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(ABSTRACT)

The thrust for institutional reform and desire for accountability has caused important changes in school districts across the nation. In many schools, authority is shifting from the central office to the school, and both parents and teachers are assuming more responsibility for making decisions about school matters that are important to them. This process, often called school-based management, has potential for creating an environment that will allow reform and accountability to occur in districts seeking options to top down management.

The purpose of this study was to acquire information about professional responsibility and involvement of building-level educators, parents, and community leaders in this reform movement and to provide a picture of school-based management in the public elementary schools of Virginia. The research describes a range of decision making that exists at different administrative levels in Virginia’s schools systems and the parameters established for site-based decision making in Virginia’s elementary schools.
A self-administered questionnaire was mailed to a randomly selected population of 400 elementary principals across the state.

Data from the survey were used to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the status of school-based management in the elementary schools of Virginia?

2. What decisions can be made at the school level in the following areas:
   a. Personnel  
   b. Budget and Finance  
   c. Curriculum  
   d. Instruction?

3. According to principals, who in the school makes these decisions?

4. Is there a relationship between the bureaucratic complexity of a school division and the status of school-based management in that district’s elementary schools?

Major findings revealed that in the elementary schools of Virginia decision making is essentially site-based but not shared. The Central Office delegates to each local site autonomy for decision making which covers a broad range of operational issues including personnel, curriculum, instruction, budget and finance; the building administrator is likely to make decisions related to personnel and budget; teachers share in the decision making process when issues involve curriculum and instruction; and parents and other interested stakeholders are most likely to be involved in decision making when issues include fund raising and some curriculum issues. Written policy (or the absence of it) may be a factor in the achievement of school-based management and the degree to which teachers and school improvement teams make decisions in the elementary schools.
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CHAPTER I

The Development of the Problem

Introduction

The establishment of common schools in Massachusetts in 1642 acknowledged the importance of education as the basic building block of American society, and a path through which its citizens could reach personal goals and aspirations. Education was the road to upward mobility and equity; therefore, the subsequent extension of the common school to higher grades and universities was the result of unyielding demands by the citizens of this country for educational services (Candoli, 1991, p. 4).

As the country grew and developed, so did the Nation's school systems. The expansion of industrial America paralleled the evolution of a system of one-room units to organizations that were large and complex. The era of the specialist began and school administrators became more specialized in their work with the superintendent while
principals emerged as school system generalists. Resulting bureaucratic development of the American school system was not only enormous, but sometimes counter productive.

Educators and others looking at bureaucratic development of the country's program for education consider a set of characteristics that distinguish it from every other system in the world. While patterned after the European model, the American school system is unique in that it empowers people, through representative democracy, with an ultimate say by people in how the schools are run. "Public education is predicated on opportunity for all" (Candoli, 1991, p. 7).

The current move to reform American public schools is based upon the realization that traditional ways of teaching and learning which worked in an emerging educational system to accommodate an industrial society and foster a growing bureaucracy no longer "satisfy the people" or "provide opportunity for all" (Candoli, 1991, p. 7).

Demographic changes in most urban areas of the country since World War II and the realities of administering a school in this complex setting brought changes to the Nation with events that included:

1. Dramatic shifts in the population of metropolitan areas.
2. Available transportation to create a highly mobile society.

3. Homogeneous enclaves of poor, unskilled, Spanish-speaking farm workers migrating and settling in older housing in the central city.

4. European immigrants coming to America to gain employment and settling in urban neighborhoods to preserve their cultural background.

5. Rural black, poorly educated citizens moving to large cities in the North to take defense related jobs.

6. Postwar prosperity resulting in the suburban growth of families oriented positively toward education and commitment to quality, homogeneous school systems.


Students who are products of this background are no longer suited to the old system that assumed that all pupils were alike. The only assumption that schools can make about the student population today is that pupils are very different from those entering the educational system twenty or thirty years ago. Today’s students are becoming
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increasingly diverse through immigration, changing social values, and access to advanced technology through resources such as computers and telecommunication. In a similar manner, teachers have also changed. Gone are compliant, lower-middle-class women who, for decades, filled the ranks of teaching (Reavis & Griffith, p. 4).

A fast paced, complex society has heightened awareness of inadequacies inherent in the bureaucratic organization of schools. Kearns (1989) questioned why this country is "... saddled with a school system organized along the lines of the factory and governed by the agricultural calendar?" (Reavis & Griffith, p. 36).

A Nation At Risk (1983) launched a school reform movement that focused attention on the importance of structuring schools in a different way if the economic conditions of this nation were to improve. To meet the needs of students, teachers, and communities, recommendations were made in such areas as fiscal support, leadership, time spent in school, content of subjects studied, and teaching. This report was the first in a cycle to identify areas of weakness in the public schools and to call for reform. Subsequent reports listed other ways to improve and each had an impact on practice by identifying educational needs.
Recommendations found in the National Governors’ Association document *Time For Results: The Governors’ 1991 Report on Education* (1986), covered topics such as clarification of goals, assessing outcomes of schooling, bringing technology into the curriculum, and school-site management.

The need for reform motivated community and state leaders, parents, students, and educators to engage in revamping the nation’s public schools. Citizens wanted the huge bureaucratic system broken into smaller, more workable units that give opportunities to participate in decisions that respond to needs of clients (Candoli, p. 31).

The concept of participation and sharing of power is not new and can, in fact, be traced as far back as A.D. 529 when under Benedictine Rule, St. Benedict guided the leadership style of Abbots by suggesting that they call together the entire community for the purpose of discussing any business important to success for the monastery. A thousand years later, Machiavelli addressed the same kind of issue when he advised the wise prince to seek opinions of other wise men before making a decision (Vroom & Jago, 1988). Since the time of St. Benedict
and Machiavelli, ideas about organizations and the degree to which participation in decision making is appropriate have continued to evolve.

The concept of power sharing and participation surfaced in the United States around 1930 following a period in the country’s history of management styles void of concepts of democracy in the work place, worker participation, or employee involvement. A resurgence of participatory management in this country was attributed to Elton Mayo (1945) and his work conducted in the Western Electric Company from 1929 to 1945. Those experiments pointed to some societal and corporate costs of the scientific management movement and the need for worker participation in decision making.

In 1949, the State Department asked W. Edwards Deming to go to Japan to assist the Japanese government with its need for statistical population studies. As a result of his earlier work, Deming was invited in 1950 by the Union of Japanese Scientists and Engineers to give a series of lectures on statistical quality control. According to Mary Walton (1991) it was during one of these lectures that Dr. Deming realized that he was talking to the wrong people. He felt that enthusiasm for statistical techniques would burn out unless he could reach the
people in charge (p. 13). During the next 30 years, Dr. Deming worked with Japanese executives to make quality their number one priority and to view the customer as the last and most important person on the production line. The Japanese were encouraged to go to their customers and ask them what they wanted in a product, to conduct door-to-door surveys, and to invest company money in market research (Bonstingl, 1992, p. 13).

Following teachings of Deming that place value on a quality product for the consumer and quality in the workplace for the employee, an environment for management was created that allowed the Japanese post war economy to boom. The effect of Quality Circles, small groups of workers talking together to improve their work and work environment, was the production of better products that could no longer be considered inferior, but in fact, became desirable for their workmanship and attention to customer needs and satisfaction.

