturally occurring states. Spradley (1979) suggested structured strategies for analysis of qualitative data. His methods allow researchers a means for examining data so that conclusions can be drawn during the analysis. The following strategies for naturalistic inquiry, derived from Spradley, have been applied to this study: (1) life history interviews, which are designed to record what people recall about their experiences, attitudes and beliefs; (2) participant observation, in which the researcher serves as a participant in and observer of a social situation, and records relevant experiences; (3) journals, which record personal accounts; and (4) document analysis, which tries to determine official positions (Spradley, 1979).

In describing qualitative research, Cassell and Symon (1994) refer to the big three: interviews, participant observation, and document analysis. These three techniques
were used and where possibly used for triangulation of the phenomena reported in this study.

**Interviews**

Theoretical sampling, was applied to this study, a technique recommended in the literature by Glasser and Strauss (1967). In gathering data for this research, people were selected who offered the most theoretical relevance. The key players were identified from among school board members, central office staff, and principals.

Denzin (1978) explained that life history interviews are valuable because they present experiences held by some participants who can interpret experiences. This procedure is based on the assumption that participants have their own specific points of view and unique life stories.

The writer of this study selected some participants from the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County school system's organization to report, through interviews, their experiences, relevant to the research questions which were part of this study. This information was interwoven into the narration that helped to formulate some key elements of the study.

Kirk and Miller (1986) theorized that the goal of the qualitative research interview is to see the topic from the interviewee's perspective and to understand how and why he or she comes to have this particular perspective.
The researcher was a participant in one meeting with five of the nine school board members and the superintendent. Regarding personnel issues, September 1993; interviews were held with the Associate Superintendents, the Division II Director, the Program Manager for Guidance, the Director for the Dropout Prevention/Students-at-Risk program, and a personnel administrator throughout the period of study. The Associate Superintendent of Instruction and the Division Director worked very closely with the superintendent. They provided certain of information and critiqued the data to the four research questions that are the focus of the study. Personal interviews were held with thirty-seven of the fifty-five principals and by phone to discuss the four primary questions. A cross section of principals was selected from the elementary, middle, and secondary schools.

Material derived from interviews includes information regarding perceptions of the superintendent's goals and objectives, his reorganization of the central staff, his interactions with subordinates in departments of the central office, and perceptions of the superintendent's handling of critical issues. Interviews provided information that would have been difficult to secure through a survey.

Once the data resulting from interviews had been gathered, they were subjected to Spradley's method for analyzing data, termed "domain analysis" (Spradley, 1979).
In domain analysis, the researcher is required to: (1) examine all data, (2) assign the data to categories of meaning, and (3) determine patterns common to the cases under study. Each transcribed question and response was categorized into one of the nine steps of Spradley's method, and then was assigned a particular "domain", or area of semantic meaning (Spradley, 1979).

Following domain categorization of the collected interview data, a search for patterns was conducted, such as "successful versus unsuccessful management of the new leadership role," and "successful versus unsuccessful site-based management." Comparisons led to the discoveries of patterns of inter-related major and minor themes. A theme is an assumption about the nature of commonly held experience (Spradley, 1979). Spradley (1979) theorized that the concept of a theme has its roots in the general idea that every culture and every cultural scene is more than a jumble of parts. Cultural themes are the elements that make up the layered patterns of a culture. A cultural theme is defined as any principle recurrent in a number of domains, tacit or explicit, and serving as a relationship among subsystems of cultural meaning (Spradley, 1979).
Participant Observation

Although the interviews doubtlessly were somewhat compromised by the fact that the researcher herself was and continues to be a personnel officer in the central office, interviewees, nonetheless, seemed to be open to all questions concerning the former superintendent's tenure as well as to their own roles in the narrative that ultimately unfolded in the district. Interviewees were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their contributions to the study. It was recognized that the contributions of certain individuals could not be hidden, because they occupied unique positions within the school system.

Participant observation was cross-referenced with news releases and school board minutes. Participation in the central office, leadership team meetings, and school board meetings produced valuable accounts that illuminated the major questions that guided this study.

As a member of the central office staff, the interviewer was in a unique position to understand the perspective of the interviewee. Participant observation also added accuracy to the compiled information.

Document Analysis

Forster (1994) argued that the use of formal documentation is a method employed frequently by historians,
anthropologists, and linguists. The documentation method, according to Forster, fell largely into disuse in the 1960's and 1970's. He contended that little use has been made of documentation in qualitative research, and found this to be surprising, in that the use of such documents sheds light on many aspects of organizational life (Forster, 1994).

Forster noted that documentation comes in many forms: company annual reports, public relations (PR) material and press releases, accounts’ statements, corporate mission statements, policies on marketing strategy, formal charters and legal documents, policies on rules and procedures, human research management, job mobility and relocation management, formal memos between different groups and departments, and informal and private correspondence between respondents and researchers. Forster (1994) maintained that various documentary records constitute a rich source of insights into different employee and group interpretations of organizational life, because they are the principal by-products of the interactions and communication of individuals and groups, at all levels, in organizations.

The documents used in this study came from a variety of sources including: (1) a Teacher Concerns Questionnaire, (2) various organizational documents, (3) formal audit studies, (4) an internal investigation, (5) an executive school board meeting, (6) official school board minutes, and (7) official
news releases. The news releases elaborated on the school board minutes, hence were valuable in that the WS/FCS' minutes merely summarized formal actions taken by the board.

**Questionnaire**

Some of the data used in this study came from a Teacher Concerns Questionnaire that the superintendent had hand delivered to all 2,650 teachers in the system (L. Coble, “Teacher Concerns: Video,” November 11, 1991). Of the 2,650 teachers, 2,402 responded to three concerns. Four university students and two persons from the central office staff sorted the questionnaires according to frequency of themes or perceived barriers to teachers' effectiveness. The results were reported in percentages (See Tables 6-9).

Sixteen individual barriers were identified for question one. Nineteen system barriers were identified for question two. The last request asked teachers to respond by giving their perceptions to the role of the central office staff. They were asked to assign a negative, positive, or neutral rating.

**Validity and Reliability**

Cassell and Symon (1994) claimed that researchers take risks when conducting qualitative studies. They do not enjoy the credibility of the hard-nose scientist searching for
truth, but rather a vulnerability and uncertainty as to how their research will be interpreted and evaluated, an uncertainty which arises primarily as a result of their choice of a qualitative method. The stance that Kirk and Miller (1985) took was that, no experiment can be perfectly controlled, and no measuring instrument can be perfectly calibrated. All measurement, therefore, is to some degree, suspect (Kirk and Miller, 1985). They pointed out that reliability depends on explicitly described observational procedures. They took the position that it is useful to distinguish several kinds of reliability. These distinctions are termed quixotic, diachronic, and synchronic reliability.

Quixotic reliability refers to the circumstances in which a single method of observation continually yields an unvarying measurement. Kirk and Miller (1985) regarded this type of reliability to be misleading. For example, Americans respond to the question, "How are you?" with an automatic, "Fine." The reliability of this answer does not make it useful data about how Americans "are." Diachronic reliability refers to the stability of an observation through time. Diachronic reliability is conventionally demonstrated by similarities in measurements, or findings, taken at different times. The general applicability of diachronic reliability is somewhat diminished by the fact that it is only appropriate to measurements of features and entities
that remain unchanged in a changing world (Kirk and Miller, 1985, p. 41).

Synchronic reliability refers to the similarity of observations within the same time period. Synchronic reliability rarely involves identical observations, but rather, observations that are consistent with respect to the particular features of interest to the observer (Kirk and Miller, 1985, p. 41).

In qualitative research, to King (1984), the concern is for the validity of interpretations. From King's perspective, the involvement of other people, such as colleagues, interviewees, and expert judges, is crucial to considerations of validity in interpreting data from qualitative research interviews. M. Mead (1980) explained that it is also important to standardize questions and the recording of information, introducing into qualitative observation some of the reliability characteristics of laboratory and survey methods.

A study of this nature present numerous threats to validity, although procedural safeguards were taken to reduce errors. Potential bias is reflected through the memories of interviewees. Because the author researched and presented the data, there are no measures of inter-researcher reliability. However, all data collected were entered from the original sources. The analysis and findings have been
critiqued by the Associate Superintendent of Instruction, who worked most closely with Superintendent Coble and with the Division II Director, who supervised principals. Cross-referencing of data was done to reduce the effects of bias in document analyses of audit studies, school board minutes, and news releases. Principal interviews were validated through comparisons with teacher responses through the Teacher Advisory Council, observations of the Associate Superintendent for Instruction, and the Division II Director for Elementary Education.

The Audit Studies

An important source of data for this research was found in a series of audit studies of the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County school system. The results of these studies were a significant contribution to Dr. Coble's formulation of his agenda for improvements in the school system. The following is an explanation of these audit studies.

Reorganization Audit

L. Linton Deck (1989) studied the school system's organizational structure. The school board approved an initial restructuring of the central staff, July 11, 1989, based on this study (“Reorganization,” Board Minutes, July 11, 1989, p. 8). A second reorganization was undertaken on

High School Curriculum Audit

At the beginning of Dr. Coble's administration, he requested a program audit of the school system. From February 7-9, 1990, Fenwick English studied the strengths and weaknesses of the high school curriculum (English, 1990). The scope of the English audit was limited to the high schools in the system only, including the special secondary schools and the Career Center. The audit team did not examine the elementary or middle schools' programs. The audit committee delivered their report to the superintendent, which was reported by the Winston-Salem Journal. The results of the English audit were completed by April 11, 1990. The report appeared in the Journal, May 11, 1990 (J. Hoeffel, May 11, 1990, p. 1).

The standards the auditors used were governed by some of the same principles as a financial audit. Those standards were: (1) Technical Expertise, (2) The Principles of Independence (no vested interest), (3) The Principle of Objectivity (events were observable and verifiable), (4) The Principle of Consistency (auditors used same method from one audit to next), (5) The Principle of Materiality (the selecting discretionary power to select and investigate all
aspects), (6) The Principle of Full Disclosure (auditors revealed all relevant information, and (7) Data Sources (the audit utilized a variety of data sources).

Five curriculum standards were assessed in the English study, which produced several findings:

1. **Standard 1: The School District Demonstrates Control**
   - Finding 1.1 - Board Policies Inadequate
   - Finding 1.2 - No Long Range Plan for the System
   - Finding 1.3 - Curriculum Job Description Vague

2. **Standard 2: The School District's Objective for Students**
   - Finding 2.1 - Secondary Curriculum Not Focused
   - Finding 2.2 - Curriculum Guides Inadequate Management Tools
   - Finding 2.3 - Special Education Program Not Well Defined

3. **Standard 3: School District Program Documentation**
   - Finding 3.1 - Curriculum Monitoring Practices Inconsistent
   - Finding 3.2 - Tracking Has Lowered Learning Expectations
   - Finding 3.3 - Career Center Not Well Integrated Into High School Programs
   - Finding 3.4 - School System Inbred and Insulated
   - Finding 3.5 - High School Curriculum Diffused

4. **Standard 4: School District Utilization of Results**
   - Finding 4.1 - Test Data Not Used Well
   - Finding 4.2 - Existing Testing Program Is Narrow
5. **Standard 5: School District Productivity**

   Finding 5.1 - School Budgeting Is Traditional
   Finding 5.2 - School Facilities Generally In Good Condition
   Finding 5.3 - Adopt A School Program Accentuates School Resource Flow

   The recommendations of the curriculum audit were:

   1. Create and Adopt Comprehensive Board Policies
   2. Create and Adopt a Strategic Plan
   3. Abolish Tracking System
   4. Reduce Number of Courses in High School
   5. Expand High School Testing Program
   6. Improve Curriculum Monitoring
   7. Refine and Revise Job Descriptions
   8. Improve Curriculum Guides
   9. Expand Administrator Recruitment
   10. Comply With Special Education Laws
   11. Move Towards Site-based Management
   12. Adjust Advanced Placement Course Requirements
   13. Perform an Equity Analysis of the "Adopt a School" Program

   Two recommendations emerged from the English study that captured a major portion of Dr. Coble's time. Those issues were site-based management, and the proposed elimination of
tracking. The English audit generated a negative report about the issue of tracking. He claimed tracking lowered learning expectations of students (English, 1990, p. 46). Tracking in the system took precedence over every other recommendation, except for site-based management.

**Exceptional Children Audit**

On May 11, 1991, auditors Clark and Stone conducted a routine audit of the Exceptional Children's Department (J. Hoeffel, May 11, 1991, p. 1). The auditor, Curtis Clark, came from the State Auditor's office, located in Raleigh, North Carolina. Alice Stone came from the State's Educational Regional Center, located in Greensboro, North Carolina. Clark evaluated the financial reports in the department, and Alice Stone and her group examined the program side of the Exceptional Children's department. Discrepancies were found in this department regarding head counts, finance, and student records, dating back for many years.

**Elementary Personnel Audit**

Dr. Coble also ordered an internal investigation in the Elementary Division of Personnel (M. Gilliam, Personal Communication, September, 1993). The internal audit was conducted by a personnel administrator, Marilyn Gilliam.
Gillian interviewed principals regarding elementary hiring practices and lateral entry hiring. Findings from this investigation were reported and discussed with the superintendent.

**Salary Audit**

Dr. Coble requested a study of salaries in the central office. He believed that job descriptions were not compatible with salaries. Eleanor Poole from Raleigh, North Carolina, and her team conducted a salary analysis of the central office positions, November, 1990 (M. Gilliam, personal communication, November, 1990). According to Gilliam, who worked with salary administration, all administrative positions at the central office were included in the study except for the two program managers for the elementary and secondary divisions of the certificated staff. The classified program manager was included in the study (M. Gilliam, personal communication, November, 1990).

The results of these various audit studies were included as a part of the superintendent's total agenda, as were his specific goals and objectives. The issues of site-based management and tracking clearly required much of the superintendent’s skill as the key administrative leader of the school system (School Improvement and Accountability Act, 1989). Dr. Coble's leadership tasks were confounded,
however, by the intrusion on his reform agenda and by a number of seemingly unrelated personnel issues.

In developing this study, attention was given first to the documentation and oral history surrounding the individual goals identified and pursued under the superintendent's leadership and overall direction. In turn, attention was given to the interaction of the goals, issues, and personnel problems. An attempt was made to determine the extent to which the superintendent's agenda, although formally adopted by the Board as its own, had to compete for public and in-house support, with the critical issues and personnel problems the superintendent in large part inherited from the board and related sources. Specific sources used for each of the research questions in the study are elaborated upon in Appendix B.
CHAPTER 4

A Narrative Account of the Leadership of Superintendent Coble, from 1989 to 1993

Dr. Coble's Agenda

During the first five weeks of his tenure as superintendent, Dr. Coble reported in the Winston-Salem Journal, in an article, "Work to be Done," released June 25, 1989, that he had visited all fifty-five schools and had returned four hundred phone calls. Dr. Coble stated that he had talked with school board members, parents, students, teachers, administrators, and community leaders, during this time (R.K. Underwood, June 25, 1989, pp. 1, 8).

According to Dr. Coble, several sensitive issues had emerged in departments either as a result of circumstances that had existed before his administration, or as a result of his objectives for changes in education in the county. He voiced his concerns regarding these issues to the editor of the Winston-Salem Journal (R.K. Underwood, June 25, 1989, p. 8). Dr. Coble explained that some of the concerns came from issues that were raised at public forums in 1989 during his candidacy for the superintendency. According to Dr. Coble, his goals for the district were developed from interviews with principals, school board mandates, state, federal, and local guides, his leadership and management teams' input, and
his own vision. These issues had determined Dr. Coble's agenda for the district, and during his time as superintendent he led the WS/FCSS through a series of programmatic changes. The following constitute the primary goals of the Coble administration and the issues dealt with by Dr. Coble during his time as superintendent.

**Goals:**

1) Offering new leadership;
2) Providing openness in his administration;
3) Ensuring quality education for the neglected population and increasing the achievement of minority students by:
   (a) establishing a special school,
   (b) establishing a drop-out program,
   (c) initiating an absentee prevention project,
   (d) employing a director of minority student achievement; and
4) Addressing teachers' major concerns.

**Issues:**

1) Reorganizing the school system in order to:
   (a) enhance decision-making (1989-90); and
   (b) improve student test scores (1990-91);
2) Dealing with the controversial issues of:
   (a) site-based management; and
   (b) tracking
3) Dr. Coble’s interactions with subordinates in the following areas:
   (a) Curriculum and Instruction,
   (b) Exceptional Children,
   (c) Support Services,
   (d) Elementary Personnel, and
   (e) Salaries

   The following text constitutes a narrative that examines each of the goals and issues on Dr. Coble's agenda.

1) Offering new leadership

   As early as February 10, 1989, while a candidate for the position of superintendent in the WS/FCSS, Dr. Coble communicated his sense of direction and vision regarding his role in helping the district establish educational goals. In a news statement in the Winston-Salem Journal, Dr. Coble stated, "First and foremost, the schools belong to the people. There's a shared responsibility. Classroom teachers ought to be in on decisions that directly affect their work-life" (R.K. Underwood, February 10, 1989, pp. 1,4).

   As Dr. Coble took his post on May 1, 1989, in his initial address to teachers on the first teachers' work day, August 17, 1989, and during his first convocation, he challenged teachers to assume a leadership role in terms of teacher empowerment. Shifting control means the superintendent did not formally decentralize the central
office control at this time but rather, he encouraged teachers to change the management behavior in their schools (R.K. Underwood, August 18, 1989, p. 1). Dr. Coble talked about his vision regarding the direction in which he would lead the district.

From the superintendent’s documents, Dr. Coble, explained that there were two important lessons that may be found in the emergence of Japan as a world economic leader: (1) most of the suggestions leading to quality came not from management, but from workers on the shop floor, and (2) the system used by Japanese to ensure quality was an invention of an American, William Ouchi, an invention America chose to ignore, until the value was impressed upon it by the extraordinary performance of the Japanese (L. Coble, Superintendent’s Documents, August 17, 1989, pp. 1-4).

Dr. Coble continued by saying, "A growing number of experts, such as Glasser, advanced the notion that if we are ever to achieve significant and lasting improvement in the academic fitness of our students, we must begin to attend more closely to the recommendations and initiatives of those who work on the shop floor of our schools" (L. Coble, Superintendent’s Documents, August 17, 1989, p. 2). Dr. Coble asked teachers to think differently for the 1989-90 school year, to look beyond their personal classrooms, and to
work toward group consensus. He asked them to form teams to create shared decision-making.

The superintendent challenged principals to relinquish control and delegate responsibility regarding the curriculum, leadership, and the instructional program. Dr. Coble promised his support to schools. According to principals and central office staff, teachers and principals returned to their sites to exercise their new control.

In the second year of his tenure, on the first day of school, August 21, 1991, Dr. Coble reminded teachers again that he continued to support reforms that gave them a voice in decisions that affected their classrooms. He was quoted as saying, "If you're to make quantum leaps in the performance of students, you need to be empowered" (J. Hoeffer, August 21, 1991, pp. 14, 16). During Dr. Coble's administration, teachers were empowered as never before in the school district. All school decisions were made through teachers or through the site-team approach. Each grade level outlined units of study and the procedures for integrating subject matter into the curriculum. The responsibility for planning, staff development, budgeting, and in-service training were left to the leadership of teachers. School personnel became accountable for the success of their schools' programs through their own leadership.
According to the principals interviewed, most of the teachers were eager to exercise their new rights of teacher empowerment, although some teachers felt that it was the responsibility of the principal to make decisions for the school. Some principals on the other hand explained that a small number of teachers were already practicing shared decision-making.

In every case, principals repeated the same theme, that there was not enough prior staff-development or training in place that prepared teachers and administrators to make the transition. Principals reported that most of their teaching staff became confused and found the task of shared decision-making difficult. One principal claimed that, the more power teachers received, the less empowerment they wanted. Some principals stated that teachers on their staff did not actually believe that they were being given authority they never had before. These principals’ comments were, "It's just something else new and will soon fade away." According to a few (<20%) principals, a small (25%) population of teachers seemed to like their freedom and the center stage.

Many (60%) principals commented that some teachers continued to wait for them to make decisions because they had not yet learned how to arrive at group consensus. Teachers were unaccustomed to making choices for the entire staff. One principal believed that his staff was overwhelmed, that
suddenly they were losing time from their own planning schedules. His staff had to meet and plan constantly together, and saw the whole effort as time-consuming. His teachers would rather have had the central staff and principals continue to make decisions for them.

A small (25%) number of principals explained that they personally took the initiative to put some training in place for their staff. One principal claimed that he set up a committee who assisted him. In other schools, principals sent one, or more teachers for staff-development and training. The principals who said that they had no problem were principals who described shared decision-making as part of their normal leadership style.

Teachers had their notions about shared decision-making, and principals had their own thoughts about it as well. Many (60%) principals believed that it was the central staff's way of shifting responsibility from their office to schools, and that the central staff wanted to separate central office from schools. These principals said they believed that the central office isolated itself from the real world. These principals also made claims that teacher empowerment was designed to reduce their authority as building-site administrators.

Interviews with the central office personnel staff produced claims that personnel managers were not given
instructions regarding their roles in the new leadership plan. Many (60%) principals' views were the same as central office personnel. Problems evolved around the inability of teachers to think and communicate globally. They were accustomed to tending to their own classrooms and to making individual decisions. Teachers now had to plan as a group and arrive to group consensus for the entire school. Principals said that many teachers felt planning was excessive and interfered with their own individual programs.

In the interviews with some (35%) principals, a belief existed that the central staff was offering teacher empowerment as a means of escaping many decisions, and that the central staff was insulating itself from schools. The central office was referred to by many (60%) persons as an "ivory tower." There was a small (25%) number of principals who explained that their leadership style was already one of shared decision-making. Their staff did not, therefore, find the new plan difficult to implement.

A common denominator of thought was voiced by every (100%) principal interviewed, which was, that principals felt they would have been more successful had they had prior training and adequate time to prepare staff for the implementation of the new leadership style of management.
Offering new leadership: Analysis

In letting go of authority, some (35%) principals did not seem to have a problem while many (65%) did. As the superintendent relinquished central office and principal control in order to empower classroom teachers through a new type of leadership, it became apparent that more training should have been provided to help teachers feel secure and to understand their roles. Dr. Coble decentralized the central office from its original bureaucratic structure to a participatory type of structure without alerting teachers and principals about the possible pitfalls, and without providing a secure plan to facilitate the transition. Teachers had made decisions on grade levels or within departments before, but now they were unaccustomed to making shared decisions. They experienced increasingly high levels of frustration as they sought to implement the new type of decision-making. Some (35%) principals used workshops and resource persons to assist teachers, but many teachers had problems in trying to handle budgets, staffing, curriculum, and personnel problems. They were left overwhelmed and unprepared for the tasks they were expected to undertake.

Not having sufficient in-service training created difficulty because of the lack of skills for arriving at group consensus. As mentioned before in this chapter, teachers had been conditioned to respond to the principals'
directions. The common theme voiced by nearly all (95%) principals regarding their personnel, was that there was not enough prior staff development or training in place for teachers or principals to assist them in making the transition, and that the system was unprepared to shift control from the central office to the principals at that time.

Personnel managers in the central office were left frustrated because they were not involved in the site-base management system and they received no training or rules to govern expected changes in their behavior or management of schools. When candidates for positions in the school system began to avoid central office personnel and go directly to schools, chaos resulted throughout the system. Personnel managers indicated that they did not have sufficient applications to service all fifty-five schools. Applications were not always formally processed before hiring. These managers said they had become ineffective and confused about their roles. Managers claimed they became "scapegoats" for the school system's problems.

2) Providing openness in the administration

Dr. Coble stated that he wanted to ensure that his administration was accessible to the entire community. He attempted to accomplish the goal of "administrative openness" through his "Clearing House Project." The purpose of the
Clearing House Project was to find businesses and other groups and individuals interested in working with the schools and to involve them in areas where schools needed help. The Clearing House Project was approved by the school board on March 6, 1990 ("Clearing House," Board Minutes, March 6, 1990). Dr. Coble said that he envisioned more than mere partnerships with schools, but that schools would be more accessible to the public, and that school officials would have to learn how to make themselves more available to the public (R.K. Underwood, March 7, 1990, p. 1).

Dr. Coble embraced the idea that he wanted parents, individuals, community groups, businesses and corporations to feel that they could express their concerns and make recommendations for the improvement of schools, saying, "I want the administration to be distinguished by openness" (R.K. Underwood, March 7, 1990, p. 1). More than one hundred businesses became partners in the Clearing House Project.

Dr. Coble, in an interview with an editor of the Winston-Salem Journal, March 7, 1990, revealed that he had been meeting with such groups as the Concerned Mothers of Forsyth County, the Winston-Salem Urban League, the Junior League of Winston-Salem, and the schools' business partners. Dr. Coble stated, "We need to underscore that the thrust is to support student achievement. There has to be a strong

A program manager was named to serve as coordinator of the Clearing House, July 1, 1990. His title was Drop-Out Prevention/Students-at-Risk Director. Until that department moved from its infant stage, Dr. Coble himself, coordinated the program. The guiding question of the Dropout Prevention/Students-at-Risk Program was, "How can business look at the overall needs of at-risk students to keep them in school?" (R.K. Underwood, March 7, 1990, p. 7). The Clearing House was divided into three units, one each focusing on information, physical resources, and attendance.

Decals were presented to any business that contracted to help students as a means of identifying a participating business partner. Employers agreed to a certain number of hours for students' employment, with the stipulation that students could not be overworked, and businesses had to commit to fairness and equity in salaries. Employers were to look at the total needs of students. They provided such materials as notebooks, pencils, pens, and a variety of other resources, and they helped to find jobs for students. A component of the commitment contract required that students had to be told that they could not work unless their intent was to return to school.
The Chamber of Commerce emerged as the major player in this plan. Two of the many participating corporations were Sara Lee and the Crosby Golf Association. The Sara Lee Corporation created a retail store in Carver High, one of the schools, with the funds going to the school. Sara Lee donated thousands of dollars to the system. Sara Lee Hosiery and Wachovia Bank and Trust Company bonded in a cooperative effort to support and work with the public schools. The Sara Lee Corporation reported in the Journal, May 19, 1990, that they had surveyed seven hundred of their workers and supervisors, and it was discovered that more than one-third of those surveyed could not function at a third grade level. It was also written in this same article that this total population had diplomas, but could not function at a seventh grade level (J. Hoeffel, May 19, 1990, pp. 1,4). These businesses justified their interest in improving education. Marshall Couch, the Director of Manufacturing-Training for Sara Lee, stated, "It's out of concern for the corporate bottom line" (J. Hoeffel, May 19, 1990, p. 4). The County's Chamber of Commerce gave fifth and sixth grade tests to a number of their candidates for employment. Over 63% of those candidates failed.

The Crosby Golf Tournament Association established the Crosby Scholarship Program for the entire system. Any student maintaining at least a "C" average, and who was drug-
free, could become eligible for a college scholarship to a school of their choice based on need and leadership. Recipients voted to allow random sampling for drug testing. Each student was evaluated yearly to determine continuing status for the scholarship award. The requirement of maintaining a "C" average and remaining drug-free remained in place as long as a student received the scholarship. Eligibility for the scholarship extended over a four year period of time.

The Crosby Tournament teamed with the Greater Winston-Salem Chamber of Commerce and the city-county school system, on December, 13, 1990, to initiate a more aggressive approach to fight drug abuse in the community. The Crosby Partnership for a Drug-Free Community expanded the tournament's support of local efforts toward drug abuse prevention and education. That support totaled almost $3 million dollars since the tournament came to Bermuda Run in 1986, in Clemmons, North Carolina, a suburb of Winston-Salem.

The new pilot projects were aimed at the workplace and schools, and the money for these programs was in addition to the allocations that the Crosby distributed every year through grants. "Through these programs, we want to empower students and employees to do something about the drug problem," Les Riley, vice president of Sara Lee corporation and general chairman of the Crosby, said at a news conference
(W. Lingo, December 13, 1990, pp. 1, 20). The Chamber of Commerce directed the drug-free workplace project, which helped area businesses put drug screening and drug education programs into effect.

The Crosby's pilot program to prevent drug-use in the schools started in Carver High School where thirty two freshmen had been chosen as leaders of their class. These students were identified by teachers, and the principal, Robert Clemmer. The students were to direct the program with the help of teachers. The Crosby program used these student leaders to discourage drug-use among other students. The drug program was developed by Dr. William Hansen, a social psychologist at Bowman Gray School of Medicine, in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

In an article written by Will Lingo of the Winston-Salem Journal, "Battle Plans," Mr. Palmer Friend, an Associate Superintendent with the city-county schools, said the Crosby program was innovative and was trying to get at the causes of drug abuse, rather than just fighting the symptoms (W. Lingo, December 13, 1990, p. 20). The Crosby program awarded eligible students up to $30,000 in scholarships to develop and put into effect community-service projects (W. Lingo, December 13, 1990, p. 20).
Providing openness in the administration: Analysis

Providing openness to individuals, groups, and the community in his administration was of paramount importance to the superintendent. Any person or business in the community who was interested in the school's welfare had access to the superintendent's office through the Clearing House Project. The superintendent was overwhelmingly successful with this program. Through the Clearing House, the superintendent was able to fuse businesses with schools to support students. More than 100 businesses in this program provided jobs and supplies, as well as a retail store in one of the schools for students.

The business' contract with the system monitored the time and hours students worked, and limited their working schedules so that they did not work past 10 p.m. These time constraints controlled businesses from over-working students. Every student employed had to stay in school to maintain employment. This effort reduced the number of students leaving school to work.

The Crosby Scholarship Program was an outgrowth of the Clearing House. The Crosby Association identified student leaders and provided college scholarships to its recipients based on: (1) maintaining a "C" average achievement and (2) consent to periodic drug testing. Students had to remain drug free for the duration of the program. They voted on
whether drug testing would be a part of the criteria. A single student could be awarded up to $30,000. This program supported a group of average students who otherwise would not have qualified for academic scholarship.

3) **Ensuring quality education for a neglected population of students**

To accomplish his goal of ensuring quality education for neglected populations of students, Dr. Coble proposed to the school board: (a) the establishment of a special school, (b) the hiring of a director to design a Dropout Prevention Program, (c) the establishment of an Absentee Prevention Project, and (d) the hiring of a Director for Minority Students.

(a) **Establishing a special school**

The Special School was an effort devised by the superintendent to focus on a segment of the black student population and other at-risk students. At a school board meeting, April 17, 1990, the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County school board heard a proposal from Dr. Coble about establishing a new elementary school for high-risk and potential dropout students ("Special School," Board Minutes, April 7, 1990). Dr. Coble told the school board that his leadership team was working with an anonymous private business to set up a school for about one hundred-fifty failing students in first through fifth grades. Many of
these students were black boys. The special school proposal included hiring a principal.

Dr. Coble's description of the staff included about ten teachers, and ten classes, with fifteen pupils each. It would use the latest teaching technology and receive help from professors and students from Winston-Salem State University, a predominate black student body. Dr. Coble proposed that the school would open in August, 1990. The building site would be a former public elementary school, William T. Diggs Elementary, located in Happy Hills Garden, a minority housing project. The superintendent said that he did not know the cost of the program.

On May 31, 1990, the school board voted down the special school idea ("Special School," Board Minutes, May 21, 1990). A reporter from the Winston-Salem Journal wrote, "School for Failing Students won't Develop." The article stated that the city-county school board had backed off an ambitious plan to start a school for failing elementary school students. It was reported that Dr. Coble had sought advice from federal and civil rights officials, and the reason for the potential failure of such a school was that it would violate civil rights laws (J. Hoeffel, May 22, 1990, pp. 13,22).

J. Hoeffel the editor of the Winston-Salem Journal, disagreed with Dr. Coble's rationale, and stated that school officials were reluctant to discuss their decision not to use
the school, calling the decision a sensitive one. He continued with, "The bottom line is fear that white parents would not allow their children to attend the school if that criteria resulted in a high proportion of black males" (J. Hoeffel, May 22, 1990, p. 22).

One of the Associate Superintendents, Mr. Palmer Friend, commented that the program would be revised to fit into a school-within-a-school concept and that the program would be located in a school with a high percentage of minorities as Latham and Forest Park Elementary. The Associate Superintendent said, "I believe there are advantages there. You don't isolate students and the transportation nightmare is something you won't have to deal with" (J. Hoeffel, May 22, 1990, p. 22). The school-within-a-school concept would contain smaller classes, there would be more control, and students of the same ability in the same grade. Students would have access to current computer technology. The goal was to bring these students up to par, and then mainstream them.

The Associate Superintendent, Mr. Friend, explained that the intention behind the creation of a special school was never to create a school only for blacks, even though most of the students would have been black. He believed that the intent was to develop a program that would have been therapeutic, hopeful, and able to intervene in the sustained
underachievement of black males, something that is a concern throughout the country (J. Hoeffel, May 22, 1990, p. 22).

The school attorney, Mr. Douglas Punger, commented that the school-within-a-school approach would probably not draw criticism from the Office of Civil Rights. Mr. Punger commented that, "Courts have adopted remedial programs which in essence pull students out of a regular program and place them in a remedial one as long as the criteria is non-discriminatory" (J. Hoeffel, May 22, 1990, p. 22).

An earlier article in the Winston-Salem Journal, dated August 24, 1989, presented the beliefs of back ministers, who expressed that there was a need for a dramatic solution to meet the educational needs of black students (R.K. Underwood, August 24, 1989, p. 1). J. Hoeffel, the editor of the Journal indicated that white parents may have had problems with: (1) the "population of the student body, black boys, and (2) the school's location in a totally black housing project" (J. Hoeffel, May 22, 1990, p. 22).

Establishing a special school: Analysis

A special school for mainly at-risk black males and other at-risk students proposed by the superintendent and his leadership team failed for lack of school board approval. Also, the school's location in a predominately black housing project raised questions by some community members. The
superintendent's description of the school made provisions for a small teacher-to-student ratio in class size. Tutorial support from the University would have reinforced the teachers' instructional program for students.

The superintendent's rationale for the special school's failure to materialize was that he felt that the school would run afoul of civil rights laws, and he did not want to provoke court litigation, a rationale that was questioned by the editor who recorded the events. It can be assumed that the editor reiterated sentiments of many white parents in the community.

The article in the Winston-Salem Journal, on August 24, 1989, had presented the beliefs of black ministers. They expressed that there was a need for a dramatic solution to meet the educational needs of black students (R.K. Underwood, August 24, 1989, p. 1). The school within-a-school concept, instead of a special school, did provide additional support for at-risk students. Classes in this program were smaller, more controlled, and grouped homogeneously. The mainstreaming of students prevented bias and isolation of students. This concept of a school-within-a-school was accepted and implemented.

(b) Establishing a drop-out prevention program

In North Carolina, the annual dropout loss was around 23,000 students, which represented 28 percent of every class
over four years of high school. During the school year 1989-
1990, more than one thousand students dropped out of the
Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System. The school
system had been identified as having one of the highest
dropout percentages in the state. In order to address this
problem, Superintendent Coble hired Steve Flora as Director
of a Drop-Out Prevention Program, and explained that he had
named Flora to this position out of his concern about
reducing these large numbers.

The Director disclosed that students had not been
properly identified, and therefore were not receiving any
remediation or counseling to correct the problem. Flora
explained that in Winston-Salem/Forsyth County, students had
not received attention, support, or follow-up counseling to
curb drop-outs (S. Flora, Personal Communication, January,
1995). Under Flora's supervision, each individual school
organized and developed meaningful projects, including
liaisons with local businesses. The editor of the Otterbourg
Report, March 5, 1992, wrote in the Winston-Salem Journal
that in Forsyth County, the Forsyth County school board
worked with the Greater Winston-Salem Chamber of Commerce to
develop a list of informal rules for businesses who were
assisting students. The Drop-out Prevention Program
requested, among other things, that businesses not permit
students to work beyond ten o'clock on school nights, and
that they employ workers of high school age only if the workers were in school or were working toward a high-school equivalency diploma (K. Otterbourg, March 5, 1992, pp. 1,6).

Ms. Gayle N. Anderson, the Chamber's executive vice president, said that two hundred companies in Forsyth County endorsed at least a section of the agreement. The Chamber, along with business, wanted to keep the limitations of businesses voluntary (K. Otterbourg, March 5, 1992, pp. 1,6). When Forsyth County studied the problem, it was found that there were not any substantial differences between the grades for students who worked more than those who did not, although grades went down when they worked more hours. The study also showed that as hours worked increased, school attendance declined. About 44 percent of the school system's high school students worked, ranging from 19 percent in the ninth grade to 61 percent in the 12th grade (K. Otterbourg, March 5, 1992, p. 6).

The Otterbourg Report indicated that the Forsyth County study debunked the idea that most students were working to help families to pay for higher education. Eighty percent of the students surveyed by the county said they were working to have spending money or to pay for a car. It was found through this study that most of the students were working for personal reasons.
Establishing a drop-out prevention program: Analysis

Winston-Salem Forsyth County, at one time, had one of the highest drop-out rates in the state. More than one thousand students were dropping out yearly from the time records were kept. The reforms developed significantly affected the drop-out rate (S. Flora, Personal Communication, January, 1995) (See Figure 5). By October, 1990, the percentage of students dropping out of the city/county high schools had declined (See Figure 5). The Winston-Salem Journal reported another decrease in the drop-out rate, February 1, 1992 (J. Hoeffel, February 1, 1992, pp. 7,15). According to Steve Flora, schools worked particularly hard in this area. The Director's management of the program saw the drop-out rate decrease from more than 1,000 to about 652 students (J. Hoeffel, February 1, 1992, p. 15).

Inconsistencies in record keeping in schools were corrected. Through Flora's monitoring and supervision, all schools initiated some type of program and offered prescriptions and recommendations for students. The Drop-out Rate Program resulted in a significant decrease in the annual dropout percentage.

(c) Initiating an absentee prevention program

The Winston-Salem Journal published an article, "School Work to Build Attendance," February 23, 1992, that disclosed the school system's absentee rate, saying that it ranked
among the ten worst in the state (J. Hoeffel, February 23, 1992, pp. 1,4). The Performance and Opportunity Standards for Accreditation, established by the North Carolina State Board of Education, identified the system as one of the most deficient. According to this report, each day last year, 1992, about 2,370 students in Forsyth County missed school, yielding an attendance rate of 93.7 (J. Hoeffel, February 23, 1992, pp. 1,4). This account put Forsyth County school in the same class as the Durham and Reidsville, North Carolina systems. These systems were reported as having more critical problems, including poorer students and less educated parents (J. Hoeffel, February 23, 1992, pp. 1,4).

Winston-Salem/Forsyth County made dramatic efforts to reduce its poor attendance rate by developing a Truancy Watch Program system-wide, through its Social Work Service Program. The board approved the Truancy Watch Program on February 19, 1990 ("Truancy Watch," Board Minutes, February 19, 1990). Through this program, students were identified and declared by the State of North Carolina as students "at-risk." State guidelines had defined this group as those "who were victimized by a variety of health, social, emotional and economic factors that interfered with learning, school attendance, and satisfactory progress toward graduation. An action plan was recommended by that department. In January, 1994, in an interview, Flora said that principals had to
identify students with truant and attendance problems, follow up, provide treatment, and offer recommendations in their school improvement plans (S. Flora, Personal Communications, January, 1995).

Schools used various techniques to increase attendance, including using computers that called parents to tell them when their children were absent, and rewarding children who attended regularly. Different schools used different approaches. One school awarded a trophy to the team with the best attendance during the week, hung its flag in a special place and allowed the team to leave ten minutes early on Fridays. At the end of the school year, the team was taken to visit a theme park in Charlotte, North Carolina. This school, Mineral Springs Middle, made the most significant gains in the system over a three year period.

Other incentives used by schools were pizza lunches and the hiring of home-school coordinators. One school, South Park High, that housed only handicapped students, gave rewards, including excursions to bowl, sail, fish, and watch movies or eat fast foods. Another project offered in the high school was the organization of free after-school daycare for unwed teen mothers. This service allowed teens to bring their children with them as they returned to class, thereby preventing absenteeism. The Federal and State governments funded the costs for the day-care program. Another component
of the Truancy Watch Program was the Jobs Program, that supplied after-school employment.

From Mr. Flora's point of view, as the director of the Dropout Program there was a need to give attention to students who were in custody by the court system for a period of time. Mr. Flora acknowledged that Dr. Coble and the school board believed that this was a concern. Students who were held in jail were given instruction by homebound teachers, to avoid a lapse in classwork. The outcome brought about restructuring of classes for students who were in jail either because they could not pay their bond or because they were held twenty to thirty days before they came to trial. The Homebound staff (teachers who taught students at home), and who were already employed by the school board, taught the classes. When these students were released, they were monitored and counseled to return to school (S. Flora, Personal Communication, January, 1995).

Initiating an absentee prevention program: Analysis

Winston-Salem/Forsyth County had been identified as having one of the worst absentee records in the state. According to the Dropout Program manager, Mr. Steve Flora, rewards as incentives for students, such as lunches and field trips, were effective (S. Flora, Personal Communications, January, 1995). The school that used these incentives most
frequently had the lowest number of absentees. The day-care program was effective in that it allowed teen mothers to continue their education and care for their children at the same time, thus allowing parent teens to stay in attendance.

The Truancy Watch, another component of the Absentee Prevention Program, established through the Social Work department, allowed principals to identify students classified as truants or as having attendance problems. Provisions were made for these students to receive counseling treatment. The court program taught students who were held by the court system so that they would not become discouraged. Students in the court system were given support and instruction and counseled to return to school. Before these programs were monitored, students were dropping out in much higher percentages in the school system.