While Deming was introducing his management techniques into the Japanese culture in the 50’s and 60’s, this country was beginning to read theories by behavioral scientists such as Argyris, Likert and McGregor who outlined models of participative management that would
increase worker involvement and satisfaction. Vroom and Jago (1988) wrote "Participation was acknowledged to play an important role in overcoming resistance to change, in motivating workers, and instilling a community of purpose throughout the organization" (p. 12).

While research suggested that employee participation was a management style for the time, most American managers of the 1960’s were unwilling to tamper with a system that allowed their organizations to dominate world markets (Lawler, 1986). Consequently, there were few opportunities for self expression, initiative, or discretion in the workplace.

Nearly 30 years later, American management methods are no longer viewed as a model for the world and many problems such as growing trade deficits and slow productivity growths are seen as "... reflections of the inadequacy of our traditional managerial methods" (Vroom & Jago, 1988, p. 139).

American productivity and the Nation’s economic health were clearly declining; marriages, corporate profits, and general civility were all heading south, and people just didn’t seem to care about
quality anymore. Something was going very wrong, and everyone wondered what it could be. (Bonstingl, 1992, p. 18)

A NBC-TV documentary entitled "If Japan Can, Why Can’t We?" aired in 1980 which focused on Deming’s work in Japan and the way his advice had revitalized the Japanese economy through dedication to quality and continuous improvement. Many saw this as the answer to the country’s problems and a host of American industries sought his help. Today, Deming’s teachings can be seen in society, in business, and School’s of Quality "... those schools that have dedicated themselves to continuous improvement for all of their people" (Bonstingl, 1992, p. 18).

Just as business and industry have begun to meet the challenge of increasing worker involvement in decision making so too, has education jumped on the bandwagon.

Deming encourages educators to create school environments in which strong relationships of mutual respect and trust replace fear, suspicion, and division, and in which leadership from administrators and policymakers empowers students and teachers (as front-line workers of the school) to make continuous
improvements in the work they do together . . . The school . . . should be a place where students, teachers, administrators, and others are able to take pride and joy in their work. It is the responsibility of administrators, the top management of schools, to remove the barriers that prevent this from being the daily experience of students and teachers (Bonstingl, 1992, p. 19).

According to Fenwick W. English (1993) in a foreword to The Kentucky Education Reform: Lessons For America, that state has passed "... the most radical comprehensive mandate ever assembled in America" (p. xi). Passed in the spring of 1990, this bill included three basic principles and five structural changes which provide the foundation for KERA (Steffy, 1993, p. 9).

The fourth structural change addresses school governance and provides legislation that mandates school district councils empowered to adopt policy in eight areas including:

(1) Determination of curriculum, including needs assessment, curriculum development, alignment with state standards, technology utilization, and program appraisal within the local school board's policy;
(2) Assignments of all instructional and non-instructional staff time;

(3) Assignment of students to classes and programs within the school;

(4) Determination of the schedule of the school day and week, subject to the beginning and ending times of the school day and school calendar year as established by the local board;

(5) Determination of use of school space during the school day;

(6) Planning and resolution of issues regarding instructional practices;

(7) Selection and implementation of discipline and classroom management techniques, including responsibility of the student, parent, teacher, counselor, and principal;

(8) Selection of extracurricular programs and determination of policies relating to student participation based on academic qualifications and attendance requirements, program evaluation and supervision (p. 82).

Clearly, Kentucky has provided a mandate based in law "... in which leadership from administrators and policymakers empowers..."
students and teachers (as front-line workers of the school) to make continuous improvements in the work they do together" (Bonstingl, 1992, p. 19).

School-based management has the potential for addressing the uniqueness of the American school system and restructuring the bureaucratic organization. School-based management is a process which can decentralize bureaucracy and place decision making in the local schools (Reavis & Griffith, p. 3). It gives schools back to the people and places decision making where it belongs. School-based management can create conditions under which learning best takes place.

Based on the idea that each school district is different and each school within the district is different from one another, school-based management involves the delegation of authority to a local school and restructuring the way decisions are made. Restructuring involves sharing decision making power which is the spirit of school-based management.

The thrust for institutional reform and desire for accountability has brought about important changes in school districts across the nation. In many schools, authority is shifting from the central office to the school, and both parents and teachers are assuming more responsibility.
for making decisions about school matters that are important to them. Van Meter (1991) writes that this movement often resulted from individuals school district initiatives, but with the passage of the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 (KERA, 1990), this circumstance has changed. "This mandate . . . adds a new dimension to the growing national emphasis on and discussion of shared decision making in education" (p. 52).

School-based management and shared decision making can be complex, time-consuming and perhaps risky, but the results can improve performance, enhance flexibility, build high morale, and increase accountability.

Significance of the Study

Changes in society are rapidly influencing the management of our public schools. Organizational structures must be designed to meet the needs of this society and its educational community. A population that is rapidly changing in demographic configuration, increasing public interest in the quality of public schooling, and problems created by
financial constraints present leaders with challenges that need creative solutions. School-based management is a process with this potential. David (1989) writes, "School-based management is rapidly becoming the centerpiece of the current wave of reform . . . . Under school-based management, professional responsibility replaces bureaucratic regulation" (p. 45).

This study was based on a need to acquire information about professional responsibility and involvement of building-level educators in this educational reform movement. The significance of the research is that it provides a picture or "snapshot" of the current status of school-based management in the public elementary schools of Virginia.

For those boards considering policies mandating school-based management, this research describes the range of decision making which exists at different administrative levels in Virginia’s school systems and the parameters established for site-based decision making in Virginia’s elementary schools.

It was assumed that school systems considering the implementation of school-based management could benefit by looking at
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what others have done prior to implementing similar practices in their own schools.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the status of school-based management in Virginia Elementary Schools. The research sought to determine which educational decisions are made by school boards, superintendents, central office personnel, principals, teachers and parents. Specific functions examined included personnel, budget, curriculum and instruction issues.

The research questions which evolved from this purpose included:

1. What decisions can be made at the school level in the following areas:
   a. Personnel
   b. Budget and Finance
   c. Curriculum
   d. Instruction
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2. According to principals, who in the school makes these decisions?

3. Is there a relationship between the bureaucratic complexity of a school division and the status of school-based management in that district’s elementary schools?

4. What is the status of school-based management in the public elementary schools of Virginia?

Definitions

1. **School-based management** is an educational reform designed to improve public education by moving decisions regarding school budget, personnel, curriculum and instruction from the central office to the school building.

2. **School-based decision making** is the major component of school-based management. It calls on those who know the problems at the building level to make decisions that affect them and for which they will be accountable. School-based management, shared decision making, and school-based decision making are used interchangeably.
3. Decentralization represents a shift in the locus of control from persons who have responsibility for the entire organization to persons who have responsibility for a particular function or area.

4. Bureaucratic complexity as used in this research refers to the size of a school division. Less Complex divisions include those which have 1-15 elementary schools; Moderately Complex divisions contain 16 to 25 elementary schools; Complex divisions comprise more than 25 elementary schools.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 included an introduction to the study, established a need for the research and the significance of the topic selection. The purpose was stated and the research questions were identified.

Chapter 2 includes a review of the significant literature related to School-based Management.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology used, the sample selection, data gathering procedures, and an evaluation of the data analysis.
Chapter 4 continues with an introduction, presentation of the data, analysis, and summary of the findings.

Chapter 5 concludes with a summary of the research, conclusions drawn, implications for practice and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Chapter 2 focuses on the literature related to school-based management. It begins with a review of the Nation’s preoccupation with the need to change the way schools operate and efforts to improve the quality of public school education through redesign or restructuring the management processes which drive daily operations. The chapter proceeds by highlighting terminology frequently associated with school-based management and continues with an examination of characteristics identified with the process. To conclude, there is a brief description of roles that may change and models which may be employed when school-based management is implemented in a school division.
The Need for Reform

The United States has been referred to as a "nation at risk" with public schools that are outdated, outmoded and outclassed by other nations. A series of reform movements during the 60's, 70's and 80's called for change to improve the status of American education. Back to basics, new math, deviations in time dimensions, differentiated staffing, smaller class size, and increased use of technology in the classroom were proposals designed to fix problems and improve status. While these innovations did not make a significant difference in educational outcomes, they did call attention to underlying realities: problems affecting large numbers of students in public schools are difficult to fix and there is no panacea for solving the educational dilemma (Allen, 1992, p. 161).

Failure of the established system to meet needs of a growing, diverse, information-based society focused state and national attempts on improving the quality of public schools by redesigning the American education system. The National Commission on Excellence in Education convened to address some of these needs and released a 1983 report entitled A Nation at Risk that warned the public of an imminent national
crisis caused by "a rising tide of mediocrity" in the public schools. Conclusions drawn in this report prompted America’s political, educational, and financial communities to initiate a reform movement that would change the way schools conducted business.

Commissions and blue ribbon task forces were formed to recommend ways to improve schools. Included among the suggestions proposed by these special groups were considerations such as higher salaries, enhanced status for outstanding teachers, legislation to lengthen the school day and school year, stiffer graduation requirements, higher standards for teachers, and more accountability (NEA, 1990, p. 44). For most; however, the reform movement came to mean more of the same.

The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) signaled an end to the first wave of reform when it published A Nation Prepared. This report distinguished itself by changing the direction of the reform movement from more of the same to different from what was already being done. A Nation Prepared recommended restructuring the workplace to give teachers greater discretion over their work, accountability for student progress, and incentives based on school-wide student outcomes. Additionally, the Carnegie Report tied its
recommendations for educational improvement to the changing nature of the U.S. economy when it was stated in the executive summary:

America's ability to compete in world markets is eroding . . . . As jobs requiring little skill are automated or go offshore, and demand increases for the highly skilled, the pool of educated and skilled people grows smaller and the backwater of the unemployable rises. As in past economic and social crises, Americans turn toward education. They rightly demand an improved supply of young people with the knowledge, the spirit, the stamina, and the skills to make the nation once again competitive (Carnegie Forum, 1986).

Following this major report, prominent thinkers in the fields of business and education began to speak and write about the link between the nation's future and the importance of education. David T. Kearns (1989), writing of young people who cannot summarize the main point of an article or accurately count change from a restaurant bill, declares "At a time when our pre-eminent role in the world economy is in jeopardy, there are few social problems more telling in their urgency. Public education has put this country at a terrible competitive disadvantage" (p. 1).
Chester E. Finn (1987) voiced concern for America’s conflict over the need to renew competitiveness and implied that practically everyone agrees on the important role education will play in achieving that renewal. Likewise; Robert D. Kilpatrick (1989), chairman of CIGNA Corporation has been quoted as saying, "If I’ve learned one thing... it’s that the answer to virtually all our national problems... ultimately rests on one word. That word is education" (Council for Aid to Education, 1989). Educating the work force is a problem with which there is substantial dissatisfaction. The quality of current educational performance is often expressed in complaints about inadequate preparation for the job force or higher education by employers, the military, college professors and even graduate schools (Finn, 1987, p. 61).

The 1991 report by the Secretary of Labor’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) identified three basic skill areas necessary for holding a job in today’s world. These skill areas include (1) reading, writing, arithmetic, listening and speaking; (2) creative thinking, decision making, problem solving and reasoning; and (3) responsibility, self esteem, sociability, self management and integrity. Again, this
report identifies schools as the primary agency for developing these skills in students.

Current discussions, programs, and mandates whose intent is to seek solutions to "national problems" would change the public school system as we know it. Schiechty (1990) writes of an American public school system designed at a time when education's purpose was to promote republican-Protestant probity and civic literacy. That system, dealing mainly with a white Anglo-Saxon, rural society was not appropriate for the culture of the industrial revolution, nor is it applicable to the information society in which students of today must function. He continues by asserting that unless schools of today change from business as usual to "getting the business right" then the future of this country will be in jeopardy (p. 4).

A focus on the need to restructure, the need to compete in an international market, and the need to improve the quality of public school education has highlighted the importance of organizational structure in the educational process. In the past, shifting national agendas affected the organization and management structure of schools, but school governance maintained its similarity to original intent and outcome. Centralized districts reflected classical organization theory in that
bureaucratic structure promoted routine problem solving designed to achieve a given purpose which according to Ellwood P. Cubberly (1916) "shaped and fashioned children into products to meet the various demands of life" (p. 325).

In a reorganization proposal, Kearns and Doyle (1989) wrote that educational excellence is our most serious national problem and not just a concern of state and local government. Further, school district organization tends to resemble factories of the late 19th century. They employ bureaucratic, top down management that inhibits creativity and independent judgment.

This acknowledgment of bureaucracy in our nation’s schools is supported by literature that challenges educators to develop new systems which will promote improvement and excellence through innovation and change in organization and management. Villars (1991) writes that schools of the future cannot be designed to operate like factories. Information Age workers and citizens must be generalists who are flexible, adaptive and able to cope with a rapidly changing global society and economy. Future schools must reflect diversity rather than standardization and decentralization rather than centralization (p. 12).
The current wave of reform seeks to improve the quality of education in America by emphasizing the importance of organizational structure for bringing about real change and innovation in the educational process. In recent years school divisions have functioned as centralized organizations which make decisions within top administrative levels and mandate implementation at the local unit. Input into this system moves from the building principal to top decision makers who then make policy and establish procedures. Until recently this system was seen as efficient because it promoted understood lines of authority.

Commenting on the report A Nation At Risk and problems facing the American school system, Carl L. Marburger (1985) wrote that the sense of ill-being about public schools has been caused by a "... lack of faith in big government and big institutions." Additionally, he believes the problem is compounded by the inability to respond to an individual's need because the institution is too large (p. 15).

In the latest series of surveys for Agenda: America's Schools for the 21st Century, Harris and Associates (1992) interviewed, by telephone, 1,252 randomly selected adults nationwide and found overwhelming support for reforming public schools. Issues addressed by the survey included topics such as "... freeing individual schools from
tight centralized controls to making those same schools accountable for the results: from more shared decision making at the school level to getting parents more involved in preparing their children for education" (p. 15).

Of those surveyed, 95% felt an urgent need to adopt school reforms that would make the labor force more competitive. Twelve reform issues measured on the survey resulted in overwhelming support which:

1. Give individual schools much more authority over their teaching and spending decisions (68%).
2. Give teachers a greater decision-making power over what is taught and how it is taught (74%).
3. Involve parents much more in making decisions about their childrens’ schools (90%).
4. Get principals to share decision-making with teachers and parents (91%).
5. Make individual schools accountable for how well they educate their students (93%).
6. Free schools from tight regulations (58%) (Harris, 1992, p. 18).
Marburger (1985) writes of public schools that shifted from total parent control during the beginning of the common school movement to no parent involvement (p. 17). Problems arising from changes which took place within that 150 years include general lack of faith in big government, loss of faith that professional educators know best, escalating cost of schooling, and schools that are monopolies in the sense that little choice is offered. Submitting these concerns as legitimate reasons for widespread dissatisfaction, Marburger then proposed that the process of school-based management be one way to deal with current discontent (p. 19).