(d) **Employing a director of minority student achievement**

On September 9, 1989, Dr. Coble appointed, with school board approval, Mrs. Geneva Brown as Director of Minority and Average Student Achievement. Her role was to monitor low student achievement ("Appointments," *Board Minutes*, September 9, 1989). Brown had been a principal for thirty-five years, and had been transferred from the principalship of a successful elementary magnet school, John W. Moore Elementary school. She had designed the Moore Laboratory Magnet school’s
program which pulled students from across the district. The school contained structured, unstructured, and experimental classes. Some classes had team teaching.

In an article, “New Tactics” in the Journal, on October 10, 1989, Mrs. Brown called for teachers and administrators to change their expectations for students, stating, "In my mind, it means making some major changes in what we do" (R.K. Underwood, October 10, 1989, pp. 5,8). Mrs. Brown called for new changes in the practices performed in classrooms, and looked for new ways of teaching subject matter. The changes Mrs. Brown proposed were longer school days or classes after school, classes during the summer, more parental and community involvement, students of different ages working with each other, and eliminating cultural biases in the ways children are taught.

Mrs. Brown was instructed by Dr. Coble to look at ways in which students were assigned into levels of classes. The school board and Dr. Coble endorsed Mrs. Brown's plans to arrange cultural diversity and sensitivity workshops for administrators. The first workshops were conducted by Charles King, of Atlanta, Georgia. Workshops were held for central administrators to assist them in understanding diverse cultures.

The program designed to address minority concerns was effective, but short-lived. The title for Mrs. Brown’s
position changed on July 1, 1990, to Director of Instructional Development and Accountability/Student Achievement. Mrs. Brown retired from the system March 31, 1992.

Employing a director of minority student achievement:

Analysis

Superintendent Coble hired a veteran principal with thirty-five years of experience to assume the role of Director of Minority Achievement. It was not disclosed why the title of this position was later changed to Director of Instructional Development and Accountability/Student Achievement, although it is assumed that the former title may have suggested excluding students other than minorities. Mrs. Brown's proposals, calling for changes with regard to longer class time and summer classes, would have been drastic for the system, and would have involved more parental and community involvement and additional personnel. The Director's call for reforms and change in student expectations were not highly visible in the system at this time because of a passive position on the part of senior level staff.

It appeared that the task of eliminating cultural biases was not an immediate goal of the school system. According to interviews with principals, some of the cultural diversity
workshops that were held for administrators were not altogether well received.

4) **Addressing teachers' concerns**

On August 20, 1991, at the end of convocation, Dr. Coble addressed teachers' major concerns (J. Hoeffel, August 20, 1991, pp. 14, 16). Subsequently, on Nov. 19, 1991, "Teacher Concerns Questionnaires" were hand-delivered to the 2,650 teachers in 55 schools in the school system. The purpose of the questionnaire was to address the major concerns teachers had that prevented them from doing a better job with their students. In these questionnaires, teachers were asked to state: (1) What school rules or barriers prevent you as a teacher from doing a better job with your students?; (2) What system rules or barriers prevent you as a teacher from doing a better job with your students?; and (3) Regarding the role of the central office, do you perceive the central office to be negative, positive, or neutral? The teachers were asked to give examples that led to this conclusion (L. Coble, Teachers Concerns Questionnaire, November 19, 1991).

Two thousand four hundred and two questionnaires were returned. Four students from Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina were hired to sort the questions by frequency of barriers. The responses were also categorized and reported in percentages. Two monitors came from the central staff to observe the process. Sixteen
categories were established to reflect the barriers that teachers believed impeded student performance. The perceptions of teachers under four directors for the school system were identified (See Tables 1-4). In the cases in which categories were judged not to be obvious to the reader, several descriptions were offered. For example, under the category "school organization," "scheduling too many interruptions," and "handling of finances," were offered for clarification.

The Elementary Department reported through its two divisions, Division I and Division II. The Middle School and the High Schools each reported through a separate division. In Division I, 587 teachers responded. In Division II, 619 teachers responded. Middle School had 589 responses and High School reported 607. The responses from the teachers were summarized by individual schools under each of the four division directors and for the system as a whole (See Table 6). The steps used to analyze the responses were: (1) all responses were read to create concern or barrier categories and to identify items of a sensitive or confidential nature; (2) frequency of responses from teachers were obtained for all the established barrier categories. Teacher responses dealing with barriers were categorized and reported in terms of percent (barrier category divided by the total responding); and (3) the role of Central Office was rated on
a scale from negative to positive (This was converted to a 
five-point scale for analysis purposes: 5=positive, 4=between 
neutral and positive, 3=neutral; 2=between neutral and 
negative, and 1=negative). The reasons for the teachers 
assignments of particular ratings to the role of the central 
office were classified in the appropriate positive and 
negative categories, and the percentages of responses under 
each category were obtained.

This report was limited to the presentation of summaries 
for schools under each of the four categories, and for the 
entire system. It did not include sensitive and confidential 
statements. In the findings, tables were created to present 
the frequency of responses by teachers (See Tables 1-4). For 
questions one and two, which concern the individual school 
and school system barriers, respectively, the percentage 
listed for each category was obtained by dividing the number 
of respondents into the number of teachers who recorded a 
particular barrier category.

The major barriers at the school level hindering 
effective job performance were discovered to be, in rank 
order: (1) discipline, (2) school administrator, (3) 
additional duties, (4) school schedule, and (5) paperwork. 
Approximately 16 percent of the teachers reported that there 
were no barriers (See Table 6). From a review of survey 
responses, a total of nineteen system barriers were given
that impeded teacher performance (See Table 2). Of this total, only three were listed as barriers by more than 10 percent of the responding teachers in the system. Approximately 14 percent of the teachers stated that there was not enough planning time, whereas 12 percent and 10 percent listed program/curriculum and school organization, respectively, as barriers.

Teachers were requested to assign ratings to the role of the Central Office on a five-point scale, with five being positive and one being negative (See Tables 3 & 4). Central Office showed that the total population of teachers assigned a 3.6 rating to that category. The ratings by divisions were Elementary I, 4.1; Elementary II, 3.8; Middle, 3.7, and High, 3.9 according to the superintendent’s assessment of the questionnaire.

Positive and negative comments supporting the ratings assigned to the role of the Central Office by teachers were grouped in eleven categories. Of these eleven categories, seven did not receive comments from at least ten percent of the total population of teachers. The four categories receiving the most attention from teachers were: Helpfulness/Support (30%), Central Office attitude (17%), School system direction (12%), and Hiring/promotion practices (1%). In the "helpfulness/support" category, 53 percent of the comments were negative; in the "central office attitude"
category, 53 percent of the comments were negative; in the "school system direction" category, 70 percent were negative; and, in the "hiring/promotion practices" category, 95 percent were negative (See Tables 3 & 4).

Major barriers at the school level were identified as "discipline," "additional duties," "school schedules," and "paperwork" (See Appendix D, Table: Individual School Barriers). Major system barriers were "not enough planning time," "program/curriculum problems," and "school organizational problems" (See Appendix D, Table: School System Barriers).

Teachers were relatively negative regarding the role that the central office played in helpfulness/support, central office attitude, school system direction, and hiring/promotion practices (See Tables 3 & 4).

Addressing teachers' concerns: Analysis

In the analysis of Dr. Coble's speech concerning the issue of teachers' major concerns, the following breakdowns were evident, Dr. Coble worked with teachers' most urgent demands, as indicated by the frequency of their responses on the questionnaires. The two barriers to effectiveness that were identified most frequently were discipline and lack of planning time, with discipline being the primary concern. Dr. Coble recommended that the expansion of the in-school
suspension program become a main source in dealing with truants. If there were expulsions, there had to be in-place a prescriptive checklist for the students' school records and alternative strategies for a student's positive responsiveness in the event of truancy problems. Report cards were to be mailed. Close cooperation was to exist with the city and county agencies to monitor truancy.

At the elementary level, schools employed twenty Home-School Coordinators with special funds to serve as agents between the school and home. In the elementary schools, twenty schools hired Home-School Coordinators to serve as agents between the home and school to support the area of discipline. According to interviews with principals, the employment of Home School Coordinators was an effective service that assisted in supporting teachers with discipline and establishing a rapport with parents. To focus on discipline more intently, middle and high schools used in-school suspensions rather than school suspensions as they had before.

The questionnaire identified lack of planning time as a "system" barrier. An allocation of $454,321.00 went to 32 schools for planning. The school team determined how that money was to be used. This allocation was based on the number of self-contained classes per school. Flexible
scheduling was provided for teachers before and after the student work-day to allow teachers more planning time.

Principals explained through interviews that at the elementary level, provisions were made for planning time through the hiring of additional support personnel. Teachers did not assist their classes when students went to support personnel in classes such as art, physical education and music. This provided additional relief for teachers, in that the time could be used as planning time. In the mornings and afternoons, teachers could leave school as long as the time was before or after the time students were in school. Monitors and classified personnel were hired to assist classes during cafeteria breaks to relieve teachers. Middle and high schools had planning time built into their schedules.

According to the superintendent’s assessment of the questionnaire, teachers reported that school officials were sometimes rude, commenting that they were unhelpful, unavailable, inconsistent, and incompetent (See Tables 3 & 4). Dr. Coble communicated that he had borrowed an idea from Wachovia Bank of North Carolina, who assigned a personal banker to each customer. He assigned a school official to each teacher to handle worries and complaints. Dr. Coble talked to the central office staff regarding the negative perception of perceived behavior in the central office.
Issues

1. Reorganizing the system

In 1989-90, the central staff was restructured in order to facilitate clearer decision-making. In 1990-91, reorganization was undertaken again, beginning March 19, 1990, and was designed to further improve communication and students' test scores. The following is a narrative account of the changes effected by the reorganization, and addresses the questions: (a) was reorganization successful in enhancing decision-making, and (b) did reorganization improve student test scores?

(a) Reorganization 1989-1990: enhancing decision-making

Shortly after entering the system, Dr. Coble brought in a group of consultants, mid-May, 1989, headed by L. Linton Deck to examine the current organization of the school system (L.L. Deck, Reorganization Document, May, 1989, p. 8). Deck was the Director of Education and Non-profit Applications for the Center of Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina. The consultants held more than a hundred interviews with members of the school board and central office administrators, who provided them with the information necessary to document the study (L.L. Deck, Reorganization Document, May, 1989, p. 8).
In a speech to the Rotary Club of Winston-Salem, Dr. Coble stated, "To me, streamlining the system is to reorganize" (R.K. Underwood, June 25, 1989, p. 1). Dr. Coble communicated that the central staff needed clearer lines of authority, and that too much had been built around individuals rather than on a systems approach. He explained that even though he did not ask anyone to retire, some people may not like traveling down the same road.

In an interview in February, 1994, Dr. Fred Adams, an Associate Superintendent, gave an account of the process the Deck team used in the first reorganization. He stated that, "Specific questions had been asked of central administrators by the team." Questions asked were:

(1) What do you think of the other staff?;
(2) What is the communication level of the central staff?'
(3) What are the central issues regarding
   (a) the polity in the community, and
   (b) the professional aspects of the district?; and
(4) Are there factions on the school board? (F. Adams, Personal Communication, February, 1994).

From the Deck audit and these questions, Reorganization 1989-90 emerged. As stated in the article, "Coble Announces Plans to Reassign Principals," March 30, 1990, the superintendent reorganized the system for 1990-91. Board members said that they felt that they were doing what was
best for the system. The superintendent explained that it was not movement for movement's sake. It was the goal of trying to match skills with the demands of the job. New organization would make the system better prepared to implement the School Improvement and Accountability Act, also known as Senate Bill, 2 (R.K. Underwood, March 30, 1990, pp. 13-16). This act gave authority to empower schools. Dr. Coble claimed that reorganization increased accountability and gave the best opportunity the system had in recent years to improve the delivery of services from the central office.

The reorganization was approved by the board on July 11, 1989, and continued during the years of 1989-90 ("Reorganization," Board Minutes, July 11, 1989). Two deputies were appointed as leaders of this effort: a Deputy for Instruction, and a Deputy for Operations. In the new organizational line-up, three positions made up what the superintendent called the executive team: the Executive Assistant to the Superintendent, the Deputy for Instruction, and the Deputy for Operations.

All instructional programs came under the department of the Deputy for Instruction, extending the responsibilities of that position. The superintendent did not choose an executive assistant immediately (See Figure 7). Reorganization 1989-90 created other changes for five individuals: (1) the Assistant to the Superintendent, (2) the
Assistant Superintendent for Support Services, and (3) three Area Assistant Superintendents.

The Assistant to the Superintendent became the Assistant Superintendent for Support Services, and assumed the responsibility for such programs as guidance, psychological services, and drop-out prevention. The Assistant Superintendent for Student Services became the Assistant Superintendent for Exceptional Education. This responsibility consisted of programs for gifted children and for those children with learning problems.

The superintendent's re-organizational structure changed the titles of area superintendents to directors. Principals previously had reported directly to area superintendents. In the 1988-89 organization there had been five assistant superintendents of equal rank. These were: Finance, Auxiliary Services, Curriculum and Instruction, Personnel, and Support Services (See Figure 6).

In the 1989-90 organizational restructuring, the two Deputies reported directly to the superintendent. Reporting to the Deputy Superintendent for Instruction were four Assistant Superintendents: Elementary Education, Middle/High School Education, Exceptional Children, and Student Services. Reporting to the Deputy Superintendent for Operations were three assistants: Human Resource (personnel), Financial Services, and Auxiliary Services.
The positions of Assistant Superintendents for Elementary Education, Middle and High School Education, and Student Services were new positions (See Figure 7). The school attorney, the internal auditor, the Director of Communication Services and the Executive Assistant to the Superintendent also reported directly to the superintendent. Although the 1989-90 Organizational Chart (Figure 7), did not show all the Directors reporting to the Superintendent, the 1990-91 Organizational Structure did (See Figure 8).

Other changes from the 1988-89 administrative staff were: (1) the Area Superintendent was changed to the position of Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction became the Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education (Middle and High).

Other titles changed. They were: (1) the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel became the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, (2) the Assistant Superintendent for Finance became Assistant Superintendent for Financial Services, and (3) the Coordinator for School Community Relations title changed to the Director of Communications, and the school attorney continued with his role and title.

Two layers of authority were eliminated in this reorganization. Although no jobs were eliminated. According
to Dr. Coble, this line up would provide a leaner administration (less staff) and allow for clearer decision-making. From his point of view, the superintendent's goal was to match people with jobs. He communicated that changing the position of the Assistant to the Superintendent of Support Services would increase responsibility in supervising people and that this reorganization would provide a true team approach. Dr. Coble stated that, "Restructuring was centered around making schools better" (J. Hoeffel, July 8, 1990, pp. 1,4). A school board member commented that he thought the matches of people with jobs were the best under the circumstances.

In the article, "Coble Called One of the Best," in the Winston-Salem Journal. Dr. Coble said that he knew before coming to the city-county school system, that it had a reputation for promoting people from within, but he was surprised to find out how closed it was. He stated, "Without outside help and information, there is a tendency to perpetuate the status quo" (R.K. Underwood, February 10, 1989, p. 1,4).

From the superintendent's perspective, the current structure created problems with fragmented authority, poor communication and duplication of duties. Schools could now see who was responsible for a given task. Dr. Coble took the position that eliminating the layer of administrators and
creating clearer lines of authority made it easier for the schools to deal with the central administrators (R.K. Underwood, February 10, 1989, p. 4).

The superintendent held that eliminating the specialists' positions (staff for specific subject areas) would prevent sending mixed messages to teachers who brought with them another set of expectations based on their particular interests. In an article, "Coble Trims Staff," in the Winston-Salem Journal, July 8, 1990, the superintendent had said he hoped that parents would notice the impact of change within the year and that he expected to see children do better in school and score higher on tests (J. Hoeffel, July 8, 1990, p. 4) (See Figure 4). He continued that there had been an assistant superintendent and a director for middle schools, and that the distinction between the two positions was blurry. The assistant evaluated the principals and supervised the staff, but the middle schools' director designed the program. "We had difficulty in establishing clear lines," stated the superintendent (J. Hoeffel, July 8, 1990, p. 4).

The superintendent was quoted as saying, "I do think it's going to take a little bit of time for the changes we've implemented to take off (J. Hoeffel, July 8, 1990, p. 4) (See Figure 4). He commented through this article, "I do feel like it's going to be an ongoing project to make better use
of the test results, and that's what we're trying to do. He concluded that such factors as tenure, affirmative action and politics affected his decisions for reorganization (J. Hoeffel, July 8, 1990, p. 4).

Enhancing decision-making: Analysis

L. Linton Deck conducted the organizational structure audit before Dr. Coble began reorganization of the system in 1989. Deck provided the information that supported Dr. Coble's basis for reorganizing the district. Two layers of authority were deleted between principals and the superintendent. Principals had reported to area assistant superintendents, and then to the associate superintendent. Reorganization 1989-90 permitted principals to report directly to Dr. Coble, or they could report directly to the assistant superintendent for elementary, middle, or secondary education. This structure facilitated communication.

Five major changes occurred in the 1989-90 reorganization: the Department of Support Services became two departments, Student Services and Exceptional Education, and Area Assistant Superintendents became Directors. The Assistant Superintendent for the Exceptional Children's Department resigned shortly after reorganization 1989-90.

Walter Marshall, the president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP),
said he was pleased. Jeri Bistline, the president of the Forsyth Association of Classroom Teachers said she supported the change. She stated, "I think it will facilitate good decision making. It took courage to do what he did. He has taken out a whole level between the school and superintendent" (R.K. Underwood, March 30, 1990, pp. 13,16).

The superintendent's 1989-90 restructuring streamlined decision-making in the district. Prior to this reorganization, principals had to cut through area assistant superintendents and the associate superintendent before reaching the superintendent in the line of authority. Decision-making was made easier, and communication flowed directly to schools.

(b) **Reorganization 1990-1991: Improvement of test scores**

On March 19, 1990, the school board unanimously again approved reorganization for the 1990-91 school year. This became the second reorganization (See Figure 8). The 1990-91 reorganization was designed to improve students' test scores ("Reorganization,” Board Minutes, March 19, 1990).

Twenty-five principals were reassigned. The new organization eliminated the title of Deputy Superintendent and created three Associate Superintendents who supervised Directors. The position of Coordinator was eliminated. The Assistant Superintendent for Support Services did not have
her contract renewed. The Assistant Superintendent for Exceptional Children retired and was not replaced. The former Assistant Superintendent for Personnel was reassigned to a principalship. The Assistant for Secondary Education retired at the end of the 1990-91 school year.

The Deputy Superintendent for Instruction became the Associate Superintendent for Programs. The Deputy Superintendent for Operations became the Associate Superintendent for Operations. The executive assistant assumed the title of Associate Superintendent for general administration. Six directors reported to the Associate Superintendent for Programs. Five directors and one technical assistant reported to the Associate Superintendent for Operations.

The Assistant Superintendents for Elementary Education, middle and secondary, became directors. A principal was appointed Director of Personnel. Eight positions of "specialists" were eliminated. Specialists had assisted teachers with instruction in specific content areas. The positions of the generalists stayed in place. Dr. Coble believed that specialists imposed their own philosophy and sent conflicting and confusing signals to schools.

There was also the reshuffling of assistant principals and the appointment of new ones. Of the 14 new assistant principals, six were black and seven were women. During the
1988-89 school year, 51 percent of the assistant principals were women and 22 percent were black. Fifty-three percent of the assistant principals for 1989-90 were women and 25 percent were black.

Students' test scores and achievement were expected to improve with reorganization. The city-county school system released a school by school breakdown for the six grades that were required to take the California Achievment Test (CAT). School administrators used the CAT as a comparison to determine whether the schools were helping students improve from year to year. In the August 8, 1990, report, it was shown that third graders improved two percentile points over their predecessors; fourth graders improved four percentile points; fifth graders scored the same; sixth graders scored the same; seventh graders improved two percentile points, and eighth graders improved 10 percentile points.

Scores were shown to be lower in a report in the daily Journal on "Forsyth Students Score Lower," August 23, 1991. After five years of incremental gains, the city-county students scored lower on a national standardized examination (J. Hoeffel, August 23, 1991, pp. 16, 22). Third graders went from the 72nd percentile to the 70th; fourth graders held even at the 58th; fifth graders increased from 65th to 67th; six graders dropped from the 65th; the seventh graders
dropped from 64th to 62nd, and eighth graders dropped from the 70th to the 62nd.

The article, "Local Test Scores Decline," was cited in the *Winston-Salem Journal* on February 1, 1992. The report indicated that the local students scored worse on most tests on the state's education report card. On the state's science tests, local students did not fare well. Forty-six percent of the high school graduates in Forsyth County completed courses required for admission to schools in the University of North Carolina system (J. Hoeffel, February 1, 1992, pp. 1, 4).