School-Based Management

School-based management is a system of educational administration in which the school is the primary unit of educational decision-making. It differs from most current forms of school district organization in which the central office dominates the decision-making process (Lindelow, 1981, p. 1). Implicit in Lindelow’s definition is a system of management which differs from the traditional way schools have been run in that decisions
are made from the bottom up instead of top down. Marburger (1985) writes that essential features of this form of school governance are principals with increased responsibilities and authority, and the right of parents and teachers to participate in important school decisions (p. 19).

Garms, Guthrie and Pierce (1979) propose school-site management as a mechanism that could help gain student equity, enlarge educational choice, and aid efficiency (p. 42). The school should be the basic unit of management in the school district.

Unlike many educational reforms, school-based management is a process, not a prescription. There is no right way to implement school-based management because the control theory behind it is the belief that each district and each school within that district is unique (Marburger, 1985, pp. 26-27).

Lawrence Pierce (1980) traces the basic outline of school-based management to the New York State Fleischmann Commission in 1971 (p. 7). This study group was credited with the first reference to "school-site management" and recommended that many educational decisions regarding curriculum, budgeting, instruction and personnel be made at the local level (Fleischmann Commission, 1973).
The attention received by the Fleischmann Commission set the stage for school-site initiatives in other states. A report to the Florida Governor’s Citizens’ Committee on Education (1973) recommended the allocation of funds based on student need at the school, the establishment of school objectives by people associated with the school, the spending of instructional funds by the local school, the determination of the organization of instruction, and the participation of parents in school decision making (p. 171).

Following the Florida mandate for local control and participatory decision making, California’s school finance reform legislation required the establishment of local school site councils with broad decision-making powers (Marburger, 1985; Pierce, 1980; Lindelow, 1981). This legislation set into policy specifics concerning membership on the site council and clarified decision-making roles and functions of the teams (Marburger, 1985, p. 64).

Although New York, Florida and California led the way in this reform movement, Lindelow (1981) identifies other programs implemented from 1970 to 1979. Five examples from Lindelow’s work are highlighted below.
1. Lansing, Michigan implemented a modified consensus model consisting of a citizen involvement committee including parents, teachers and building administrators who shared governance of the building (p. 39).

2. Edmonton, Alberta implemented school-based budgeting in all schools in 1979. This move to decentralization includes responsibility for the budgeting of certificated and support staff, supplies, equipment and services. Under this plan maintenance and renovation, long term substitutes, and utilities remained centralized (p. 40).

3. Cherry Creek, Colorado used a school-based approach that gives the principal 95% autonomy over personnel and curriculum. Parents help develop school policy and work with the administrator through the parent-teacher organization (p. 42).

4. Eugene, Oregon established one school-based management pilot using the lump sum budgeting model with a school council composed of seven parents and seven staff members using consensus when possible and majority rule if necessary. This council has power over budget, the curriculum and some personnel issues (p. 44).
5. Salt Lake City, Utah's model consists of two groups of adults who work cooperatively to solve problems. Each school has an improvement council composed of teachers and administrators and a community group of parents and administrator. These groups establish the school schedule, make policy, set disciplinary standards, manipulate the school budget, and design the curriculum (p. 45).

These early attempts at decentralizing are recognized as the formative stage in school-based management since they pioneered the environment for experimentation across the country. Since the 1970's, according to the latest Rand Report only a few dozen school systems have formally embraced site-based management but thousands of districts across the country are experimenting with it in some form or another (Hill & Bonan, 1991, p. v).

The purpose of the most recent Rand report is to provide information on site-based management "... because of its potential for changing the relationships of schools to the community" (p. iii). During the school years 1989-1990 and 1990-1991, a Rand research team studied five urban and suburban school systems that had adopted site-based management. Two are established systems (Edmonton, Alberta
and Dade County, Florida) and three (Columbus, Ohio; Prince William County, Virginia, and Jefferson County, Kentucky) are relatively new at the process. Each site was visited twice and numerous interviews both in person and via the telephone were held. Like earlier programs the goals of these divisions were similar. Site-based management was adopted for the purpose of school improvement, teacher professionalization, public support, and budgetary and administrative decentralization (Hill & Bonan, 1991, p. 5).

Jane L. David (1989) writes that Montgomery County, Maryland, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and Santa Fe, New Mexico are a few of a growing list of districts in which school-based management is rapidly becoming the "centerpiece of the current wave of reform." She suggests this practice exists to " . . . bring about significant change in educational practice: to empower school staff to create conditions in schools that facilitate improvement, innovation, and continuous professional growth" (p. 45).

School-based management is a process that is being implemented across this country as a way to decentralize control over the local school and to hold the individual unit more accountable for outcomes. Those who write about rationale suggest that it is tied to several needs.
Marburger (1985) writes that the first rationale for school-based management is in response to parent demands for quality education, the need to change, and more accountability. A case is made for parents’ "...right to participate in the planning and decision making that produce the outcomes of schooling" and that participation brings ownership, and confidence in public schools (p. 20). Marburger’s (1985) second rationale for school-based management is based on the assumption that principals and teachers are in the best position to know the needs of the students; therefore, they should have more control over school operations (p. 20).

Lawrence Pierce (1980) writes that the rationale for school-based management is "...an attempt to reverse the trend toward increasing centralization of educational policy making so that those persons closest to school children have more to say about policies affecting those children" (p. 9).

The rationale for school-based management as described in the philosophy of Monroe County, Florida, summarizes succinctly the best reasons for entering into this process. They believe the following:

1. When persons who will be affected by decisions participate and share in making those decisions, better decisions are made.
2. When persons are involved in making decisions, they have more ownership and commitment to outcomes.

3. People who function closest to decisions that must be made are in the best position to help make decisions affecting that operation.

4. When decisions affecting a school center and the educational programs provided by that school center are made by the persons responsible for implementation and outcomes of the programs, the school can respond more effectively to the needs of its students and the community it serves.

5. If school centers and teachers are to be accountable for results, they should share in making decisions about how the school center will operate (Henriquez, 1978, p. 1).

Since the early 70’s the interest in school-based management has grown and expanded in use as both school districts and support groups promote it as a viable structure for governing schools. The focus on a need to restructure, a need to compete in an international market, and a need to improve the quality of public school education has increased the importance of this organizational structure as an ingredient in improving the quality of education in our nation’s schools. The next
section will highlight definitions of school-based management and identify terminology closely associated with the phenomenon.

School-Based Management Defined

School-based management is a process identified by many names and associated with a variety of reform movements since the 1970's. Definitions generally fall into two categories dealing with the transfer of authority to the school site or the alteration of the governance structure within the school (Murphy, 1991, p. 37).

Marburger (1985) writes that school-based management means both the "delegation of some important decision-making authority to the local school and a restructuring of the way decisions are made" (p. 27).

Definitions by Clune and White (1988), Lindelow & Henydrickx (1989), and Pierce (1980) include structural changes. According to Murphy (1991), these changes transfer authority to the local site and are employed when decentralizing larger organizational units into smaller, more responsive ones (p. 37).