**Reorganization 1990-91, improvement of test scores: Analysis**

During reorganization 1990-91, many reassignments took place, and several titles changed shortly after reorganization. Eliminating the layers of authority allowed for easier communication with the superintendent. Dr. Coble explained that he believed specialists sent confusing messages to teachers, therefore, these positions were eliminated. Eliminating the specialists' positions in 1990-91 did not accomplish its aim, according to principals. Many principals explained during interviews, that they felt less adequate when assisting teachers in support areas. Principals believed that specialists were valuable because of their specific training and expertise.
Dr. Coble had expressed concern about students' test performance, and the primary justifications Dr. Coble gave for reorganizing in 1990-91 was that it would improve test scores and allow for more effective communication. Test scores did not improve in every grade level in the system. In the 1990-91 reorganization, the California Achievement Test (CAT) scores remained relatively constant from 1989-1992 for grade three students. Grade six reflected about the same percentile, varying slightly upward in year 1991-92. Grade eight showed the same percentile for the years, 1989-1990.

Scores were based on the California Achievement Test up through the 1991-92 school year. The state administered its own test after that year, the State's Basic Competency examination. It can be concluded that reorganization 1990-91 did not improve the overall test scores significantly for students.

2) **Controversial issues: Site-based management and tracking**

   (a) **Site-based management**

   Site-based management can be defined as school-empowered authority (as opposed to school-system) granted by the General Assembly of North Carolina. As the educational reform movement gained new momentum, management gained more attention as the nation entered the 1990's. In September,
1989, at the request of President Bush, the National Education Summit convened in Charlottesville, Virginia (Bush, 1989). At that meeting, a number of areas for the development of educational goals were identified. In the 1990 State of the Union address by President Bush, the following goals were identified: (1) All the children in America will start school ready to learn; (2) The percentage of students graduating from high school to at least 40%; (3) Students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship; (4) The United States will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement; (5) Every American adult will be literate and possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship; and, (6) Every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

Allied to the summit report was a National Governors' Association, document, "Restructuring the Educational System: Agenda for the 1990's," which called for a new look at school partnerships (National Governor's Conference, 1990). This report concluded that greater discretion and flexibility were needed at the local school levels.
The North Carolina’s Governor Hunt felt state control over education was too rigid. He suggested that principals and teachers be drawn into the decision-making process.

The impetus for the superintendent and the school board's agreement to implement site-based management stemmed, in part, from the national government and state's position for educational reform. To meet these new educational missions and goals, local educational units in the state of North Carolina were empowered by the General Assembly under Senate Bill 2, the School Improvement and Accountability Act of 1989, to decentralize their central offices and empower individual schools ("School Improvement," Senate Bill, 2, 1989, pp. 1,4). The Act, which had the improvement of student performance as the primary goal, solicited voluntary participation across the state. The North Carolina State Department of Education set their expectations for local units within the guidelines for implementation of site-based management (See Figure 9).

Implementation of site-based management was supported in the English audit, by the school board, Dr. Coble's own philosophy, and the state's position. Under the School Improvement and Accountability Act, Senate Bill 2, school boards were allowed to vote for or against the plan. Site-based management was approved by the school board in Winston-Salem/Forsyth County on March 5, 1990 ("Site-Based
Management,” Board Minutes, March 5, 1990). With school board approval, Dr. Coble made a commitment to site-based decision-making as a decentralized method of operating the school system. As reported in the school-board minutes, and stated by Dr. Coble, “the school system has begun to move toward site-based/shared decision-making and is committed to move in the direction of more site-based decision-making in the future” (“Site-Based Management,” Board Minutes, March 5, 1990). As indicated in Dr. Coble’s documents from January, 1989, to August, 1989, a 40 member committee of teachers and administrators at the state level met to develop a policy on site-based decision-making and its accompanying regulations and parameters (“School Improvement and Accountability,” Senate Bill, 2, pp. 1-4). The sources used by the State’s Task Force to gather information and ideas for its recommendation were: testimony from experts, digests of reports from other counties, background research conducted by the members, responses from interested organizations, members' knowledge, and surveys from other systems.

Dr. Coble's own committee conducted a system-wide study, which was then extensively analyzed. Administrators and teachers met with a nationally known consultant and author on site-based decision-making. (Richard G. Neal, Director of the Site-Base Management Project in Prince William County, Virginia.)
Dr. Coble chose "Mission Possible" as the theme for the mission of instituting site-based management. "Mission Possible" logos were displayed across the system. Dr. Coble said about site-based management, that it was "to provide students with an educational program that will ensure that they become academically proficient, responsible citizens and eventually productive in a rapidly changing world" (J. Hoeffel, August 17, 1990, pp. 1,4). All fifty-five school sites organized to implement the plan.

The adoption of site-based management gave the superintendent and board full authority to empower teachers and principals with decision-making responsibility for their schools. Guidelines were established at the state level to govern the plan and make it uniform across the state, according to the state's rules and regulations as adopted under Senate Bill, 2. There were two components to Senate Bill, 2, the (1) system wide school development plan, and (2) differentiated pay. If a school board chose to adopt the plan, there would be a choice for an allowance for funds called Differentiated Pay funds. Part of the entire school system's budget was transferred to the local schools. The guidelines for Senate Bill, 2 instructed that the superintendent address five basic areas: the parameters of site-based management; the school improvement team's membership; methods of operations; the school staff's role in
the site-based/shared decision-making process; and the central office staff's role in the site-based/shared decision-making process. Dr. Coble, with his committee, included in his plans the parameters written according to state and federal laws and requirements, school board policy, administrative regulations, contracts, the School Improvement Plan (SIT) the Differentiated Pay Plan, and the SIT guidelines (See Figure 10).

Three committees were established for converting to site-based management: the Superintendent's Committee, the School Improvement Coordinating Committee, and the Local School Improvement Team (See Figure 9). The Superintendent's School Improvement Committee acted as a liaison between the superintendent and other committees and staff members. The members completed and reviewed system-wide objectives and strategies for the superintendent's approval. Its members developed plans and reported data required by the state.

The School Improvement Coordinating Committee coordinated the process of planning for school improvements between the superintendent's committee and the Local School Committees. This team developed system-wide objectives and strategies for review by the superintendent's Coordinating Committee, and provided technical and instructional assistance to the local school committee and staff.
The Local School Improvement Team planned for the school. The objectives of this team had to meet the guidelines set forth in the State's Basic Education Plan (BEP). This team also determined the flow of money allocated for school use. According to the guidelines of Senate Bill 2, the local School Improvement Committee was composed of a teacher from each grade level, a member from the support staff, the principal, parents, business partners and non-certified staff. The grade-level representative or the subject-area representatives coordinated the work in the schools. All plans had to be locally approved before they could be sent to the State Department.

In the Team Membership Committee, three-fourths of the School Improvement Team's participants were elected and one-fourth appointed to ensure balance and representation. The appointments were made by the principal. The team's size was dependent upon the size of the staff. A parent was included on each team. Staggered rotation of committee members was required. The principal became a voting member. In the spring of each year, new members were elected for the following year.

The agenda and the minutes of meetings were posted and put in hand-out notebooks for all staff to review. Staff members were encouraged to attend meetings. Each school formulated and received approval before implementation of any
school plan. All staff members had the right to vote by secret ballot for the school plan. Staff members also had the right to vote by secret ballot on the Differentiated Pay Plan. A school decided on the necessity of a waiver.

"Fund for All; Principals Have Own Style in Managing Money," was the headline of the Sunday Journal, December 9, 1990 (J. Hoeffel, December 9, 1990, pp. 4,6). The article described principals as being similar to the North Carolina National Banks of Winston-Salem. This article illustrated that some principals in the system kept thousands of dollars in reserve in case of unforeseen expenses, while others spent most of their budgets. Some schools were run like small businesses. Each school had its own method for managing funds. Some had fund raisers and large budgets, while other principals did not want to build up a surplus of money. In the areas such as transportation, food services, and payroll, the budget remained central under the site-based management design. The function of the central office changed to facilitate programs and some staff development, and was responsible for high cost activities.

According to the parameters, the central personnel division was left out of the process. The indicators of the parameters guides indicated that schools were assigned to carrying out specific functions for their respective school sites (See Figure 10). One high school spent $258,535 in the
1990-91 school year, not including salaries and donations. The football team and candy selling brought in $44,000. Another principal did not have fund raisers and kept only $20,000 in reserve.

Site-based management: Analysis

The site-based management plan hit the system like a bolt of lightning. Implementation found the entire district unprepared in terms of planning, staff development, and training of personnel.

Before the coming of the site-based management teams, the personnel department had been the central hub for employment and personnel activity. The managers of this department had offered recommendations for employee hiring to principals and to the superintendent. They transferred all personnel, worked with retirements, mediated school conflicts, inducted employees into the system regarding their benefits, salary, certification, and pre-processing and pre-screening of applications. These managers also had interviewed all employees hired into the system and recruited personnel.

Under the new structure those managers’ responsibilities were reduced. The functions of recommending the hiring of personnel and mediating school conflicts, were eliminated and some functions were diminished, for example: recruiting and
interviewing and the transferring of teachers when those transfers were principal-initiated (called administrative transfers).

The site-based management plan contained two components: the system-wide school improvement plan and differentiated pay. Differentiated pay included supplementary funds allocated by the State Department of Public Instruction to each local school district. This new way of managing created radical changes for schools, principals, teachers, and the central office staff. As site-based management was being implemented, training was taking place. From interviews with principals, teachers, and principals, it was discovered that they felt the strain of the new management. According to personnel managers, site-based management created problems that affected hiring and staffing across the entire system.

According to interviews held with principals, many (60%) teachers experienced difficulties in their new roles of site decision-making. There were concerns about the parameters, building consensus, frustrations about the time and effort planning took. There was no specific understanding about the guidelines; there were varying degrees of comfort; dispersing funds was difficult, and it was not easy for teachers to discern who was in charge of what.

There was a small (25%) number of principals who described their schools' climate as positive. Their teachers
enjoyed making decisions, and they had few of the problems they had experienced with shared decision-making when Dr. Coble introduced the teacher empowerment of new leadership to the system in August, 1989. These principals said that teachers had no problems allocating their funds. One principal said that his teachers had no problems. They had used the team approach before site-based management was introduced.

In some schools, the School Improvement Team (SIT) received compensation for the amount of time they spent planning. Differentiated pay funds added money to school budgets. These funds could be used to hire in-service staff only to expand or supplement existing programs. There were many inconsistencies in the way employees were paid. No specific formula had been developed for the site-based plan. According to the finance officer, there was no uniform method of paying certificate and classified employees when they were hired.

All principals reported that they and the staff needed more training and staff development in decision-making before implementation of site-based management. From interviews with personnel managers, it was reported that there were no rules and regulations in place, and no training or sense of direction for them to follow. These managers saw each school as a separate personnel department, and did not have enough
personnel files to serve the district when some principals needed recommendations. The managers reported that many candidates were hired without their security, health, or personnel credentials checked. Candidates roamed throughout the district looking for jobs and seeking interviews. Most principals said this plan had more impact on their careers than any other they had experienced.

To principals interviewed, the three committees put in place to ensure the success of the program did not function effectively. The School Improvement Team became the vehicle for guiding schools to plan for budgets, plan the curriculum, staff personnel, and resolve internal problems. However, guidelines were equally unclear to teachers and principals. They were equally unclear about the parameters, the methods that should be used for operations, the school staff's role, and the central office's staff role and how each related to one another. Most principals commented that teachers on their staffs became frustrated because they were unprepared. They did not have enough training or staff development to justify assuming their new style of management. Teachers expressed concerns through the Teacher Advisory Committee that they were unprepared to balance budgets, or to plan the curriculum for the entire school, or to staff schools.

Principals claimed that they had conflict with some of the teachers, and that some teachers assumed too much
authority. According to some principals, many teachers did not know where their job functions started or stopped. Most principals said that they felt they themselves would be finally held accountable for making the final decisions. It was reported through interviews with principals that there were many inequities with business partners. Some businesses were able to give more to their school partners than other businesses. This created some concern on the parts of schools not receiving the same equity.

Dismantling the central office without informing or training the central staff to assume and understand their new roles created a hardship for the managers. They could not carry out their job assignments as they attempted to service all schools. Principals said they struggled and continue to struggle to become successful.

(b) The elimination of tracking

Tracking in Winston-Salem Forsyth County was the process of assigning students to special and sequential classes on the basis of teachers’ recommendations, test scores, and student performance. Tracking had existed in the school system for a long period of time. When English audited the school system, they made a recommendation that the tracks be eliminated (English, 1990). English revealed that almost no black students were in the highest level of college-level advanced placement courses. Few were in the honors classes,
the next highest level. The report cited that once a student was assigned to the lower level, there was little chance that he would escape, and that he would likely remain labeled an underachiever during the four years in high school (See Appendix C, Visual 11: Percentage Blacks Students in AP courses).

Dr. Coble's position regarding tracking was influenced by pressures from the minority community and his own desire to eliminate tracking. In an interview with Bill Albright, the Director of Guidance, the following account was given. From 1980 up to 1992, student placements mostly resulted from standardized tests, teacher recommendations, and class performance. Advanced student placements came also from recommendations of parents. According to Mr. Albright, Director of Guidance, parents could request an advanced placement class for their child (W. Albright, Personal Communication, January, 1995).

At the time of the 1984 reorganization, with the emergence of eight, four-year high schools, courses previously termed "advanced placement courses," "academically gifted courses," and honors courses were grouped together to form the framework for all the honors curriculum. During the 1984-85 school year, a proposal was presented to the school board by a group from the Parent Teacher Association Council to award a "challenge point" for taking honors courses. This
proposal was studied extensively by a committee chaired by the PTA chairperson. That committee concluded awarding a full point for taking honors courses would result in putting a disproportionate emphasis on the honors courses, thereby creating a negative influence on the rest of the curriculum.

After many meetings and considerable deliberation, the committee recommended that the school system adopt a three-level system which awarded a fraction of a point for each level. This plan was not adopted by the board. The history on tracking showed that in 1984-85, no points were awarded and that some students at this time were reluctant to take any honors or advanced courses because no extra points were attached. In 1985-86, the school board authorized reinstituting three extra points for honors AG and AP courses, two points for advanced courses, and one point for regular courses (Albright, Personnel Communication, January, 1995).

The curriculum audit expressed concern that the five-tier tracking system relegated a disproportionate number of black students to the lower levels. To this statement, Dr. Coble responded, "I think we need to re-examine how students are placed in programs and how they are tracked." He communicated that he was concerned about the position in which minority students had been placed. The audit report declared that the tracking system in the public schools was
arbitrary, largely inflexible, applied unevenly, was inherently subjective, and as a result, racist. The report stated that, "Tracking continued to perpetuate segregation in the school, even as segregation has been officially abolished" (J. Hoeffel, May 11, 1990, pp. 1,15).

The high school curriculum audit performed by English and his team illustrated that the criteria for assigning students to various levels varied from school to school, so that a student could have a better chance at one school over another. The report's documentation took issue with the current practice of allowing parents to have their children placed in a higher level than the one to which they were assigned. The audit read, "This practice further intensified the element of bias at work in high school pupil placement" (J. Hoeffel, May 11, 1990, p. 15). Dr. Coble supported the report's recommendation to offer three levels of courses: regular, honors, and advanced placement.

According to principals interviewed in that audit, black parents were much less apt to protest a low tracking placement than their white counterparts. The audit gave the curriculum an "F" on its report card as written in the headline of the local newspaper (J. Hoeffel, May 11, 1990, p. 1).

Dr. Coble stated, as part of his overall plans, that his intent was to reduce the disparity of test scores between
minority and non-minority students (See Figures 1-3: Comparison of CAT Percentile for Black, White, and North Carolina Students) From the interviews and conversations, the superintendent said that he learned that the school system had a previous history for creating disparities between minorities and non-minorities in student placement. Many black students were not college-bound through their high school courses. Dr. Coble eliminated the tracking of minorities from lower levels. These several changes are summarized in the accompanying Exhibit 4.

The elimination of tracking: Analysis

In the Coble administration, due to timing, political pressures, the audit, and past concerns about tracking, a closer scrutiny and reassessment of the way students were assigned received widespread community attention. Black ministers spoke out at a community forum. They supported the view that most parents were unaware that there were two systems within the school system.

At one forum, Dr. Coble was asked to respond to tracking. He explained that some whites would have to be educated to understand that the practices of tracking had dishonored some students. All members of the school board did not agree to eliminate tracking.
With school board approval, the administration, in 1991, beginning in the 9th grade (the other grades were to be phased-in over four years), placed all courses in either a regular or honors-advanced placement system (J. Hoeffel, March 5, 1991, pp. 1,4). The vast number of courses were regular. Honors courses were offered in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Advanced placement courses were offered in grades 11 and 12. The four level system was now restructured to two levels, honors, and regular. The school board approved and adopted this plan 9-0.

In 1994-95, the North Carolina University System developed an alternative scheme in conjunction with the State Board of Education, one that placed the entire state on a uniform system. In spite of certain local districts' opposition, the State Board imposed this modification on the State of North Carolina's high school grading system. This system added one additional point for advanced placement courses. The tracking scheme in Winston-Salem/Forsyth County System, once again reflected a three-level system. When the state made uniform the three grading level plan, it undermined the school system's two level plan that had just been put into place.

Several attempts were made to restructure the grading system, but all plans failed. The school board approved the elimination of tracking, March 5, 1991. Various reviews from
the community and from teachers showed positive attitudes about Dr. Coble and the school board's decision (J. Hoeffel, March 5, 1991, pp. 15, 17).

3) **Dr. Coble's interaction with subordinates: Crisis events**

During Dr. Coble's administration as superintendent, he faced five situations that could be considered to be crisis events involving interactions with subordinates. This section of the study focuses upon Dr. Coble's interactions with subordinates in four departments, namely: (1) Dr. Donald Doepner, Curriculum and Instruction Department, (2) Mr. C. Douglas Carter, Exceptional Child Department, (3) Dr. Barbara Phillips, Support Services Department, and (4) the Division of Elementary Personnel. A crisis also developed in the area of salaries.

According to his earliest interview while still a candidate for the position of superintendent, Dr. Coble had communicated to the editor of the Winston-Salem Journal, on February 10, 1989, that he was aware of some internal school system problems that were being voiced by the community. He said he was questioned by members of the community and school administrators about the instructional department and minority achievement (R.K. Underwood, February 10, 1989, p. 4). The English audit confirmed problems in the departments
of: (a) Curriculum and Instruction, (b) Exceptional Children, and (c) Support Services.

(a) **Curriculum and Instruction Department**

Through a news citation, Dr. Coble disclosed that in the forums held during his candidacy for the superintendency there were strong public concerns regarding problems in the Curriculum and Instruction Department, particularly concerning the middle schools (R.K. Underwood, February 10, 1989, p. 4).

The audit study performed by English, on April, 1990, reported that the Department of Curriculum and Instruction needed improvements in the areas of monitoring and compliance with special education laws (English, 1990). They also recommended that the curriculum guides be improved. The audit specifically stated that: (1) there was little consistency in curriculum monitoring within the WS/FCSS; (2) that job descriptions were vague; and (3) few understood the nature of monitoring or the constructive use of test data as feedback to improve instruction and learning. The Assistant Superintendent for Instruction retired from that department June, 30, 1990. A new Director, Elsa Woods, was hired to head the department, July 1, 1990.

(b) **Exceptional Children's Department**

In the Exceptional Children's Department, the English audit had recommended that the system fully comply with the
laws concerning special education. The Assistant Superintendent of Support Services, Mr. Carter, had been reassigned from that department to the Exceptional Children's Department in the 1989-90 reorganization. Mr. Carter was relieved of the gifted program in that department, on July 18, 1989. He later retired from the system. After Mr. Carter's retirement, the auditors, Curtis Clark from the State Auditor's Office in Raleigh, North Carolina, and his team, which included Eleanor Stone of the Educational Regional Center in Greensboro, North Carolina, evaluated the Exceptional Children's department's records in a routine audit (R.K. Underwood, September 12, 1991). The audit was conducted on September 12, 1991. The auditors spent three twelve hour days at the central office reviewing records and interviewing fifteen members of the staff. The committee investigated the department's documents from 1989 to 1991 and discovered many missing records (J. Hoeffel, August 18, 1991).

According to the outside auditors, it was obvious that there were more children eligible to be mainstreamed in Winston-Salem/Forsyth County than was indicated in the system's records (R.K. Underwood, September 12, 1991, pp. 1,8). Auditors of the State Department of Public Instruction found that about 34 percent of the records for gifted and handicapped children did not include the required information
(R.K. Underwood, September 12, 1991, p. 8). Auditors were unable to find school rosters that listed all handicapped children dating to 1985. In 1986, Odell Clanton, the official who reviewed the records at that time, found 154 students at one school who should not have been counted. The system was required to return $26,000 (R.K. Underwood, September 12, 1991, p. 8).

Emily Hyatt of the North Carolina State Department arrived on September 12, 1991 to help train principals and teachers to set up, maintain, and interpret records. The former Assistant Superintendent, C. Douglas Carter, spoke out in defense of the department. Mr. Carter said, "We did everything the rules said we were supposed to do. Memos were sent to schools and information was filed" (J. Hoeffel August 18, 1991, p. 9). Some persons in that department were transferred, and a new director, Dr. Carlinda Purcell, was hired, to manage the department, July 1, 1991.

(c) Support Services Department

On December 12, 1990, the Journal Headlined, "Ex-Assistant Superintendent Sues Board for $15 Million." The Assistant Superintendent for Support Services, Dr. Barbara Phillips, alleged that an unnamed source had been slanderous and libelous. The source said in the article that the Assistant Superintendent for Support Services, who had not been chosen for the position of superintendent, had tried to
sabotage Dr. Coble's chance of being hired and later had tried to ruin his career.

In this report, the former Assistant Superintendent alleged that an article in the *Winston-Salem Chronicle* (a black owned newspaper company), on March 29, 1990, included comments from an unnamed source that were slanderous (J. Hoeffel, December 5, 1990, p. 15). The source specified in that article that the former assistant who had applied for the job of superintendent, but was not chosen, tried to sabotage the superintendent's career. This account had been given December 12, 1990 (J. Hoeffel, December 5, 1990, p. 13).

Dr. Phillips had served as the Assistant to the Superintendent in the 1988-89 restructuring, and was reassigned to the Department of Support Services. Shortly after Dr. Phillips was reassigned, Dr. Coble alleged that she had defamed his character. On March 30, 1990, Dr. Coble did not recommend to the Board of Education the renewal of her contract ("Resignation" Board Minutes, March 30, 1990). The assistant was terminated by the school board June 30, 1990, according to the lawsuit ("Resignation," Board Minutes, June 30, 1990).

For each of the charges, slander, libel and wrongful dismissal, the lawsuit of the former Assistant Superintendent asked for actual damages in excess of $10,000, bringing the
total to more than $15 million. The accusations in the suit against the former Assistant Superintendent were that she had:

1) Provided confidential information to another candidate of her choice;

2) made critical and unflattering comments about the superintendent;

3) asked the source to have the janitor search the superintendent's trash for information that might put him in a bad light;

4) tried to have someone break into the superintendent's office to find information that might put him in a bad light; and

5) tried to have someone break into the superintendent's office to find information that might put him in a compromising position (J. Hoeffel, December 5, 1990, p. 15).

Dr. Coble won the case, and subsequently spoke with leaders in the community and explained his position. According to Dr. Coble, he could not be effective with Dr. Phillips on his staff (J. Hoeffel, December 5, 1990, p. 15).

(d) Elementary Division of Personnel

It was reported by one school board member that there were unfair hiring practices in this department, alleging that uncertified personnel were being hired instead of
certified personnel, and that the manager of that department was assigning specific teachers to schools. Dr. Coble conducted his own internal investigation. Marilyn Gilliam, a personnel manager, was directed to ask three questions of elementary principals: (1) Who recommended hiring on their staff? (2) Did you hire lateral entry personnel over certified? (3) Did you receive specific assigned teachers from personnel? (Gilliam, Personal Communication, September, 1993). The elementary principals disputed the claims of unfair hiring issues. Concerned about the investigation, the elementary principals met as a group and then appointed a delegation to address the issues with the superintendent. Elementary principals responded again in another meeting with the division directors and once more assured the central staff of their fair hiring procedures. Principals interviewed said that hiring was done either by principals, by the principals with the school improvement team, or by the school improvement team only.

The results of that investigation showed that there were no irregularities of hiring in the Elementary Division of Personnel, that lateral entry hiring was within the rules and regulations as approved by the State of North Carolina, and had been endorsed by the WS/FCSS since before 1980 to the present time. The Elementary Department was reviewed during the summer of 1993, and it was found to be in compliance with
the state's rules and regulations regarding lateral entry. The Forsyth County system had been hiring under lateral entry before 1980, and no wrongful practices were found.

(e) **Salary issues**

The school system had not had a salary review in many years. It had come to Dr. Coble's attention that some positions were not in alignment with salaries, and that there were no uniform procedures or documents to support salary administration. During November, 1990, Eleanor Poole of the Management and Personnel Services of Raleigh, North Carolina, (MAPS) conducted a salary and classification review of all administrative positions within the system, except for the managers of certificated personnel (E. Poole, MAPS Study, November, 1990).

A system-wide salary survey was conducted. A representative group of employees was interviewed regarding their duties and responsibilities. Employees were asked to complete a Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) that described their duties and responsibilities. The data were reviewed and analyzed.

Poole used eight criteria to analyze the salary review: (1) Variety and Complexity of Work (Difficulty); (2) Decision-making Responsibility; (3) Accountability (consequence of error); (4) Type and Nature of Public Contacts; (5) Supervision Received Independence of Action;
(6) Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities to Perform the Work; (7) Supervision Exercised; and (8) Working Conditions.

The MAP study conducted by Eleanor Poole did not consider volume as part of the criteria. Volume was the amount of work performed. Administrative personnel were reclassified according to the criteria of the MAP study, and salaries were adjusted according to job descriptions (E. Poole, MAPS Study, November, 1990).

Dr. Coble's interactions with subordinates crisis events:

Analysis

It is evident that Dr. Coble spent a great portion of his time "putting out fires" in every department in the district. He dealt with many personalities and with situations that were delicate and sensitive in nature, which distracted him from his original goals and objectives. Little explanation was given concerning his rationale for staffing since the concept was that the schools would be better able to communicate with the superintendent. Still many questions were raised and left unanswered. When such a climate is created sometimes, it stifles growth and causes workers to feel insecure.

According to the superintendent, on the one hand, the sensitive issues that developed in departments came forth either as a result of circumstances that had existed before
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his administration, and on the other hand, issues developed as a result of his goals and objectives.
CHAPTER 5
Summary and Comments

1. When Dr. Coble became Superintendent of Schools of Winston Salem/Forsyth County Schools in 1989, he set out to improve decision-making within the school system and to aggressively solicit local community businesses and corporations in school affairs. He expressed the hope that these actions, once accomplished, would ultimately lead to better classroom performance and student learning.

2. By all appearances at the time that he resigned in 1993 to return to his former position in the Center for Creative Leadership, he was largely successful in pursuing these principle initiatives.

3. In obtaining the active support and participation of 100 or more local area businesses and organizations in vocational and other related school programs, Superintendent Coble clearly brought the schools and community groups into close harmony with great promise for participating students and teachers.
4. In two efforts at reorganization, he sought initially in 1989 to match personnel assignments to positions and again in 1991, and perhaps more importantly, to open lines of communication between school personnel and the superintendent by eliminating two layers of bureaucracy. These actions seemed in line with bodies of administrative theory that extolled the virtues of employee participation in management decisions and of "flat" organizations in which teachers and principals have immediate access to senior administrators, including the superintendent (See Appendix A).

5. In so doing, however, he may have left the superintendency more exposed and vulnerable to routine personnel and staffing problems that in more conventional organizations would be handled by key subordinates. In deed, by his seeming inability or unwillingness to delegate authority for handling sensitive personnel issues, he left himself exposed to time consuming, emotion-laden crises that ultimately proved to be major distractions from achievement of key elements of his agenda.

6. Moreover, Dr. Coble was clearly frustrated in pursuing his principal initiatives by the intrusion of State
education and legislative actions. Under authority of Senate Bill, 2, state authorities in effect expanded exponentially Dr. Coble’s efforts merely to “flatten and simplify” the district’s administrative structure to become a full blown effort to introduce “site-based management” in a State-directed attempt to “empower teachers and principals.” Despite his experiences at the Center for Creative Leadership and his seeming commitment to openness and participation in management, Dr. Coble seemed ill prepared to provide the kind of training and assistance needed to introduce site-based management in the participating schools of his district. Clearly, the State itself provided a poor example in mandating such revolutionary changes essentially by fiat. But participating principals in general expected more from their superintendent in forstering and facilitating these changes, however, mandated.

7. Dr. Coble’s effective service in negotiating changes in the district’s traditional patterns of academic tracking also was negated in part by the preemptive action of State and State University education authorities, despite Dr. Coble’s evident skill in bridging across social class and racial lines in dealing with the issue of tracking.
8. Dr. Coble's hope that his various initiatives, once accomplished, might be reflected in greater student learning has yet to be demonstrated, at least in terms of standardized test scores. Comparisons between beginning and ending years of his tenure were frustrated by a major change in tests.
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Review of the Literature

It is believed that a historical review of literature anchors any study on leadership. This review offers an overview of the theories of researchers in the field of education. Included in the literature review is literature from one of the earliest educational researchers, Henri Fayol, to present day researchers, Bolman and Deal, and Peters and Waterman. Section One presents, (1) a discussion of leaders in management roles, and (2) a discussion of the literature concerning organizational structures. Section Two contains literature that is more closely related to this study.

Section One: Leadership/Management

Henry Fayol

Henry Fayol, A French industrialist with a background as a top management executive, advanced ideas in the area of administration theory:

1. Fayol focused his attention on the manager rather than the worker.

2. He clearly separated the processes of administration from other operations in the organization, such as production.
3. He emphasized the common element of the process of administration in different organizations.

Fayol (1916) believed that a trained administrative group was essential in improving the increasingly complex operations of organizations. As early as 1916, he wrote that Administrative ability can and should be acquired in the same manner as technical ability, first at school and later in the workshop (Fayol, 1916).

In his work, General and Industrial Management, Fayol established himself as the first organizational theorist. He defined administration in terms of five functions: (1) planning, (2) organizing, (3) commanding, (4) coordinating, and (5) controlling.

Fayol identified a list of "Principles," which were: (1) unity of command, (2) authority, (3) initiative, and (4) morale. He emphasized that flexibility and a sense of proportion were essential to managers who adapted principles and definitions to particular situations.

Max Weber

Max Weber's (1942) theory of bureaucracy identified three types of legitimate authority in leadership: legal rational, traditional, and charismatic. In the legal rational authority, there is a set of established rules which individuals are required to follow. Traditional authority
dictates the duty of allegiance, in which the administrator legitimizes where he works. The idea of charismatic authority is derived from the religious sector of Christianity. "Charisma" legitimates one's authority over another, and establishes a form of loyalty to an individual.

Weber's research supported the notion that bureaucracy is the ideal way to compel people to obey. The manager is the imperative coordinator. Imperative coordination is the probability that an order, if issued by an administrator, will the order be obeyed by the participants? This theory maintains that subordinates assign the probability that they will obey the command. In a bureaucracy, there is a set of rules that dictate probable results. Supervision in the ideal type of bureaucracy is close, and is identified by a span of control. A line of authority is in direct connection with a product or delivery of service. There exists a distinction between line and staff. Staff personnel are advisory personnel to line people. In a line relationship, a direct relationship exists between two positions, but one is given the right to issue orders for the other.

Weber listed the characteristics of a bureaucracy as follows:

1. Hierarchy of Authority - There is a delegation of authority which flows down a line of command. There is a network of positions formed in a pyramid fashion.
2. Division of Labor - Specialization improves efficiency. Division of labor increases the quality of work.

3. Technically Competent Participants - These participants function to carry out the division of labor.

4. Standard Operating Procedures - This process brings uniformity and control. (If everyone understands standard procedures, the standards of imperative coordination is greater.)

5. Rules and Regulations - The behavior of subordinates is governed by rules and regulations. Participants know exactly what they can and cannot do.

6. Limited Authority of Office - This process defines responsibilities not in one's authority.

7. Differential Rewards of Officer - The higher the position in the hierarchy, greater the reward.


9. Administration Separate From Ownership - Those who manage are separate from those who own.

10. Emphasis is on Written Communication - All bureaucracies have files which become the archives. Weber's theory offered a dysfunction for every function of a bureaucratic characteristic. Certain dysfunctions are brought on by the nature of the bureaucratic characteristics.
In every human function, that which is maximum can become minimum (Weber, 1949).

**Tannenbaum and Schmidt**

Tannenbaum and Schmidt developed a continuum ranging from boss-centered leadership to subordinate-centered leadership. Tannenbaum and Schmidt's work is believed to be one of the best topologies of decision procedures. They identify three varieties of autocratic procedures. In the first variety, the manager simply "announces" his decision to the subordinate. In the second autocratic procedure, the manager "makes the decision," but instead of simply announcing it, he tries to "sell" the decision to subordinates. In using this procedure, the manager recognizes the possibility of subordinate resistance and seeks to explain why the decision was necessary and how it will be advantageous to subordinates. The third autocratic procedure also reflects concern about subordinate resistance. A question-and-answer process allows subordinates the opportunity to clarify their understanding of the decision and its implications. Any doubts and fears which are based on misunderstanding of the decision can be dispelled.

Two other procedures in the Tannenbaum and Schmidt topology are variations of consultation. Unlike the autocratic procedures, subordinates have some influence over
the decisions. In the first consultation procedure, the manager takes the initiative in identifying and diagnosing the problem, generating alternatives and identifying the most promising one. The inactive choice is presented to subordinates for their reaction. The decision is subject to change if the manager finds the subordinates have serious objections or criticisms.

The final decision is reserved for the manager himself. With the second consultation procedure, there is somewhat more influence from subordinates. The manager presents the problem to subordinates and invites them to diagnose it and suggest solutions. Subordinates also may participate in evaluation of the solutions. From the list of alternatives that have been generated, the manager then makes the final choice.

The last two decision procedures in this topology are variations of joint decision-making between a manager and subordinates. In the first variety of group decisions, the manager defines the problem and establishes boundaries for the solution. Within these limits, the group generates solutions, evaluates them, and makes a final choice. The manager takes part in the decision-making process of the group, but is only a discussion coordinator with no more influence over the final choice than any other group member.
The maximum degree of subordinate influence occurs with the second variety of group decision. With this decision procedure, the leader allows the group to identify and diagnose problems, as well as to generate solutions and make a final choice. The manager may or may not participate in the discussion process, but if he does, his role is once again only that of a discussion coordinator. The manager usually specifies certain limits or constraints within which the group is allowed to make decisions. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1961) pointed out that this procedure is an extreme form of group participation that is only occasionally found in formal organizations.

Chris Argyris

Chris Argyris based his ideas of human personality on Maslow's need-hierarchy theory. He saw incapability between the human personality and traditionally structural organizations. According to Argyris, people tended to develop in certain directions as they matured from infancy to adulthood. They move from passive infant to adults; from high levels of dependence to high levels of independence; from few skills and interests to a wider range.

Argyris viewed the stages of development trends as predispositions that could be altered with experience. Argyris did not believe this theory would be useful in making
predictions about individuals; but it could be used to describe the individual's level of development. He said there is conflict between individuals because the employees in the workplace were treated like children, and problems were built into the traditional principles of organizational design and management. Argyris believed task-specialization produced the need for a chain of command to coordinate the work of all the people doing narrowly specialized jobs. Chains of command required that people at high levels be able to direct and control people at subordinate levels, causing dependence. Argyris said this resulted in psychological failure because the individuals could not define their goals. He further believed that frustrated employees would resist or adapt to the frustration. He listed six ways in which employees might respond:

1. They might withdraw from the organization by frequent absenteeism;

2. They might colorize the workplace as unrewarding, and perceive changes for advancement as slim;

3. They might resist the organization through sabotage or deception; (Argyris, 1964)

4. They might try to climb the hierarchy to obtain better jobs;
5. They might create groups (labor unions) that can help to change the imbalance between the individual and the organization;

6. They may become indifferent to the organization's needs. Argyris (1964) said that managers usually use three major strategies, and all three of these tend to compound the problem. One method is "strong dynamic leadership." The assumption is that the employees will respond; however, it was maintained that this approach is self-defeating. Another approach is to install tighter controls, to utilize control inspectors, and time-and-motion studies. These tighter controls, however, reinforce the conflict between individuals and organizations and lead to competitive games between managers and employees. The third method involves the use of a variety of "human relations" programs, which take the form of "selling" the company's philosophy through advertisement.

Argyris (1964) recommended resolving conflict through job enlargement and participative management to reduce conflict. He felt there could be problems with employees when many are already socialized to be passive and dependent at work. They may resist efforts to make the work challenging and to take responsibility. Argyris believed "reality-centered leadership" is needed that takes into account the actual needs of the employees and the needs of the organization.
A. H. Maslow

Maslow (1970) constructed a theoretical hierarchy of human needs. These needs were developed into five basic categories, arranged from low to high. Lower needs take control of behavior when they are not satisfied. Higher needs surface and become important only after the lower needs are satisfied.

Maslow supported the idea that all human beings have a variety of needs. The example of extremely hungry people was used. When persons are very hungry, food controls their lives. People who are well fed, find eating not as important and other needs become important. Maslow believed that lower needs have to be satisfied before higher needs. He did not assume that they had to be completely satisfied, but it is a matter of degree. The more a lower need is satisfied, the more an individual is likely to focus on higher needs. Maslow believed there were exceptions as sacrifices of parents.

Researchers say Maslow's needs theories have had a significant impact on managers and behavioral scientist. Researchers, however, in attempting to assess the validity of Maslow's theory have found it difficult, because to test the theory, one has to be able to assess both the strength and level of satisfaction of each need (Maslow, 1970).
Ralph Stodgill

Stodgill (1974) reviewed 163 trait studies that were conducted during the period from 1949 to 1970. In this study of traits, a variety of measurement procedures were used. The emphasis for this study focused on the relation of leader traits to leader effectiveness. Stodgill suggested that the following trait profile is characteristic of successful leaders. The leader is characterized by a strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals, venturesomeness and originality in problem-solving, a drive to exercise initiations in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decisions and actions, readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other persons' behavior, and capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand (Stodgill, 1974).

Stodgill's earliest research review supported the assumption that leaders are born rather than trained (Stodgill, 1957). Researchers have clearly discredited his earlier assumption. His later studies also supported a reformed theory that persons are trained to be leaders.
David McClelland

McClelland did a great deal of research on managerial effectiveness. Need strength is measured with a projective technique called the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). The test consists of a series of pictures of people in ambiguous situations. A person taking the test is asked to make up a story about each picture, and the feelings, needs, and attitudes of the person are "projected" into his stories. The test provides a good indication of what the person thinks in idle moments, his daydreams, fantasies, and aspirations. The TAT appears to be a better measure of needs than direct questions about them. The person taking the tests, typically reveals much more about himself than he realizes.

When a person's stories indicate he thinks a lot about attaining a challenging goal, attaining a standard of excellence, or successfully completing a difficult task, the person probably has a high need for achievement. People with a strong need for achievement prefer a job with the following characteristics:

1. Performance outcomes depend on a person's own effort and ability rather than on chance factors beyond the person's control.

2. The tasks are moderately difficult and risky, rather than easy or impossible.
3. There is frequent concrete feedback about how well the person is performing.

4. There is considerable opportunity to initiate action rather than merely deciding how to react to immediate problems.

Such characteristics are likely to be found in occupations such as sales representatives, real estate agents, producer of entertainment events, and owner/manager of a small business.

When a person's stories indicate he thinks a lot about influencing other people, defeating an opponent or competitor, winning an argument, or attaining a position of greater authority; the person probably has a high need for power. Such persons may act in a variety of different ways to express and satisfy this need. Such persons may be:

1. Reading books or watching films with an emphasis on violence, explicit sexuality, or competitive sports;

2. Collecting prestige possessions as symbols of influence and status;

3. Engaging in competitive sports, especially those with a "one-on-one" situation where a player tries to outwit or dominate a particular opponent;

4. Taking alcohol or drugs, or participating in mystical-religious rituals to heighten experience of personal strength and influence over events;
5. Helping others or giving advice in a way that demonstrates personal superiority and the weakness or dependence of others;

6. Joining organizations and assuming leadership role in them.

People with a strong need for power prefer occupations that entail the exercise of influence, such as executive, politician, labor leader, police officer, military officer, and lawyer.

When a person's stories indicate that he frequently thinks about establishing or restoring close, friendly relationships, joining groups, participating in pleasant social activities, and enjoying shared experiences with family or friends, the person probably has a need for affiliation. Such a person receives great satisfaction from being liked and accepted by others, including the people with whom he works. Effective performance is sometimes instrumental in attaining acceptance by co-workers, but concern for the task can also impede co-worker acceptance, such as when there is a disagreement over work procedures or standards.

An organizational manager is most likely to be effective if his need for achievement is subordinated to a strong power need so that it will be expressed in efforts to facilitate team performance rather than in pursuit of individual
success. If achievement is the dominant need, a manager tries to accomplish everything by himself. He is reluctant to delegate and fails to develop a strong sense of responsibility and commitment among his subordinates.