Marburger (1985) refers to structural change as administrative decentralization (p. 25). Examples of school-based management defined
in terms of structural or administrative decentralization are: (a) "School-based management is a system designed to improve education by increasing the authority of actors at the school site" (Clune & White, 1988, p. 1), (b) "School-based management is an educational reform designed to improve public education through decentralization. Its adoption involves moving many decisions regarding school budgets, personnel, and curriculum from the central district office to the school building" (Pierce, 1980, p. 1), and (c) "School-based management is a system of administration in which the school is the primary unit of educational decision making" (Lindelow & Heynderickx, 1989, p. 109).

The second category of school-based management definitions considers the alteration of governance within the school (Murphy, 1991) or restructuring the way decisions are made (Marburger, 1985). This is implied in the school-based definitions of Lewis (1990), Malen (1989), and Hill and Bonan (1991).

"Site-based management is a structure by which all units of the district are decentralized and the inherent ranking person is given the authority over the unit with some input from the people of that unit" (Lewis, 1990, p. 1).
School-based management can be viewed conceptually as a formal alteration of governance structures, as a form of decentralization that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement and relies on the redistribution of decision making authority as the primary means through which improvements might be stimulated and sustained (Malen et al., 1989, p. 1).

Site-based management shifts decision making responsibility and authority from the central office to the school. It reverses a trend . . . to try to improve school performance through general purpose instruments of public policy regulation, mandate, enforcement, and legal action. According to the theory . . . all decisions of educational consequence are to be made at the school and none may be compelled by regulation in the school district (Hill & Bonan, 1991, p. 4).

School-based management and site-based management are synonymous terms that are also found in the literature as building-based, school-site, or school-centered management. These terms depict school governance structures based on concepts defined in the preceding paragraphs. Additional descriptors associated with school-based
management are school-based budgeting, school-community councils, school-advisory teams, school-based curriculum development, and school-based staff development.

The term restructuring is also closely associated with the school-based management movement. Reavis and Griffith (1992) write that restructuring means "... a complete change in the culture, organizational assumptions, leadership, curriculum, instructional approach, and accountability of the school" (p. 2). They continue by identifying seven elements of restructuring which are gaining nationwide consensus. Element one is appropriate to the review of this literature because it supports the following sections related to characteristics of school-based management. It states "Site-based decision making is the critical areas of budget, staff development, curriculum and instruction, and personnel" (p. 2).

Generally, restructuring is referred to as systematic change (Murphy, 1991, p. 15) or a specific change (Hill & Bonan, 1991, p. 6) within the school and an "alteration in the relationships among the players involved in the educational process" (Murphy, 1991, p. 15).

Decentralization is also closely aligned with school-based management. Lewis (1990) defines decentralization as "... the process
of dividing the school district into manageable parts” (p. 1). In One School At A Time, Marburger (1985) writes about school-based management as a form of decentralization:

School-based management is a decentralized form of organization in which the power and the decisions now made by the superintendent and school board are shared with those who know and care most about the excellence of the education students receive - the teachers, the principal, the parents and citizens, and the students at each local school (p. 26).

Reavis and Griffith (1992) bring consensus for most writers on the topic of decentralization when they say that “decentralization . . . involve(s) a change in the source of decisions” (p. 3). When deciding what to decentralize, one can look to the Florida and California experiences for guidance. Generally, those decisions required to properly manage a school should be made at the school level while those more efficiently made at the central office should remain there.

A final word on decentralization comes from then presidential candidate Bill Clinton in an interview with Edward Fiske (1992). Speaking about reform, Governor Clinton said, "We really need . . .
significant decentralization. We need to give more decision-making power to principals, teachers, and parents at the school level" (p. 12).

When using the terms school-based management and shared decision making, one should consider basic beliefs. School-based management can be practiced without shared decision making. In this situation, the assumption is that the principal is the ultimate authority. When school-based management is practiced with shared decision making the assumption is that bureaucracies are best broken into smaller units where those who work directly with children know best what they need. This includes parents, teachers, students and community.

The next section of this paper will look at the literature related to the components of school-based management identified by association in definitions or terminology.

Elements of School-Based Management

School-based management is a combination of functions that include budgeting, staffing, advisory councils, curriculum implementation, staff development and decision making at the school-site. Generally speaking, no one merging of characteristics is more prevalent than
another and combinations of factors used in the school-based management process are as different as the districts that set up this design. According to Henderson and Marburger (1985), what school-based management looks like "varies with what it was set up to do and which problems it is supposed to resolve" (p. 3). Consensus by those who write extensively about school-based management such as Pierce (1976,1980), Marburger (1985), and Lindelow (1981) is that the essential elements include authority to make decisions about budget, curriculum, and personnel, teams or councils that serve as the governing body for each school, and role changes for the central office.

Accountability for results becomes the job of the school. Gordon Cawelti (1989) writes about site-based experiments across the nation and suggests that the demonstration schools are those that are responsive to increased authority and responsibility for improving accountability and productivity. From work done in these pilot divisions key elements have emerged which include:

1. Various degrees of site-based budgeting affording alternative use of resources;

2. A team operation affording groups to expand the basis of decision making;
3. School-site advisory committees with key roles for parents and students at the high school level;
4. Increased authority for selecting personnel who are assigned to the school;
5. Ability to modify the school’s curriculum to better serve their students;
6. Clear processes for seeking waivers from local or state regulations that restrict the flexibility of local staffs;
7. An expectation for an annual report on progress and school improvements (p. 46).

**School-Based Budgeting**

Stated in anatomical terms, Jane L. David (1989) writes that the backbone of school-based management is the "... delegation of authority from district to schools" (p. 46), and Lindelow and Heynderickx (1989) conclude that the heart of school-based management is budget control (p. 180).

Budget autonomy is often called "school-based budgeting" or "school-site lump sum budgeting" and must be a component of the school-based management process since control of curricula and personnel are
dependent on control of the budget (Lindelow & Heynderickx, 1989, p. 180). Controlling the budget provides an opportunity for staff and community involvement when they set priorities for using limited resources. Proponents believe this move to decentralize is an advantage over traditional models since "... every school has different needs, and, therefore, should be responded to with different resources" (Beers, 1984, p. 6).

Decentralized budgeting, according to Murphy (1991), is associated with lump sum budgeting. This may be distinguished from traditional budgeting that allocates monies for predetermined categories such as books, salaries, staff development and travel. Under lump sum budgeting, the school rather than the district decides how the money is spent. In highly decentralized divisions, schools may decide whether the money is spent inside or outside the district and may even be able to carry over unspent money for another year. The degree of budget decentralization by a district can be measured by the size of the ratio of lump sum funds to monies restricted by categories (p. 47).

Among advocates for school-based management, there appears to be general agreement that funds for accounts should be allocated to schools on a lump-sum basis (Garms, Guthrie, & Pierce; Lindelow, 1981;
Marburger, 1985; Pierce, 1980). Whereas there is no one clear model for allocating resources, most plans include the number and types of students in attendance at the building site, staffing patterns, program features or a combination of these factors. According to Lindelow (1981), the Monroe County School District in Florida allocates funds based on student enrollment and the unique needs of the school (p. 69). The most often used method for acquiring funds for a local site involves negotiations for amounts and categories between the central office and the building principal. The school has an opportunity to submit proposals or an entire package can be generated (Beers, 1984).