McClelland's classical patriarchal ideology is an effective set of values for building and expanding organizations. The themes in this ideology include: gaining power through submission to a father figure or superordinate entity, self-discipline and self-sacrifice so that the system may prevail, and justice in distribution of rewards and punishments, with rewards for the obedient and faithful in the after-life if not in their present lifetime.

McClelland believed that the core values of ideology of patriarchal authority have led to some of the strongest organizations and most expansive empires in history (McClellandm 1975). This occurred when there were leaders who were able to mobilize the resources of the system for expansion, and who inspired member dedication to the system by building on the influence potential of the core values.

Hersey and Blanchard

Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) model dealt with only one situational moderator variable, called follower maturity. This is defined as the capacity to set high but attainable goals (achievement motivation), willingness to take
responsibility, and education and/or experience. Maturity of a subordinate is measured only in relation to a particular task that the subordinate is to perform. A subordinate may be quite mature in relation to one task, but very immature in relation to another aspect of the job.

According to Hersey and Blanchard, follower maturity involves two related components, job maturity, and psychological maturity. Job maturity is a subordinate's task-relevant skills and technical knowledge. Psychological maturity is a feeling of self-confidence and self-respect. A "high maturity" subordinate has the ability to do a particular task, and also has a high degree of self-confidence about the task. A "low maturity" subordinate lacks both ability and confidence. Hersey and Blanchard recognized that other situational variables, such as the expectations of the leader's boss, the nature of the task, and time pressures, are sometimes as important as follower maturity.

In Situational Leadership theory, as the level of subordinate maturity increases, the leader should use more relationship-oriented behavior and less task-oriented behavior up to the point where subordinates have a moderate level of maturity. As subordinate maturity increases beyond that level, the leader should then decrease the amount of relationship-oriented behavior, while continuing to decrease
the amount of task-oriented behavior. These researchers gave prescriptions for the appropriate behavior combination for each level of maturity. The most essential aspect of their theory is that these authors remind us that it is essential to treat different subordinates differently and to treat the same subordinates differently as the situation changes (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977).

In an attempt to explain inconsistencies, Hersey and Blanchard formulated a contingency theory of leadership. It was originally called the "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership" and in its revised form is referred to as the "Situational Leadership Theory."

The theory is concerned with two broad categories of leadership behavior, "Task Behavior" and "Relationship Behavior." Task Behavior is the extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of members of their group (followers; to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs accomplished. Relationship Behavior is the extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group by opening up channels of communication, providing
socioemotional support, "psychological strokes," and facilitating behavior.

Cohen and March

Cohen and March’s (1986) study examined general ideas about leadership and ambiguity in the context of the American college president. They believed that the role of the presidency is an illusion, in that important aspects of the role seem to disappear on close examination. In particular, decision-making in the university appears to result extensively from a process that decouples problems and choices and makes the president’s role more commonly sporadic and symbolic than significant.

They looked at ways in which leadership functioned within an organized anarchy, including the special problems associated with leadership in colleges and universities. They translated a set of observations made in the study of some university organizations into a model of decision-making, which they termed organized anarchies, that is, institutions which do not meet the conditions for more classical models of decision-making in some or all of the important ways.

Cohen and March identified another process, which they termed the garbage can process (Cohen & March, 1986). As they observed, this process is one in which problems,
solutions, and participants move from one choice opportunity to another in such a way that the nature of the choice, the time it takes, and the problems it solves all depend on a relatively complicated inter-meshing of the mix of choices available at any one time: the mix of problems that have access to the organization, the mix of solutions looking for problems, and the outside demands on the decision-makers. The garbage can model is a possible step toward seeing the systematic interrelatedness of organizational phenomena. Measured against a conventional normative model of reactional choice, the garbage can process does not seem pathological, but such standards are not really appropriate, because the process occurs precisely when the preconditions of more "normal" rational models are not met. This process enables choices to be made, and problems sometimes to be resolved, even when the organization is plagued with goal ambiguity and conflict.

Cohen and March identified five major properties of decision-making in organized anarchies that are of substantial importance to the tactics of accomplishing things in colleges and universities.

1. Low salience - most issues for most people have salience. The decisions to be made secure only partial attention from participants. A major share of the attention devoted to a particular is tied less to the
content of the issue than to its symbolic significance for individual, and to group esteem.

2. High inertia - the total system has high inertia. Anything that requires a coordinated effort of the organization in order to start is unlikely to start anything that requires a coordinated effort of the organization in order to be stopped.

3. Garbage can - any decision can become a garbage can for almost any problem. The issues discussed in the context of any particular decision depend less on the decision or problems involved than on the timing of their joint arrivals and the existence of alternative arenas in which to exercise problems.

4. Overload - the processes of choice are easily subject to overload. When the load on the system builds up relative to its capabilities for exercising and resolving problems, the decision outcomes in the organization tend to become increasingly separated from the formal process of the decision.

5. Weak information base - the organization has a weak information base about past events on past decisions, and is often not retained. When retained, it is difficult to retrieve. Information about current activities is scant.
Eight basic tactical rules for use is suggested to those who seek to influence the course of decisions: (1) spend time before making the decision, (2) persist on following through in a variety of contexts, (3) exchange status for substance, (4) facilitate opposition’s participation, (5) overload the system, (6) provide garbage cans, (7) manage unobtrusively, and (8) interpret history.

Cohen and March stress the under-use of the competitive market, anarchy, independent judiciary and plebiscitary autocracy models of governance in the universities (Cohen & March, 1986).

Gary Yukl

Yukl (1981) classified nearly all research on leadership into one of four approaches: (1) the power-influence approach, (2) the trait approach, (3) the behavior approach and (4) the situational approach.

The power-influence approach attempts to explain leader effectiveness in terms of the source and amount of power available to leaders and the manner in which leaders exercise power over the followers. The trait approach emphasizes the personal qualities of leaders. The behavior approach emphasizes what leaders do, instead their traits or sources of power.
The situational approach emphasizes the importance of situational factors, such as the nature of the task performed by the group, the leader's authority and discretion to act, the role expectations imposed on superiors, peers and subordinates, and the nature of the external environment.

Yukl (1981) developed a list of eleven forms of leadership influence. Yukl felt that there was more conceptual confusion about influence processes than about any other facet of leadership.

His research revealed that a large number of studies used influence measures that were based on the power topology proposed by French and Raven (1959).

1. Reward power
2. Legitimate power
3. Coercive power
4. Expert power
5. Referent power

Yukl's study showed that some trends in the results of such studies are evident. Influence based on the attractions and expertise of a leader was usually associated with greater subordinate satisfaction, less absenteeism and turnover, and higher performance. Use of legitimate power and coercive power tended to result in lower satisfaction and performance, or to be uncorrelated with them. The results for use of reward power were quite inconsistent with a clear trend.
across studies. The finding that effective leaders rely more on the use of personal power derived from their expertise and attractiveness can be explained in terms of the complex nature of work roles in most task groups. Reliance on position power emphasizes the performance of normal role requirements prescribed by rules, regulations, and specific directions from the leader.

One issue in such studies is the validity of the influence measures. Yukl claimed that is difficult to measure accurately the manner in which one person exerts influence over another person. The power studies have depended on subordinates to report the relative usage of different forms of influence by their leader. This research offered six methods for studying leadership behavior: the diary, continuous observation, activity sampling, retrospective self-reports, questionnaires, and critical incidents. Differentiation is the allocation of tasks and responsibilities across individuals and units which create a structure of roles, each with specified responsibilities and expectations (Yukl, 1981).

Ann Lewis

Ann Lewis (1990) in her material on Leadership Styles provided an up-close and personal look at the styles of several school leaders. Lewis probed into the literature of
local school district practices, and explored some of the instruments designed to measure style.

Lewis (1990) offered a view that described today's leaders as those individuals who are called upon to facilitate group decisions and "oversee" the big picture. She believed that no institution is more heavily involved in a management upheaval than public education.

Section Two: Organizations

Frederick Taylor

One of the earliest studies on educational administration was conducted by Frederick Taylor. Taylor was developing his research on middle management concurrently with Max Weber's research. Taylor's work utilized a structural viewpoint and was concerned with how organizations could be constructed to obtain maximum efficiency.

Taylor's (1911) study of scientific management was technological in nature. His concept of management dealt primarily with attempting to break tasks into minute detail, and to retrain workers to achieve the most efficient return from each motion and second spent at work. He felt the best way to increase output was to improve the techniques or methods used by workers. Taylor's work is interpreted as considering people as instruments or machines to be manipulated by their leaders. Based on this assumption,
other theorists of the scientific management movement who accepted this assumption proposed that an organization should be rational and create as much efficiency as possible in administration, consequently increasing production.

Taylor held that management was to be derived from human affairs and motions. The result was that workers had to adjust to the management and not the management to the workers. To accomplish this aim, Taylor applied his time-and-motion studies to analyze work tasks in order to improve performance in every aspect of the organization. Once jobs had been reorganized with efficiency in mind, the economic self-interest of the worker could be satisfied through various incentive work plans and piece rates.

The function of the leader under a scientific management system was to set up and enforce performance criteria to meet organizational goals. The primary focus of a leader was based on the needs of the organization, and not on the needs of the individual. Taylor's study of the early 1900's was one of the most widely read on administration. Taylor's "Principles of Scientific Management" were to (Taylor, 1911):

1. Eliminate the guess work from the "rule of thumb" approaches to deciding how each worker is to do a job by adopting scientific measurements to break the job down into a series of small related tasks.
2. Use more scientific, systematic methods for selecting workers and training them for specific jobs.

3. Establish the concept that there is a clear division of responsibility between management and workers with management doing the goal setting, planning, and supervising, and workers executing the required results.

4. Establish the discipline whereby management sets the objectives and the workers cooperate in achieving them. These principles became popular not only in industry, but in the management of all kinds of organizations, and in the press, and had a significant effect on American life. Taylor's principles became popular in the press, and his ideas and their applications have had an enormous impact on American life. Recently, Bolman and Deal have contended that these time motion studies of Taylor created an efficiency mind set among many managers, which led to a generation of efficiency experts (Bolman & Deal, 1987).

**Lawrence and Lorsch**

Lawrence and Lorsch's (1967) focus was on the single notion that the structure of an organization depends particularly on the amount of uncertainty in the organization. The more complex and difficult the environment is, greater is the need for structures that are more complex, differentiated and flexible.
These authors studied organizations in three industries: box containers, plastics, and foods. The container industry shows growth in which the main objectives are consistent with quality and prompt service. Innovation is not a top priority because containers are produced rapidly and at a low cost, giving organizations a competitive edge. The packaged food industry is in a more rapidly changing environment; innovative marketing approaches are a major factor in success. Plastics, twenty-six years ago, was a rapidly changing, high-growth industry. The dominant competitive issue was the development of new and revised products. Each had a different environment and relied on different technologies. Lawrence and Lorsch talked about three areas of the task environment: (1) clarity of information, (2) uncertainty of cause-and-effect relations, and (3) the time space of feedback.

These researchers supported the thought that environmental uncertainty would have a major impact on four major organizational characteristics: the degree of formality and bureaucracy in the structure, how people related to each other, how people dealt with time, and what goals the organization sought. They believed that it was easier for an organization to have accurate information about its environment if the environment was stable. Jobs can be specified through the predetermined rules. Communication can
be handled through the formal channels. A straightforward, task-oriented, managerial style is likely to be effective. When the environment is complex and changing, the task is more difficult. The organization needs more points of contact with the environment, so a flatter hierarchy is needed. Much more information is needed to be communicated and the traditional channels cannot handle all of it, so a much more complex, multiple-channel communications system is needed. Such a system is likely to work better with an interpersonal style that emphasizes building effective relationships.

Lawrence and Lorsch’s theory held that in most large organizations, different sub-units face different environments. In the plastics industry, the research units face much more uncertainty than the manufacturing units. The two units need different structures and different management. The more diverse the environments that different units face, the more differentiation in structure is needed. As differentiation increases, integration becomes more difficult. The more different two units are, the harder it will be for them to work together.

These authors' theory was confirmed through their study. Within industries, organizations with structures that fit the environment were found to be more effective. Effective container organizations were more centralized and formalized than effective plastics organizations. The effective plastic
firms had higher levels of differentiation and more complex approaches to integration (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967).

James Thompson

Thompson, a structural theorist, talked about three major forms of interdependence: pooled, sequential, and reciprocal. Pooled interdependence portrayed a relationship in which the efforts of one or more individuals or groups made a general contribution to the whole, but the different parts did not have to take one another into account. He cited the example of two banks which may have very little relationship, except that they may be linked in their contributions to the overall success of the bank. In sequential interdependence, one division may design the overall shape and dimension of a product, but a specialist may need to develop a blueprint and specifications for individual parts. Reciprocal interdependence takes place when interdependence goes in both directions. Interdependence increases as it moves from pooled toward reciprocal (Thompson, 1967).

Warren Bennis

Bennis (1969) identified one characteristic of organizational development as “an educational strategy adopted to bring about a planned organizational change. He
held that, the only viable way to change organizations is to change their culture, that is, to change the systems within which people work and love. Bennis advocated accomplishing this by an individual approach in which people in a workshop setting, or other small learning group, are stimulated to change their behavior, which initiates changes in their attitudes, which in turn, changes the "culture" of their organization as more individuals undergo metamorphosis.

To Bennis (1969) initiating consultative processes also requires change in the culture, but a formal, educational strategy has not been attempted. Instead, consultation, like innumerable subjects, can be taught effectively in an organization by setting an example, by doing it, pointing out positive results and helping others to imitate the process.

D. H. Kamens

Kamens’ (1977) research had a focus on colleges and universities. He supported the notion that the major function of colleges and universities is symbolic. He believed the structure of the organization was dependent upon the major features of the institution, whether it was elite or non-elite and whether it allocated students to a particular corporate group in society. Size demographics all vary according to the symbolic messages the institution attempts to communicate. An elite school will develop a
curriculum that restrains specialization, advertises its high faculty/student ratio, develops an attractive residential campus, and dramatizes selectiveness.

When the environment shifts or the institution changes, then adjustments are necessary to mirror the shifts. Legitimacy and worth are judged by correspondence between structural characteristics and prevailing myths. Organizations are frequently obliged to alter their appearance to produce consonance. Organizational structures are built of "blocks" of contemporary myth.

Kamens took the position that the theory that another purpose of organizational structure was to convey a "modern" appearance to communicate to external audiences that it is not a horse-and-buggy operation, but is fully up-to-date. In response to legal and social pressures, business organizations create affirmative action policies and rules, yet hiring practices change very little. For example, when laws are passed for special education children, schools hire psychologists and learning disabilities specialists (Kamens, 1977).

Smith and Scott

Stuart C. Smith and James J. Scott (1990) also talked about culture. They held the thought that taboos embedded in the culture of schools make collaborative behavior very
difficult to develop. A well founded belief prevails in many schools that have potential for hindrance rather than assistance. Collaboration in an organization does not come easily.

Smith and Scott talked about the state's involvement in education. They wrote that state leadership in the later half of the decade began to realize the shortcomings of its approaches and sought other ways of reforming schools. For example, several states entered into an experimental federal-state partnership to decrease regulations in return for improved academic performance in selected school districts. Other states, on their own, approved pilot projects permitting greater freedom of decision making at school levels (Smith & Scott, 1990).

Section Three: Literature specifically related to the study

The literature in Section 3 presents theoretical support to the narrative of Superintendent Coble's leadership. This literature discusses (1) Managers Roles, (2) Management and Organizations) (3) Goals and Objectives, and (4) Organizational Structures.

(a) Manager's Roles

Henry Mitzberg

Mintzberg (1973) analyzed studies on managerial activities to provide insight into what a manager does. His
studies looked at activities at a concrete level, rather than in terms of activity content. He used unstructured observation and developed content categories during and after the initial observations. The meaning of the activities was interpreted by identifying a set of ten underlying managerial roles that accounted for all the activities observed by him. Each activity can be explained in terms of at least one role, although many activities involved more than one of the ten roles. Three of the managerial roles: "figurehead," "leader," and "liaison," dealt with interpersonal behavior. Three other roles "monitor," disseminator," and "spokesman" related to information-processing behavior. The remaining four roles "entrepreneur," "disturbance handler," "resource allocator," and "negotiator" had to do with the decision-making behavior of managers. All of the roles are important for any manager or administrator, although their relative importance may vary from one kind of manager to another. A manager's role is largely predetermined for him by the nature of his position, but he can interpret them in different ways (Mintzberg, 1973).

Katz and Kahn

To Katz and Kahn (1979), the real skill in working with others must become a natural, continuous activity involving sensitivity, not only at times of decision-making, but also
in the day-by-day behavior of the individual; because everything a leader says and does (or leaves unsaid or undone) has an effect in his associates, and his true self will in time show through. Thus, to be effective, this skill must be naturally developed and unconsciously, as well as consistently, demonstrated in the individual's every action. Human relations are needed at all levels of management, but they are relatively less important for top-level managers than for lower-level managers. Technical skills are usually more important than conceptual skills for low-level managers, who are mainly responsible for implementing policy and maintaining the work flow within the existing organization structure. Katz and Kahn (1979) described the role of the middle managers as primarily one of supplementing existing structure and developing ways to implement policies and goals established at higher levels.

(b) Management and Organizations

Douglas McGregor

McGregor (1960) developed a set of ideas about motivation in organizations. To Maslow's theory of motivation, McGregor added another central idea: that the perspective or theory that a manager holds about other people determines how the others will respond. McGregor believed most managers hold two theories, which he labeled theories X and Y.
Theory X supported the notion that managers need to actively direct and control work of subordinates and that the workers are passive, have little initiative, don't accept work because they are lazy, are thinking for themselves, and do not take easily to change.

McGregor supported the notion that nearly all management at one time was structured around Theory X assumptions. He believed Theory X management approaches ranged from "hard" Theory X to "soft" Theory X. Hard Theory X held management to administer punishments, tight controls, coercion, and threats. This type of management led to low productivity, antagonism, militant unions and subtle sabotage. The "soft" style attempted to satisfy worker's every need, and to avoid conflict. Soft management might lead to superficial harmony while giving less in return. McGregor believed it would also lead to apathy, and people expecting more and giving less in return. Theory X's hard and soft concepts indicate that workers don't care about quality.

On the other side, McGregor presented a different view of management, which he termed Theory Y. Theory Y notions of management were just the opposite of Theory X. McGregor believed that management accepted the responsibility for organizing, in the interest of favorable outcomes. McGregor, through his findings, challenged managers to behave differently. Management should arrange organizational
conditions so that people can achieve their goals by directing their efforts toward organizational goals. Job management should arrange things so that the organization's interests and the employee's self-interest mesh together (McGregor, 1960).

**Peters and Waterman**

Peters and Waterman (1982) took a different approach to understanding management and analyzing organizational structure. They studied successful companies and offered a series of "stories" about how successful companies manage to be effective. Their research discovered similar characteristics in nearly all the companies researched. Two of the characteristics identified in their study were: (1) bias for action, and (2) simple form and lean staff.

In their analysis, the authors interpreted "bias for action" as meaning that the work was streamlined and not engulfed with bureaucracy. They found that instead of long, drawn-out methods, action was immediate and experiments were done quickly.

"Simple form and lean staff" kept the companies' staff controllable. The staff was kept small, which therefore increased the opportunity for each unit to accomplish its goal without being overly concerned about all other departments (Peters & Waterman, 1982).
Rensis Likert

Likert (1961) emphasized the need to consider both human resources and capital resources as assets requiring proper management. As a result of behavioral research studies of numerous organizations, Likert implemented organizational change programs in various industrial settings. It appears that these programs were intended to help organizations move from Theory X to Theory Y assumptions, from fostering immature behavior to encouraging and developing mature behavior, from emphasizing only hygiene factors to recognizing and helping workers to satisfy the motivators.

Likert found that the prevailing management styles of organizations can be depicted on a continuum from System 1 through System 4. They are described as follows:

System 1 - Management is seen as having no confidence or trust in subordinates, since they are seldom involved in any aspect of the decision-making. Decisions are made by the strategic planners. Employees are forced to work with fear, threats and punishments, and occasional rewards and need satisfactions at the psychological and safety levels. When there is interaction, it is with fear and mistrust. An informal organization generally develops, which opposes the goals of the formal organization.

System 2 - Management is seen as having condescending confidence and trust in subordinates, as master toward
servant. Most decisions and goal setting of the organization area are made at the top, but many decisions are made within a prescribed framework at lower levels. Rewards and some actual or potential punishments are used to motivate workers. Any superior/subordinate interaction takes place with some condescension by superiors and fear and caution by subordinates. Although decisions are made in top management, some are delegated to middle and lower levels. An informal organization usually develops, but it does not always resist formal organizational goals.

System 3 - Management is seen as having substantial, but not complete, confidence and trust in subordinates. Broad policy and general decisions are kept at the top, but subordinates are permitted to make more specific decisions at lower levels. Communication flows both up and down the hierarchy. Rewards, occasional punishment, and some involvement are used to motivate workers. There is a moderate amount of superior - subordinate interaction, often with a fair amount of confidence and trust. Significant aspects of the control process are delegated downward with a feeling of responsibility at both higher and lower levels. An informal organization may develop, but it may either support or partially resist goals of the organization.

System 4 - Management is seen as having complete confidence and trust in subordinates. Decision-making is
widely dispersed throughout the organization, although well integrated. Communication flows not only up and down the hierarchy but among peers. Workers are motivated by participation and involvement in developing economic rewards, setting goals, improving methods, and appraising progress towards goals. The informal and formal organizations are often one and the same. All social forces support efforts to achieve stated organizational goals.

In summary, System 1 is a task-oriented, highly structured authoritarian management style; System 4 is a relationships-oriented management style based on team work, mutual trust, and confidence. Systems 2 and 3 are intermediate stages between two extremes, which approximate closely Theory X and Theory Y assumptions.

Likert and his group developed an instrument that enabled members to rate their organization in terms of its management system. The instrument was designed to gather data about a number of operating characteristics of an organization. These characteristics include leadership, motivation, communication, decision-making, interaction and influence, goal setting and the control process used by the organization. The complete instrument includes over twenty such items. Various forms of the instrument have been adapted to be situation specific. For example, a version for school systems is now available with forms for the school
board, superintendent, central staff, principals, teachers, parents, and students. Likert used this instrument not only to measure what individuals believe are the present characteristics of their organization, but also to find out what they would like these characteristics to be (Likert, 1961).

William Ouchi

Ouchi's (1981) Theory Z focused on participatory management in the business world. His Theory Z is an extension of McGregor's Theory Y, and is based on a form of a successful Japanese method of boosting productivity. Theory Z is an effort to modify Japanese management techniques to fit the American culture and to identify changes in assumptions about management that can be made within the American business community that would subtly change the culture of the workplace and make it possible for American management to succeed. Much of Ouchi's work describing Theory Z illuminates consultative processes in general, in any organization, including universities as well as business firms.

In Type Z organizations, the decision-making process is typically a participative one. Social scientists described this process as a democratic (as opposed to autocratic or apathetic) process in which many people are drawn into the
shaping of important decisions. In Type Z companies, the decision-making may be collective, but the ultimate responsibility for decisions still reside in one individual. Each person will come from the meeting with the responsibility for some individual targets set collectively by the group. The concensual process is one in which members of the group may be asked to accept responsibility for a decision that they do not prefer but that the group, in an open and complete discussion, has settled upon. The combination of collective decision-making with individual responsibility demands an atmosphere of trust. Only under a strong assumption that all hold basically compatible goals and that no one is engaged in self-serving behavior, will individuals accept personal responsibility for a group decision and make enthusiastic attempts to get this job done.

The orientation of Type Z companies inevitably maintains a strong egalitarian atmosphere. An organization that maintains a holistic orientation and requires employees at all levels to deal with one another as complete human beings creates a condition in which depersonalization is impossible, autocracy is unlikely, and open communication, trust, and commitment are common. A holistic relationship provides a counterbalance that encourages an egalitarian attitude.

Egalitarianism is a central feature of Type Z organizations. Egalitarianism implies that each person can
apply discretion and can work autonomously without close supervision, because he is to be trusted. Trust underscores the belief that goals correspond, that neither person is out to harm the other. This feature, perhaps more than any other, accounts for the high levels of commitment, of loyalty, and of productivity in Japanese firms and in Type Z organizations.

Type Z organizations, unlike Utopian communities, do employ hierarchical modes of control, and thus do not rely entirely upon goal congruence among employees. Nevertheless, they do rely extensively upon symbolic means to promote an attitude of egalitarianism and mutual trust, and they do so in part by encouraging a holistic relation between employees. Self-direction replaces hierarchical direction to a great extent, which enhances commitment, loyalty and motivation. Type Z organizations challenge managers to integrate individuals into organizations, not to create alienating, hostile, and impersonally bureaucratic places of work. In a real sense, the Type Z organization comes close to realizing the ideal. It is a consent culture, a community of equals who cooperate with one another to reach common goals. Rather than relying exclusively upon hierarchy and monitoring to direct behavior, it relies also upon commitment and trust.

In the ideal Theory Z organizations, decision-making processes are purposely slow. The participatory manager
tolerates disciplined and purposeful disorder that is anything but chaotic. It is aimed at gathering facts, seeking opinions, discovering relationships, and building a consensus that give the decision, once made, a real chance for successful implementation. That kind of leadership is not weak or confused; it sets clear goals; it reaches for quality. It provides clearly articulated purposes around which people can organize their work, it is patient enough to wait until a good decision can be made, yet strong enough to insist upon reaching it (Ouchi, 1981).

Deal and Kennedy

As managers move from the outside inward to organizations, and as they interact with their new environments, some theorists say that they ought to learn about the culture of their environments. Deal and Kennedy (1985) held the thought that the primary (but informal) means of communication within an organization's cultural network, is the "carrier" of the corporate values and heroic mythology. "Storytellers," 'spies," "priests," "cabals," and "whisperers" form a hidden hierarchy of power within the company. Working the network effectively is the only way to get things done or to understand what is really going on. Companies that form their individual identities by shaping values, making heroes, spelling out rules and rituals, and
acknowledging the cultural network, have an edge. These corporations have values and beliefs to pass along, not only products. They have stories to tell, and not just profits to make. They have heroes whom managers and workers can emulate, not just faceless bureaucrats. A strong culture is a powerful lever for guiding behavior. It helps employees do their best jobs a little better in two ways (Deal & Kennedy, 1985):

1. A strong culture is a system of informal rules that spells out how people are to behave most of the time. By knowing exactly what is expected of them, employees will waste little time in deciding how to act in a given situation. In a weak culture, they waste time trying to figure out what they should do and how they should do it.

2. A strong culture enables people to feel better about what they do, so they are likely to work harder.

Deal and Kennedy’s research offered the theory that values are the “bedrock” of a corporate culture. Although they are unwritten, values provide a sense of common direction for all employees and guidelines for their day-to-day behavior. "Rational Managers" rarely pay much attention to the value system of an organization. Values are not "hard" like organizational structures, policies and procedures, strategies, or budgets.
Because organizational values can negatively influence what people actually do, Deal and Kennedy support the notion that values should be of great concern to managers. In fact, shaping and enhancing values can become the most important job a manager can do. It was found that successful companies placed a great deal of emphasis on values. These companies shared three characteristics:

1. They stand for something -- that is, they have a clear philosophy about how they aim to conduct the business.

2. Management pays a great deal of attention to shaping and fine-tuning these values to conform to the economic and business environment of the company, and to communicate them to the organization.

3. These values are known and shared by all the people who work for the company.

Deal and Kennedy (1985) wrote in *Corporate Culture* that a culture has difficulties when its people are chronically unhappy, because unhappy people do not remain with the company. Therefore, one of the indicators to observe closely is the companies' rate of turnover. Some turnover is inevitable, a high turnover or an upward trend in turnover is an indication that something is wrong in the culture. This can happen in a division or across a whole company, and in a function or a location. Culture diagnosis will give managers
a fix on the state of the culture. Given this fix, a manager can then sharpen the focus of his or her managerial efforts.

Deal and Kennedy (1985) discussed the characteristics of a symbolic manager, a manager who sees himself as a player, script writer, director and actor in the daily drama of the company. These types of managers are termed symbolic managers because of their recognition of the symbolic influence they have on cultural events around them. To a symbolic manager, a firing is a catastrophe, because firings should not happen. If the employee has a congruent fit with the culture, lifetime employment should be secure. Second, when a firing is necessary, it should not be the end result of poor performance, but of violations of cultural norms. When such an event occurs, it demands the personal attention of the symbolic manager to make sure the cultural message of the firing is fully understood.

(c) Goals and Objectives

Westerlund and Sjostrand

As Westerlund and Sjostrand (1979) discussed organizational goals and their purposes, they focused on the difficulty of organizational goals and offered the idea that "disentangling the actual structure of tools is a difficult task." Goals are important to a structural design, exist in a variety of different forms, and are used for different
purposes. The goals offered by Westerlund and Sjostrand were:

1. Honorific "boy scout" goals were those that support the organization;
2. Taboo goals were real but not spoken of;
3. Stereotype goals were the goals any creditable organization was expected to have;
4. Existing goals were a mixture of goals that were commonly held by all the employees;
5. Stated goals were the goals the organization said it had for itself;
6. Repressed goals were goals that were used, but were not reliable.

(c) Organizational Structures

Bolman and Deal

Managers reorganize systems to resolve conflict, and sometimes to meet goals. Bolman and Deal (1987) believed that the structural perspective is based on a set of assumptions: (1) Organizations work most effectively when environmental turbulence and the personal preferences of participants are constrained by norms and rationality. (2) Organizational problems usually reflect an inappropriate structure and can be resolved through redesign and reorganization. (3) Specialization permits higher levels of individual expertise and performance. (4) Structures can be
systematically designed and implemented. (5) Coordination and control are accomplished best through the exercise of authority and interpersonal rules. (6) Organizations exist primarily to accomplish established goals. (7) For any organization, there is a structure appropriate to the goals, the environment, the technology, and the participant.

According to Bolman and Deal, how to structure itself is one of the central issues facing any organization. A formal structure is more than just boxes and lives arranged on an organizational chart. It is a depiction of the formalized pattern of activities, expectations, and exchanges among individuals. The shape of the formal structure enhances or constrains what an organization is able to accomplish. Formal structure, from these researchers' view, affects the activities, relationships and mental state of participants who work in the organization. They extend the importance of structure to even small groups. Because organizations face a complex task in structuring work; to get work done, it is necessary to "differentiate" (divide responsibilities across different individual and organizational units) and to "integrate all the different parts." Achieving a balance between differentiation and integration is one of the most fundamental issues of structural design, and every organization develops its own unique pattern (Bolman & Deal, 1987).
Differentiation allocates activities and responsibilities among participants. By distributing responsibilities, an organization creates offices, positions, specialties, and sub-units. These authors use the terms "role" to refer to differentiation and the allocation of work to various individuals and groups. An individual's role involves both activities and expectations. The structure of roles varies considerably across organizations of different types, size, or location. As organizations become larger and more complex, the level of specialization is higher and the role-structure more specialized.

Bolman and Deal (1987) maintained that the rapid pace of change and development in many technical areas has made it impossible for a single individual to stay current in a particular field. Such changes create the need for even higher levels of specialization, which makes the role structure of the organization even more complicated. People and units depend on one another to get work done. The authors discussed the "linkages" added to the structure to keep organizations coordinated by linking specialized efforts. They believe that linkages keep organizations organized. Bolman and Deal held the view that the relative importance of vertical and lateral coordination depends on the task and the environment. Vertical coordination is likely to be more significant when the environment is
relatively stable and the task well understood, or when uniformity is a critical organization need.

A common method for linking the activities of various roles is to create a position that has authority over others. Creating a chain of command yields a hierarchy of managers and supervisors. These positions carry out activities designed to keep the organization well integrated and in tune with organizational goals. Executives, managers, and supervisors control activity by making decisions, resolving conflicts, solving problems, evaluating performances and output, and distributing rewards and penalties.

Organizations vary in the number of links in the chain of command and in the centralization of authority. Vertical strategy alone is not sufficient. Lateral techniques are developed to fill the coordination void. They include: (1) formal and informal meetings for developing plans, solving problems, and making decisions, (2) task forces that bring together representatives from different specialties to work on a problem, (3) coordinating roles that work through informal, but important, negotiations.

Organizations with explicit, well-enforced rules are typically highly formal places in which to work. At the other end of the spectrum are highly informal organizations where individuals have nearly unlimited latitude. Since rules are a key strategy for coordinating activities, one
could expect rules to be established in areas of importance, uncertainty, or conflict, where they can regulate the activities that are most central to an organization's mission or survival (Boman and Deal, 1987).

Bolman and Deal (1987) offered the view that current research identifies technology and environment as the two most important factors in influencing how an organization is structured. They believe that the technology of an organization is the central activity for transforming inputs and outputs. Technologies differ in their clarity, predictability, and effectiveness. Environment is typically seen as everything outside the boundaries of the organization.

Charles Perrow

Perrow's (1972) study suggested that the organization should match the people, and people-skills were being matched to fit the needs of the organization. Perrow looked closely at the reasons why organizations select one structure over another. He also investigated the impact of structure on morale, productivity, and effectiveness.

Perrow supported the belief that organizations cannot be explained by explaining the attitudes and behavior of the individuals and small groups within them. Perrow firmly states that structural imperatives set up serious limits on
the possibilities of creating organizations that are significantly different from existing ones. He saw organizational structure as a network of interdependent roles coordinated through a variety of horizontal and vertical linkages. He held the idea that because structure needs to be responsible to organizational purposes, the shape of an organization is determined by its goals, techniques, and environment. Perrow put forth the idea that the structure of an organization is the prime determinant of the effectiveness of the people in the organization. He pointed out that: One of the persistent complaints in the fields of penology, juvenile correctional institutions or mental hospitals, or any of the people-changing institutions, is that there is a need for better workers. The problems of these organizations stem from the lack of high quality personnel. More specifically, the types of individuals they can recruit as guards, or cottage parents, or orderlies, typically have too little education, hold over-simplified views about people, tend to be punitive, and believe that order and discipline can solve all problems (Perrow, 1972).

Perrow (1972) described a study in which applicants for positions in juvenile correction institutions were, when tested, found to be quite enlightened and permissive, whereas, after they had worked in the institution for a while, had become less permissive and took a punitive,
enlightened view regarding the cause of delinquency and the care and handling of delinquents. Perrow offered this as an illustration of the power of organizations to shape views and attitudes, and thus, the behavior of participants.

Perrow maintained that the organizational structure is the chief controlling variable of "Organizational Analysis." He strongly suggested the view that (1) organizational problems are people-problems and that good leadership as "the answer" is frankly a prejudice, and (2) that classical organizational views have more unity than organizational theorists generally believe. He does not support the general theme in the literature on leadership research, and believes that environment (in the form of organizational structure) is the crucial determinant of organizational outcomes. Other researchers contend that Perrow's views should not be taken seriously until they are documented by empirical evidence derived from designed research (Perrow, 1972).

(e) **Definition of Leadership: A Summary**

The meaning of leadership is complex, and eludes consistent definition. Stogdill (1974) offered a definition of leadership, as the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction. He concluded by maintaining that there were almost as many definitions of leadership as there were persons who attempted to define the concept.
Stogdill believe that the term leadership is a relatively recent addition to the English language. The term has only been in use for around two hundred years, although the word "leader" from which it is derived appeared as early as 1300 A.D.

Yukl agreed with Stogdill's notions about the meaning of leadership, in that the term leadership means different things to different people. To try to answer the question, What makes a person an effective leader? is ambiguous and complicated. Researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspectives and the aspects of the phenomenon that are of the most interest to them. Most concepts of leadership imply that at various times one or more group members can be identified as leaders according to some observable difference between person(s) and other members, who are referred to as "followers" or "subordinates" (Yukl, 1981).

Hemphill and Coons defined leadership as "the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

To Tannenbaum, Weshler, and Massarik, leadership is "interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation, and directed through the communication process toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals" (Tannenbaum, et al, 1961).
Jacobs (1971) believed "leadership was an interaction between persons in which one presented information of a sort and in such a manner that the other became convinced that his outcomes (benefits/costs ratio) would be improved if he behaved in the manner suggested or desired.

To Janda (1961), leadership is a particular type of power relationship characterized by a group member's perception that another group member has the right to prescribe behavior patterns for the former regarding his activity as a group member.

Kachan, Schmidt and Decotiss did a study on leadership and concluded that leadership is an "influence process whereby O's actions change P's behavior and P views the influence attempt as being legitimate and change as being consistent with P's goals" (Kachan, et al, 1961).
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Question 1

Were the goals set by the Superintendent for the district achieved? Specifically, were the goals of (a) Offering New Leadership, (b) Providing Openness in the Administration, (c) Ensuring Quality Education for the Neglected Population, and (d) Addressing Teachers' Concerns achieved?

These goals were identified through news releases and official board minutes, and the superintendent's personal agenda. Structural questions were designed and presented to principals soliciting their responses through interviews regarding the success of the superintendent's goals. Their responses were recorded and triangulated with the board minutes and news releases. Principals were asked if they felt the goals the Superintendent set for the district were achieved, and specifically was the goal of offering new leadership achieved?

Question 2

Were the Superintendent's efforts to reorganize the system successful? Specifically, did (a) reorganization
enhance decision-making, and (b) improve students' test scores?

Visually illustrated the organizational structure showing that the reduction of staff eliminated two layers of bureaucracy. Visuals showed the test scores in reorganization.

**Question 3**

Did the superintendent successfully deal with controversial issues? Specifically, how did the superintendent deal with the issues of (a) site based management, and (b) tracking?

Site Based Management: Central office staff and principals were interviewed regarding whether they believed site based management was successful. Their answers were recorded and analyzed. These responses were referenced and cross examined with the Division 11 Director and an associate superintendent's responses.

Proposed Tracking Elimination: The issues surrounding the elimination of tracking were investigated through an audit study, official board minutes and news releases. The initial recommendation to eliminate tracking was made by a school-system audit. The Program Manager for Guidance substantiated the written history of tracking.
Question 4

Was the Superintendent's communication effective with his subordinates? Specifically, how did the Superintendent deal with the issues of subordinates in the departments of: (a) Curriculum and Instruction, (b) Exceptional children, (c) Support Services, (d) Elementary Personnel, and with (e) Salaries.

Official board minutes, interviews with board members and the Associate Superintendents, the author's observations as a participant in the environment, and news releases supported the claims made regarding the effectiveness of the superintendent's communication with subordinates. The Associate Superintendent's communication was corroborated through news releases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>86/87</th>
<th>87/88</th>
<th>88/89</th>
<th>89/90</th>
<th>90/91</th>
<th>91/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Comparison of Grade 3 CAT Median Percentiles for Black, White, and North Carolina Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>86/87</th>
<th>87/88</th>
<th>88/89</th>
<th>89/90</th>
<th>90/91</th>
<th>91/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Comparison of Grade 6 CAT Median Percentiles for Black, White, and North Carolina Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>86/87</th>
<th>87/88</th>
<th>88/89</th>
<th>89/90</th>
<th>90/91</th>
<th>91/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** Comparisons of Grade 8 CAT Median Percentiles

for Black, White, and North Carolina Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>86/87</th>
<th>87/88</th>
<th>88/89</th>
<th>89/90</th>
<th>90/91</th>
<th>91/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERCENTILE</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS FOR GRADE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>86/87</th>
<th>87/88</th>
<th>88/89</th>
<th>89/90</th>
<th>90/91</th>
<th>91/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERCENTILE</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS FOR GRADE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>86/87</th>
<th>87/88</th>
<th>88/89</th>
<th>89/90</th>
<th>90/91</th>
<th>91/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERCENTILE</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS FOR GRADE 8**

**Figure 4.** Total Comparison of CAT Median Percentiles for Grades 3, 6, 8 and North Carolina Students

Note. Visual depiction of three grades from 1986 - 1992
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>17,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>16,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>16,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>16,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>16,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.** Dropouts in Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools

Note. Visual depiction of dropout rate from 1988 - 93
Figure 6. Organizational Structure for 1988 - 89

Note: Visual depiction of Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools' organization.
Figure 7. Organizational Structure 1989 - 90

Note. Visual depiction showing new positions of two deputies.
Figure 8. Organizational Structure 1990 - 91

Note. Visual depiction showing direct line between school and the superintendent.
### Local School Improvement Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Schools</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson(s)</td>
<td>Chairperson(s)</td>
<td>Chairperson(s)</td>
<td>Chairperson(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Teacher from each grade level or subject area*</td>
<td>One Teacher from each grade level or subject area*</td>
<td>One Teacher from each grade level or subject area*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person from support staff*</td>
<td>One person from support staff*</td>
<td>One person from support staff*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal (optional)</td>
<td>Assistant Principal (optional)</td>
<td>Assistant Principal (optional)</td>
<td>Assistant Principal (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (as elected/selected/appointed)</td>
<td>Others (as elected/selected/appointed)</td>
<td>Others (as elected/selected/appointed)</td>
<td>Others (as elected/selected/appointed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School Improvement Coordinating Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Schools</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Exception Ed.</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Ed.</td>
<td>Director of Middle Schools</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson from each special school</td>
<td>Chairperson from each elementary school</td>
<td>Chairperson from each middle school</td>
<td>Chairperson from each high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office subject specialist</td>
<td>Central office subject specialist</td>
<td>Central office subject specialist</td>
<td>Central office subject specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Superintendent’s School Improvement Committee

- Two Elementary Teachers Chosen by Peers
- Two Middle School Teachers Chosen by Peers
- Two High School Teachers Chosen by Peers
- One Special School Teacher Chosen by Peers
- Assistant Principal Chosen by Peers
- Elementary Principal Chosen by Peers
- Middle School Principal Chosen by Peers
- High School Principal Chosen by Peers
- Executive Assistant to the Superintendent
- Director of Middle Schools
- Deputy Superintendent for Instruction
- Deputy Superintendent for Operations
- Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education
- Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education
- Assistant Superintendent for Exceptional Education
- Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
- FACT President
- FFT President
- Data Manager
- Project Coordinator

*Grade-level, support-area and subject-area teachers will work with all teachers in their school at their particular grade levels or in their particular subject areas.