Lindelow and Heynderickx (1989) describe two major steps in the budget process in a decentralized system. The first step involves lump sum allocation of funds to the individual school based on some uniform formula and the second is the preparation of its budget at the school site. Most critical is the second of the steps.

It is from this process that most of the advantages of decentralized management stem, in particular the flexibility of the school to meet students’ needs and the feelings of ownership that people derive from making decisions at the school site (p. 180).
Decentralized budgeting brings about the reality of program costs, limitations on spending, and the financial status of the school. Under school-based management the individual school is given preference for budgetary decisions; however, central office is not relieved of major monitoring and accountability responsibilities. The system ensures that funds are properly used (Pierce, 1980). According to Marburger (1985):

... the board of education cannot turn over their statutory fiscal responsibility, although they can certainly delegate a major portion of that responsibility to local schools. ... Once district restraints have been defined, the central office would need to monitor whether state and federal law is being complied with, whether the district’s educational goals and objectives are being met, and how well students are learning, in order to fulfill its major responsibilities (pp. 52-53).

The implementation of school-based budgeting should not be undertaken without a system of checks and balances to serve as a guide for the local school. Reavis and Griffith (1992) recommend the requirement of explicit accountability measures with assessable progress, the appointment of parents to school councils, mission statements with supporting objectives to which the school is deeply committed, and
training for principals, teachers, and parents on the legal requirements regarding budget matters (pp. 177-178).

For interested parties, John Greenhalgh (1990) offers the model for school-site budgeting used in Fairfield, Connecticut and suggests that "... with the availability of desk and pocket calculators, and computer assisted data handling, the computational aspects of school-site budgeting are not found to be a burden" (p. 1).

**School-Based Curriculum**

Bureaucratic systems, firmly established on generations of precedent, have created not only conforming non-educators, but also teachers who accept the premise that teacher decision making should be very limited. Curriculum guides, time allocation for subjects, and determination of textbooks are but a few of the many educational decisions made from on high. This collective direction by the central office - and its accompanying acceptance by many teachers - is why school curriculums are often irrelevant. They are packaged, sent to the principal, interpreted by teachers, and perceived by pupils in a manner that probably bears little
relationship to the authors' original conceptions, which may not
have been relevant anyway (Gasson, 1972, p. 83).

Compared with Gasson's description of the existing situation in
many districts, Lindelow (1981) writes that school-based management
offers "... near total autonomy over curriculum matters" (p. 58). When
curriculum decisions are decentralized, the school acts within broad
outlines defined by the board. As long as the school acts within the
parameters of these guidelines, and attains the educational goals
established by the board, individual schools are free to teach anyway
they see fit. School-based curriculum (Clune & White, 1988) means that
each school staff decides what teaching materials are to be used, as well
as the specific teaching techniques to be stressed.

Marburger (1985) parallels the thinking described above when he
writes:

The central office generally defines what is to be learned and
establishes broad goals for the schools to accomplish, but as long
as the school accomplishes those goals it can be free to make
decisions that are in the best interest of its children" (p. 53).

When discussing curriculum, Roland Barth (1980) agrees that good
guidelines are to be taken seriously by educators and that they become
good if ". . . teachers have participated in their development, if they include teachers’ judgements about what can and should be taught, and if they reflect teachers’ knowledge of the ways children learn (p. 95).

Lindelow (1981) writes:
. . . a district’s implementation of school-based management has led to an increase in the diversity of educational approaches in that district. Teachers and principals gain more freedom to design their own instructional programs, and parents gain more influence on the design of those programs (p. 122).

The literature reviewed has three themes related to curriculum. It emphasizes that decisions about methods of instruction, materials, and specific programs to use are made at the school site; teachers, students, parents and other concerned citizens should participate in the planning of the curriculum at the school site, and the central office should develop standards and objectives for the district which are implemented at the school site.

Educators need flexibility to deal with educational objectives and students involved in learning. With the flexibility offered under school-based management "all schools work toward the same educational goals but the way in which the individual school works with its students is
dependent upon the local needs and priorities” (Candoli et al., 1984, p. 382).

**School-Based Personnel**

When principals tailor a school’s educational programs to the needs and ambitions of the community, "they must have control of their major resource . . . teachers" (Lindelow, 1981, p. 122).

Esler (1981) describes two models frequently employed to determine staff allocation in a school-based management district. The Resource Allocation Model frequently used in Florida provides for lump sums to be budgeted under the certified and noncertified personnel budget categories. Student enrollment and average salaries within each personnel category are generally used in the calculation of staff allotment. Student enrollment is also considered in the Personnel Unit Model, where points, based on the average teacher’s salary, convert to units that are then assigned to a school. A variation on this theme involves the allocation of additional points based on the individual needs of students. "Having been assigned a number of points, a building principal and staff spend those points by selecting the kinds of positions they want" (Prasch, 1984, p. 28).
Jane L. David (1989) describes "staffing units" based on the average cost of a teacher, including benefits, as the basis for budget allotment to schools.

Once monies for the "staffing units" have been assigned, there are two basic decisions that must be made about personnel. Positions must be identified and filled. Once the number of certificated teachers is determined on the basis of enrollment, school staff can choose to spend residual dollars (usually very few) on another teacher, several part-time specialists, instructional aides, or clerical support. Some districts achieve the same effect by allocating one full-time equivalent to each school to be used at the school's discretion (p. 46).

The second area of discretion in personnel rests with the need to fill vacancies resulting from retirement, transfers, or increasing enrollment (David, 1989, p. 47).

The most common way of selecting instructional resources is for the principal to select a finalist from a pool of qualified applicants maintained in the central office. This method for selecting staff often happens in association with the staff and community. Salaries, working
conditions, fringe benefits, and grievance procedures are negotiated with the district (Lindelow, 1981, p. 123).

When writing about staff selection in site-based management, Prasch (1984) concludes:

The personnel office is responsible for conducting an initial screening of all applicants and keeping a current list of all candidates meeting district standards for employability. Principals will recommend from the approved list appointments to fill their vacancies (p. 29).

**Shared Decision Making**

Literature associated with school-based management is replete with the importance of shared decision making. Whereas it is recognized that school-based management can occur without shared decision making, the process is described as the essence of "organizational effectiveness." Writing about empowerment, frequently used to mean shared decision making, Bailey (1991) states "the key to organizational effectiveness is decision making. Not only is it important to make the right decisions, it is important to the overall climate as to who makes the decisions" (p. 56). Hill and Bonan (1991) believe
. . . Shared decision making . . . represents a shift in the balance in an individual school, from control of all important issues by the principal to some degree of open discussion with the staff. Under shared decision making, all decisions are to be made by vote or consensus (p. 4).

The discussion continues by suggesting that site-based management does not necessarily imply shared decision making and that principals may very well have increased power to act without sharing it. They do; however, emphasize that shared decision making and school-based management go hand-in-hand because they are based on two assumptions: people closest to students are the ones most likely to make good decisions and adults in a school will perform best if they perceive themselves as able to make judgements about students and accountable to parents for results (p. 6).

Lewis (1990) suggests that the terms associated with school-based management are becoming confused and proposes a set of definitions that seek to "set the record straight." Joint or shared decision making is determined to be ". . . the process of arriving at a decision in which all people affected by the decision participate in making
the decision. Decisions are usually reached by consensus with the principal and superintendent having only one vote" (p. 1).

Hill and Bonan (1991) state:

Shared decision making . . . represents a shift in the balance, in an individual school, from control of all important issues by the principal to some degree of open discussion with the staff. Under shared decision making, all decisions are to be made by vote or consensus (p. 4).

In summary, shared decision making with autonomy for making important decisions about budget, curriculum and personnel are the quintessence of school-based management. Within the parameters defined by federal and state laws and local policy, the school has an opportunity to decide pertinent issues that are unique to the community and school setting. Within the process, key roles change and the central office, principal, teachers and parents function collaboratively to solve problems.

The next section looks at key roles played by the central office, principals, teachers, and parents as related to school-based management and shared decision making.
Roles and School-Based Management

The Board

According to Caldwell and Wood (1988) the process of school-based improvement begins when the school board, through the superintendent, identifies educational concerns for the division and subsequently chooses 10 or 15 goals directly related to areas of student achievement where improvement is most needed. Schools select their improvement goals and since schools differ from one another, the way an individual school addresses the concern selected is decided by each faculty through participatory decision making (p. 51).

Parameters for operation must be determined by the school board. According to the School-Based Management Executive Summary for Prince William County, a most important step "... for implementing school-based management is determining the conditions or parameters which determine . . . the degree of autonomy assigned to the schools" (1990, p. 8). Generally, principals must (a) operate within the parameters of federal, state, and local laws governing the operation of schools, (b) comply with school accreditation standards and state
regulations pertaining to education, and (c) comply with board policies and administrative directives unless waived by the board (p. 8).

Once the school board has identified improvement goals, the central office becomes important in helping the individual school implement its plan and achieve established outcomes.

The Central Office

John Lindeelow (1981) describes a school-based management system where central office administrators "shed some of their authority and become managers of the school system instead of its bosses" (p. 118). In this system, central office staff become facilitators for the local school in that they are technical assistants to the site in instructional matters and they monitor the schools’ progress toward goals (p. 58).

From their work in four school districts across the nation, Caldwell and Wood (1988) identify roles that central office personnel or "the district management team" play in school-based management. It is the responsibility of these administrators to:

1. Translate board policy and priority goals for improvement into short and long-range district plans for implementation;
2. Provide data related to the district’s major problems and goal areas identified by the board;

3. Provide and manage district resources to support school instructional improvement plans;

4. Approve and monitor school instructional improvement plans;

5. Evaluate all aspects of the district improvement operation;

6. Provide staff development to accomplish desired goals and objectives on approved school improvement plans;

7. Model, in all aspects of their operations, the behavior expected of principals and their school-based improvement teams (p. 52).

Following guidelines from the central office, furnished with strategic data, and trained in a decision making process, the principal must guide his or her team through planning for school improvement.

The Principal

American principals believe they have considerable responsibility for school leadership (Barth, 1980). This belief is supported by a survey of 2400 principals where 54 percent indicate "The principal is recognized publicly as the head of his school, with considerable authority to plan, organize, and administer the educational program in it" (p. 200).
Under school-based management the principal’s leadership role is increased; however, it undergoes dramatic changes. As central figure in this organizational process the principal’s authority and responsibility expand in three directions simultaneously to include "... more involvement in the school program, more involvement in shared governance, and a higher level of responsibility in district decision making" (Clune & White, 1988, p. 19).

John Murphy (1991) writes of changing relationships as a key element in the school-based management strategy for restructuring schools "... the principal is the nexus of restructuring efforts - accepting additional autonomy and accountability on behalf of the school and passing it through to the teaching staff (and to the larger community)" (p. 26).

The principal’s role, according to Pierce (1980) "... changes from being the head teacher to being an educational manager" (p. 28). Lindelow (1981) believes that the principal and staff should have considerable leeway to make decisions about personnel, program, and budget within the limits of general objectives defined by the central office and board (p. 53). He or she then works with staff and parents to determine educational needs and to design the school’s curriculum.
around these needs (Lindelow, p. 58). Emphasis for working with these groups is not the principal’s power but rather the ability to facilitate shared decision making.

Under this management plan a principal must be competent in four important areas: personnel management, program management, public relations, and budgeting (Pierce, 1980, p. 29). Principals are held accountable for accomplishing goals established in the school improvement plan (Caldwell & Wood, 1988), and fostering a quality relationship of shared governance within the school by making decisions cooperatively with teachers and the school-based management council. Expanded authority and decision making also include the hiring and firing of personnel, budget allocations, and curriculum development (Clune & White, 1988, p. 19).

Dealing effectively with a wider range of tasks in the delivery of educational services means that school-based management will require more work for the principal, and additional time needed to implement shared decision making. James Lewis (1989) writes that the new role of a principal employed at a school-based management site includes the requirement to:

1. Tolerate risks, failure and mistakes.
2. Provide discretionary time for the council as well as teams.

3. Become a protector of new ideas.

4. Express the school vision from time to time when it appears that the actions of individuals and/or the council are off course.

5. Give clear and frequent feedback.

6. Train as well as assist in planning and implementing training activities for teachers.

7. Recognize and reward individual and council efforts.

8. Conduct the various activities of the support staff to maximize their effectiveness.

9. Guarantee council freedom to perform.


11. Remove school organizational barriers.

12. Identify, support and nurture champions within and without the school.

13. Assist the council in presenting new ideas and methods to the central administration.

14. Identify individual potential and help each council member to reach that potential (p. 7).
Caldwell and Wood (1988) identify the roles that principals play in school-based management. They report that principals:

1. Ensure the positive climate necessary for gaining commitment to school improvement decisions;
2. Involve their staffs and those clienteles served by the school in developing goals and program plans for improvement;
3. Ensure that staff development programs designed for their staffs are related to their school improvement goals;
4. Participate in staff development with their faculties;
5. Ensure that the design of the school improvement plan addresses the major educational problems in their schools;
6. Implement and evaluate school instructional improvement with their planning teams (p. 53).

Though stated differently, principals’ roles addressed by Lewis (1991), and Caldwell and Wood (1988) include the essential competency areas identified earlier by Pierce (1980) and others (Clune & White, 1988; Murphy, 1991; Lindelow, 1981).

When selecting principals to manage a site-based school, it is important to consider characteristics necessary to implement this bottom up reform movement. All principals may not be prepared professionally
or emotionally to be a school-based manager (Candoli et al., 1984). Principals who work in this environment are expected to carry a heavy burden of leadership, take risks and exhibit characteristics of a true executive (Finn, 1986).

Flexibility and adaptability are necessary traits for moving the school forward and building relationships with staff and community. Rather than being evaluated on how well the principal conforms to central office edicts, school-based managers are evaluated on their relationship with staff and the public, fiscal competence, and program productivity (Lindelow, 1981).

Principals working in site managed schools must trust others, be self confident and secure in their leadership ability for as Marburger (1985) points out, principals who are "...unwilling to share decisions with faculty or with parents can block implementation of any school-based management program initiated by the central office" (p. 66).

**The Teacher**

School-based management widens the horizon for teachers as professionals for it offers them the opportunity to take initiative and solve problems. According to the latest Rand Report (1991) there are
some corresponding burdens imposed on those who would become involved. Teachers "... must put in the time and endure the conflict and uncertainty that responsibility brings" (p. 19). Under this process "... guidelines shift the teachers' role. Teachers are expected to be actively creative, rather than passively compliant (Barth, 1980, p. 97).