**NOTE:** Support will be provided when needed or requested.

---

**Figure 9. Organizational Structure for Implementing Senate Bill, 2**

Note. Visual depiction of the Superintendent’s committees for site-based management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DIPT</th>
<th>SPD</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PIT</th>
<th>TPP</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel &amp; Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing/Staff Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting to post within school</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting to post outside of school</td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget preparation</td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Based fund raising</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum &amp; Instruction Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Curricular goals and objectives</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring that Curriculum is taught</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating effectiveness of curriculum</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting Curricular content</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Site/School Plant Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding uses</td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodeling</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing</td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies/Equipment Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding Uses</td>
<td>XXX XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*D=District Only*  
**DIPT=District with input from principal & Teachers**  
**SPD=School with parameters from district**  
**P=Principal Only**  
**PIT=Principal with input from teachers/staff**  
**TPP=Teachers with parameters set by principal**  
**SA=Staff alone**

**Figure 10. Parameters for Site-based Management**

Note. Visual depiction of guidelines for site-based management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>C H. S. (%)</th>
<th>G H. S. (%)</th>
<th>E. F. H. S. (%)</th>
<th>W. F. H. S. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP Math 275</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Math 276</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Comp Science 295</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Biology 375</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Chemistry 378</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP European History 476</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Spanish Lit. 530</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Spanish 534</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Music 776</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Eng. Lang. 174</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Comp/Lit 175</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11. Black and White Students in AP Courses**

in Four High Schools during 1989 - 90

Note. Visual depiction of students in Advanced Placement Courses.
Figure 12. A Graphic Design of Dr. Coble's Leadership

Note. Visual depiction of Dr. Coble's leadership activities from 1989-93
Figure 13. Perceived Barriers Within Individual Schools

Note. Visual depiction of the results of teacher barriers within individual schools for question one.
Figure 14. Perceived Barriers Within The School System

Note. Visual depiction of teachers' barriers within the school system.
Figure 15. Mean Ratings Assigned to the Role of Central Office by Teachers

Note. Results of teacher ratings regarding the role of Central Office Staff
APPENDIX D
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Table 1. Individual School Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS</th>
<th>PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behavior</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of School for Problem Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Teacher Respect from Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Administrator Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Policy Direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Physical Classroom Barriers</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Room/Poor Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Accessibility</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones Not Properly Located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of a Computer for Teachers</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Schedule</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Schedules</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Planning of Teacher Schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program/Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Changes</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Changes in Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Office Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Subject Area Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack in Clarity of Roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmentation; Piecemeal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS</th>
<th>PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Central Office</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Direction e.g. What is Site-Based Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented and Inconsistent Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks: Insufficient Number, Delay of Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Spending of Money in Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Much Red Tape Acquiring Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Duties</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Parental Involvement</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Planning Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings at School Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Visits or Phone Calls During School Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Barriers</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Individual school barriers from superintendent's teacher concerns questionnaire for question one.
Table 2: School System Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS</th>
<th>PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Support</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say One Thing/Do Another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Support-Clerical Help</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Extra Duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Parent Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Dictate Curriculum</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Dictate Child Placement (Also AG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Interruptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of Finances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many New at the Same Time</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Too Low - Students Unprepared for Next Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Fragmented</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Staffing Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Help From</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS</th>
<th>Elem 1</th>
<th>Elem 2</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Drives Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Interruptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Out-of-Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding in Classes</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Planning Time</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Much Paperwork</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Easy Route to Acquire Computers, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money for Pilot/Evaluation Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Management</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Disciplinary Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Teachers Carry Too Much Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Respect for Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism with Class Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Guidance Counselor Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need More Support from Coordinators/Generalists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-Based Management Not Working or Truly Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS</th>
<th>Elem I</th>
<th>Elem II</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate for Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Materials</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in Obtaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Not Clearly Defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Follow Through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. School system barriers from superintendent's teacher concerns questionnaire for question two.
Table 3: Positive and Negative Reactions to Role of Central Office by Primary Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REACTION CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Elementary I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Responding</td>
<td>% Positive</td>
<td>% Negative</td>
<td>% Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to Curriculum</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Credit Renewal Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Attitude</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility in Schools</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO Administrators Visiting Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness/Support</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Instructional Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Who Does What</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of Phone Calls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Help from the Correct Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Consistency</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various, Ambiguous Information From</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Clarity or Consistency in Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System Direction</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move in Curriculum Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REACTION CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Elementary I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Responding</td>
<td>% Positive</td>
<td>% Negative</td>
<td>% Responding</td>
<td>% Positive</td>
<td>% Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring/Promotion Practices</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting in Terms of Favoritism, Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Incompetence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRI's Who Have Not Gotten Fulltime Jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification/Renewal Process</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance From Certification Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Assistance</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity in Answers from the Personnel Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information to Schools</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptness of Info From Central Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals Relating Info to Teachers That Comes from Central Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages from primary teachers regarding their ratings of Central Office staff.
Table 4: Positive and Negative Reactions to Role of Central Office by Secondary Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REACTION CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Middle N = 589</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>High N = 607</th>
<th>% Positive</th>
<th>% Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Credit Renewal Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Office Attitude</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility in Schools</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO Administrators Visiting Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helpfulness/Support</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Instructional Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know Who Does What</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of Phone Calls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Help from the Correct Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Consistency</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various, Ambiguous Information From</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Clarity or Consistency in Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School System Direction</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move in Curriculum Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent’s Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency in Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Alignment with Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction Categories</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Responding</td>
<td>% Positive</td>
<td>% Negative</td>
<td>% Responding</td>
<td>% Positive</td>
<td>% Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring/Promotion Practices</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting in Terms of Favoritism, Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Incompetence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT's Who Have Not Gotten Fulltime Jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification/Renewal Process</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance From Certification Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Assistance</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity in Answers from the Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information to Schools</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptness of Info From Central Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages from secondary teachers regarding the role of Central Office staff.
Appendix E

Questions from Internal Investigation by Dr. Coble

Regarding Elementary Personnel
Appendix E

Questions from Internal Investigation by Dr. Coble
Regarding Elementary Personnel

Who hires the personnel in your school?

Does the Elementary Personnel Department recommend to you, specific personnel to hire?

Do you hire lateral entry personnel over certificated personnel? (Lateral entry personnel are candidates who have degrees in the assigned field, but not certified by the State of North Carolina.)
Appendix F

Summary Exhibits Depicting the Four Primary Research Questions
Exhibit 1. Goals and Objectives

The description in Exhibit 1 identifies the four goals. The analysis explains the goals and what took place. The conclusion illustrates the result.
Exhibit 1. Goals and Objectives

This exhibit depicts the summary of Dr. Coble’s four goals: (1) offering new leadership, (2) providing openness, (3) ensuring quality education for the neglected population, and (4) addressing teachers major concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New Leadership offered to teachers August 17, 1989.</td>
<td>- Empowered Teachers in 1989-90</td>
<td>- Teachers sought to implement new leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lacked staff development and training for teachers</td>
<td>- Few schools provided training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some schools provided training</td>
<td>- Some teachers satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Few teachers satisfied</td>
<td>- Others frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many felt inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing Openness to individuals, groups, and community through the Clearing House</td>
<td>- Identified students for after-school employment</td>
<td>- Provided jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gave supplies</td>
<td>- Set up retail store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Offered training in selling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosby Scholarship Foundation developed for students</td>
<td>• Identified student leaders</td>
<td>Provided scholarships up to $30,000 for a student</td>
<td>• Drug-tested students periodically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired a director</td>
<td>• Managed Clearing House and Dropout Programs</td>
<td>Business partners expanded</td>
<td>• Jobs were provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensuring Quality Education for the neglected population through (a) a Special School, (b) Dropout Program, (c) Absentee Prevention, and (d) Hiring a Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Showed openness in administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special School for at-risk Black males and other at-risk students</td>
<td>• Superincendent and leadership team worked on proposal</td>
<td>School Board did not approve Special School proposal, May 22, 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Program</td>
<td>• Manager held building reforms in schools</td>
<td>Dropout rate decreased from 1989-90 school year from over 1000 students to about 600 through the 1992-93 school year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervised prescriptions and follow up in Dropout Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td>Established a Truancy program</td>
<td>According to manager, absentee rate decreased significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identified truants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided instruction for incarcerated student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided after school day care for teen mothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired a director for Minority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitored at-risk students</td>
<td>No evidence of monitoring results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set up cultural diversity and sensitivity workshops</td>
<td>Workshops created some negative feelings among administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Made proposals for change</td>
<td>No changes were evidenced in programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Addressing Teacher’s major</td>
<td>Superintendent issued 2,650 Teacher Concern Questionnaires,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds allocated to hire assistants/ cafeteria monitors for discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerns through 3 responses: (a)</td>
<td>11/19/91</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 schools hired Home/School coordinators for discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What “individual barriers prevent</td>
<td>Had monitors and students sort forms according to themes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds were used to extend employment of existing personnel/ planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you from doing a better job, (b)</td>
<td>Themes became barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What “system” barriers prevent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you from doing a better job, and (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate the role of central staff from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg. to pos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,402 teachers identified two concerns, (1) discipline,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support personnel schedules permitted free time to regular classroom teachers / planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and (2) planning time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible time was given teachers before and after the student day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rated central staff negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent talked to central staff about attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle/High used in-school suspension for discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle/High planning time built into schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 1. Summary of Goals and Objectives

Note. Four goals and objectives were developed, (1) new leadership, (2) providing openness, (3) ensuring quality education for a neglected population, and (4) addressing teachers’ major concerns. These goals and objectives were generated by the superintendent, based on his Teacher Concerns Questionnaire, interviews, and his own personal vision. They were designed to enhance the leadership role of teachers and principals. The superintendent issued 2,650 questionnaires, November 19, 1991, to teachers; 2,402 questionnaires were received identifying teachers’ major concerns of: (1) discipline, and (2) planning time. The central staff was rated negative on the questionnaire by teachers. Provisions and strategies were used to augment the capabilities of this central office personnel.
Exhibit 2. Reorganization

In reorganization, the description identified the subject. Critical Incidents are the actions that occurred. The analysis gave an account of what occurred in the crisis events and the conclusion gave the final results regarding the subject.
Reorganization designed for enhancing decision making, and improving students’ test scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Critical Incidents</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization 1989-90 for enhancing decision making</td>
<td>L. Linton Deck audited current structure</td>
<td>Two Assistant Superintendents were reassigned as deputies</td>
<td>Reorganization eliminated two layers of authority between principals and superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board approved changes; July 11, 1989</td>
<td>• Titles changed from area Assistants to Assistant Superintendents • Principals reported directly to Superintendent</td>
<td>Created two departments from Student Services to Support Services and Exceptional Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Created changes for five individuals: Assistants to the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Support Services and three area assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lines of authority became clearer for enhancing decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assistant to the Superintendent reassigned to Support Services</td>
<td>Changed departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Former Assistant Superintendent for Support Services became Assistant for Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Created a new department for Exceptional Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization 1989-90 (July 11, 1989)</td>
<td>• Titles changed from Assistant Superintendents to Deputies</td>
<td>Two positions of Deputy emerged, (1) Instruction, (2) Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Critical Incidents</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization 1990-91</td>
<td>• Board approved second reorganization, March 19, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mar. 20, 1990)</td>
<td>• Reorganization 1990-91 designed to improve test scores</td>
<td>• Students' test scores remained constant in early August, 1990</td>
<td>Test scores did not improve with reorganization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reorganization 1990-91 designed to improve communication</td>
<td>• Scores declined by August 1991 report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist' positions were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty five principals were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reassigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization 1990-91/To</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendents for Support Services contract not renewed</td>
<td>• Filed a lawsuit</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent lost lawsuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Test Scores (Mar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 1990)</td>
<td>Eliminated titles of deputy superintendents to associate superintendents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Assistant Superintendent of Exceptional Education retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Superintendents became directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Critical Incidents</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The system saved $400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91/Test Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reassigned some assistant principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hired 14 new assistant principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 2. Summary of Reorganization 1989-90/90-91

Note. Reorganization was undertaken as a result of the Deck audit, school board mandates, and the superintendent’s vision. The superintendent’s objective was to enhance division of authority making by creating clearer lines of authority. Reorganization 1989-90 developed and restructured a new department. Support Services became Support Services and Exceptional Children. The 1990-91 organizational structure was designed to reduce confusion in teaching the curriculum and to improve communication. In 1990-91, test scores were expected to improve. Test information did not show improvement.
Exhibit 3. Critical Issues

The description identifies the subject. Critical Indicidents discussed the subject. The analysis explains what happened in the subject. The conclusion gives the outcome of the actions that occurred in the analysis.
Exhibit 3. Critical Issues

The superintendent faced the critical issues of, (1) site-based management, and (2) tracking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Critical Incidents</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical issues the superintendent faced were: (1) site-based management, and (2) tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-based management</td>
<td>• English audit of February 7, 1990 encouraged system to adopt site-based management (Senate Bill, 2)</td>
<td>Teachers had difficulty making building level decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State of North Carolina gave school districts authority to empower teachers through Senate Bill, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WS/PCS8 adopted site-based management March 15, 1990</td>
<td>Site-based management had two components, (a) System-wide school improvement plan, and (b) differentiated pay funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Superintendent offered new leadership, titled &quot;Mission Possible&quot; through site-based management</td>
<td>Teacher empowerment was not as difficult the second time around</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Critical Incidents</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Superintendent established three committees: Superintendent's committee, School Improvement Committee, and School Improvement Team (SIT)</td>
<td>· Site based management desired staff development and training</td>
<td>· Implementation frustrated most teachers and principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Senate Bill, 2 mandates addressing five basic areas: parameters, SIT membership, method of operations, school staffs role and the central staff's role</td>
<td>· Shared decision making was a part of the management style that satisfied teachers</td>
<td>· Some teachers enjoyed new decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Made decision making easier</td>
<td>· A few schools had shared decision making in place before site based management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking</td>
<td>· State imposed a uniform system across the state</td>
<td>· Personal managers confused with implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Critical Incidents</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· Tracking had existed in the system for many years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· The Superintendent and the Board abolished tracking March 5, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· The audit study said that tracking was biased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· The English audit recommended tracking elimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Study stated that tracking demeaned Black students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Superintendent responded to the April 1990 audit of English to abolish tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Superintendent claimed that he was going to &quot;wage war on tracking&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Due to timing, political pressure, and the publication of the audit study, the black community became alarmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· The black community spoke out regarding the system-within-a-system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 3. Summary of Critical Issues

Note. The superintendent dealt with site-based management due to the State’s adoption of site based management, the English audit, the School Board, and his own personal vision. Site based management was a innovative management plan adopted on the system. Tracking became an issue on the superintendent’s agenda, based on the English’s audit study concerns expressed by the black community and the superintendent’s personal perspective. The objectives were to implement, site based management and to eliminate tracking.
Exhibit 4. Summary of Course Placement for High School Students

Note. This table reflects the history of course placement from 1980-1993. With board approval, Dr. Coble eliminated the tracking of minorities from lower levels. These several changes are summarized in the accompanying Exhibit 4.
Exhibit 4. Course Placement for High School Students in Winston-Salem/Forsyth County, 1980-1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Level Tier Quality Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Advanced Placement (AP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Academically Gifted (AG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Special Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1980 - 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Level Tier Quality Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) AG/Honors (Academically Demanding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Special Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1984 - 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Quality Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4 Levels) Unweighted - No Quality Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1986 - 1991

| (1)    | Honors                  | +3 |
| (2)    | Advanced                | +2 |
| (3)    | Regular                 | +1 |
| (4)    | Basic (Special Education) |     |

1992 - 1993 (Two Levels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Quality Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Honors/AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the spring of 1994, the State Board ruled to give an entire point to AP courses. This is prestructured to 3 units:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 5. Interaction with Subordinates

The description names the four departments and identifies the subject of salaries. The crisis events details the action that affected the department. The analysis explains what happened in the crisis event. The conclusion gives the final result.
Exhibit 5. Interaction with Subordinates

The superintendent’s interaction with four subordinates, (1) Donald Doepner, (2) C. Douglas Carter, (3) Barbara Phillips, (4) Jo Franklin; and a salary issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Crisis Event</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent dealt with five sensitive and delicate problems in four departments: (1) Curriculum and Instruction, (2) Exceptional Children, (3) Support Services, (4) Elementary Division of Personnel, and a (5) Salary Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English audited department on February 7, 1990</td>
<td>• Identified little consistency in department</td>
<td>• Hired a new director of the department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audit study identified needs in the department</td>
<td>• Identified little consistency in department</td>
<td></td>
<td>• New department was set up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• According to Deck, there was little use of test data as feedback to improve instruction</td>
<td>• No evidence was shown using test data as feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Director was hired to replace the former, July 1, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assistant Superintendent retired from department June 30, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Crisis Event</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>• Assistant Superintendent was reassigned July 18, 1989, from Support Services to Exceptional Children's Department</td>
<td>• New director was hired in the department, July 1, 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Department was purged through reassignment and retirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Current personnel were transferred to another position July 1, 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New trained personnel were placed in the department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Problems were cleared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Head counts created financial deficits in audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• System had to return funds to State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Former Assistant Superintendent spoke out in defense of department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Crisis Event</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Support Services</td>
<td>● Assistant Superintendent was reassigned to department, July 18, 1989, from assistant to superintendent</td>
<td>● Superintendent explained his position to black community leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Assistant Superintendent for department was accused of sabotage by Superintendent</td>
<td>● Superintendent interviewed with Black-owned newspaper explaining the situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Assistant Superintendent's contract was unanimously non-renewed by the School Board, June 30, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Former Assistant file $15,000,000 lawsuit</td>
<td>● Resulted in court litigation</td>
<td>● Superintendent won suit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Elementary Personnel</td>
<td>● Source reported to School Board member hiring problems in Elementary personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● School Board member ordered Superintendent to investigate</td>
<td>● A random sample investigation occurred among principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Issue</td>
<td>● Superintendent ordered an internal investigation of the department among Elementary principals</td>
<td>● Investigation took place</td>
<td>● No irregularities found in department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Principals met, created a position paper</td>
<td>● Discussed issues</td>
<td>● Supported elementary personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Superintendent believed salaries were not in alignment with job descriptions</td>
<td>● There was no justified salary procedure in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Crisis Event</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Superintendent ordered a salary analysis, November 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Used a Position Descriptive Questionnaire</td>
<td>• Poole examined all classified administrative positions, using eight criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eleanor Poole, of Management and Personnel Services, conducted the study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluated and adjusted all classified administrative positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Exhibit 5. Summary of Interaction with Subordinates

Note. The superintendent’s interaction with subordinates was triangulated by the superintendent’s personal investigation, school board mandates, the audits of Clark and Stone, and the MAPS (salary study) conducted by Eleanor Poole. The superintendent had to deal with five sensitive issues early in his administration. He had to settle problems in the departments of Curriculum and Instruction, and Exceptional Education, as recommended by the English audit. He had to contend with the former Assistant Superintendent of Support Services in a personnel matter. A School Board member ordered him to investigate the Elementary Division of Personnel. He also had a salary analysis conducted. Dr. Coble worked through these issues with the School Board’s support.
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3924 Glen Oak Drive  Work: (910) 727-8350
Winston-Salem, NC  24105  FAX: (910) 727-2008

BORN:  Winston-Salem, North Carolina

PARENTS:  Johnnie and Katherine Griffin (Deceased)

FAMILY:  One daughter, Allison Adele Griffin-Walser

EDUCATION:
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- Atkins High
- Winston-Salem, North Carolina

- B.S.  Elementary Education
- Winston-Salem State University
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                       Salem, North Carolina

                       Phi Delta Kappa - National Honor Society
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                       Springs Elementary School
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                  Visiting Instructor (Career Opportunities)
                  Winston-Salem State University

                  Classroom teacher--regular and open, Laboratory
                  setting, Team Teaching
                  Danville City School System
                  Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System

TRAVELS: Moscow, Leningrad, Russia; Brussels, Belgium;
          Prague, Czechoslovakia; Budapest, Hungary;
          Bucharest, Romania; Frankfurt, Berlin and
          Munich, Germany; Warsaw, Poland; Vienna,
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          St. Croix and St. Thomas Virgin Isles, and
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RELIGION: First Baptist Church
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