Membership on a school improvement team provides teachers greater flexibility and opportunities to make changes, more responsibility and authority to organize and coordinate school programs, and the chance to strengthen communication links with the principal. Additionally, teachers work together to develop a school improvement plan that includes identified goals and objectives; consequently, they are more sensitive to and better able to respond to the needs of all children (Clune & White, 1988, p. 22).

Caldwell and Wood (1988) identified the role of teachers in decision making groups based on their research of four case studies in Denver, Ft. Worth, St. Paul, and Webster Grove, Missouri. In these districts teachers:

1. Work collaboratively with the principal, central office staff, and representative parents ... to consider district and school priorities and to select goals to achieve over the next four or five years;
2. Help identify the programs and practices necessary to achieve their school goals;

3. Assist in the implementation of these programs and practices by participating in staff development designed to help them achieve their goals;

4. Conduct inservice for their peers;

5. Help collect and interpret evaluation data related to their improvement goals;

6. Assist the principal in managing the resources to assure their improvement plans are successful (p. 53).

Within the structure of school-based management, the literature suggests that teachers play a central role in achieving the school’s mission. Their position becomes one of active participation within the school and on school councils where he or she moves beyond advisory duty to responsible decision making important to student outcomes, the school and community. "Teachers, whose decision making responsibilities may have rarely extended beyond the classroom, now need to develop a school wide perspective" (Caldwell & Wood, 1988, p. 52).
The Parents and Community

An assumption of school-based management includes parents and community members who are directly involved in decision making that results in ownership of the decisions made, a generation of new ideas outside the professional staff, and team building between a trained faculty and lay persons within the greater community.

Carl Marburger (1985) stresses the importance of the role parents and community play in decision making at the local site as follows:

They should also have the right to participate in the planning and decision making that produce the outcomes of schooling. They can participate effectively, and are most likely to do so, if the planning and decision making take place in their local school buildings. With school-based management, the school program becomes "ours" rather than "theirs" (p. 20).

The essence of Marburger’s thoughts is expressed in the literature by other writers with statements such as "Parents can participate in decisions that affect their children. . . . Involvement enhances public support of the schools" (Lindelow, 1981, p. 67).

In their research Clune and White (1988) found that parents involved in school-based management have a more meaningful role in
what their children learn at school. "They see that the education program is being geared to the needs of their child" (p. 23). The authors continue by defining the parents’ role which serves to improve communication, build support through ownership, provide input into the curriculum and increase the community’s knowledge of school activities (p. 23).

The majority of references to the role of parents in school-based management are in conjunction with a school council or school improvement team. There is general agreement that the school council is the appropriate forum for participating in decision making which affects the local school.

Advisory Councils

Advisory councils are familiar in school-based management literature since they typically provide the means by which all participants become active in school decision making strategies. Just as the descriptors characterize school-based management under a variety of names so do advisory councils appear under an assortment of titles. Many are prefaced by the word school such as school council, school advisory council, local school advisory council, school advisory
committee, or school improvement team. The intent of each group, no matter the name, centers on people who have a common interest in the school and decision making which will enhance the school’s written plan for improvement.

Hollinger and Richardson (1988) identified four conceptually different models that involve teachers and parents in schoolwide decision making. They are called (a) Principal’s Advisory Council, (b) Instructional Support Team, (c) School Improvement Team, and (d) Lead Teacher Committee (p. 233).

Garten and Valentine (1989) describe two distinct building level committees that focus on teachers as decision makers. They are similar in function to Hollinger and Richardson’s (1988) Principal’s Advisory Council and School Improvement Team but are called (a) Administrative Advisory Council and (b) Instructional Improvement Council (pp. 4-5).

Similarly, Guthrie (1986) describes two council models that encourage employee participation (p. 307). The Professional Advisory Committee and Parent Advisory Council which he writes about are similar to a modified Principal’s Advisory Council described by Hollinger and Richardson (1988).
The Principal’s Advisory Council works to improve the organizational climate in a school. In this model, a representative group of the faculty is elected to advise the administration. Although broad in range, the issues addressed tend to focus on policy and management.

Advisory Councils are usually formed under the leadership of the principal and chaired by a teacher. This committee meets regularly, publishes its agenda and invites anyone to attend the meeting. The principal clarifies topics for which the faculty role is advisory, and those for which the staff makes the final decision (Hollinger & Richardson, 1988, p. 234). In this model, formal authority for school-level decision making remains with the principal; however, formal power may be given to or withdrawn from the committee at the principal’s discretion.

The Principal’s Advisory Committee Model can promote a better working climate through regular, formal discussion of issues of concern to teachers. It can gather information and negotiate between viewpoints of teachers and the administration. The Principal’s Advisory Committee can have a significant impact on the school. “Teachers assume greater influence through expanded access to information, and through increased opportunities for participation in meetings and problem-solving task forces” (Hollinger & Richardson, 1988, p. 236).
The Instructional Support Team Model is one whose purpose is to improve instruction by providing faculty members a vehicle for input into curriculum and instruction. Beyond improving learning for students, this model generates instructional leadership and decision making in the domain where teachers have the greatest expertise. An Instructional Support Team has three primary responsibilities: (a) diagnosing and solving learning problems, (b) coordinating curriculum, and (c) improving instruction (Hollinger & Richardson, 1988, p. 236).

Members of this team may volunteer or be appointed but the membership should cover the faculty by instructional divisions. Principals influence the Instructional Support Team by the message they give to the faculty about the importance of the team, by direct involvement, and by asking the team for advice, assistance and ideas. Although this type of participative decision making does not have any authority which is formally delegated, it does represent significant potential for expanding teachers’ instructional leadership (Hollinger & Richardson, 1988, p. 238).

The School Improvement Team model, like the Instructional Support Team focuses on involving teachers in the decision making process of the school as related to teachers and instruction. Hollinger
and Richardson (1988) write "The school improvement model is based on the premise that schools can become more effective by opening up the decision making-influencing process" (p. 238). Team members may be elected by peers or appointed by the principal, and may include nonprofessionals or parents. The principal is an active participant; however, the nature and degree of his influence may vary.

The School Improvement Team establishes a mission for the school, sets goals, collects and analyzes assessment data, determines improvement and program priorities, and evaluates the improvement efforts. If this model is to be successful, teacher input and support are needed to bring about change in policy and practice.

The School Improvement Team Model is the one most frequently associated with school-based management and differs from the previous models in that the members have authority delegated by school board policy or a legislative act. This team also has the authority to allocate and spend funds. The School Improvement Team makes recommendations to the faculty. These recommendations are discussed and the decisions are then forwarded to the principal and Board for approval.
The Lead Teacher Committee Model is a radical change from any other model described. The purpose is "... to improve educational outcomes for children by increasing the utilization of the expertise of the professional staff and by widening accountability within the school site beyond the principal" (Hollinger & Richardson, 1988, p. 240).

In the Lead Teacher Committee Model, teachers and principals are involved in shared decision making by contractual agreement and authority to make instructional related decisions is given to this group (example: Rochester, New York). In some situations, teachers have more formal authority than the principal. This model differs from the others in that the principal retains many management decisions but now shares instructional and personnel decisions with a group of lead teachers. Lead Teachers are nominated by the professional staff but the superintendent and school board must give final approval to those selected. In this model, the principal may be selected in the same way.

Each model described has the potential to alter the traditional way schools are managed and there is evidence that shows that fundamental shifts in school authority and responsibility can result in more effective schools.
Vroom and Jago (1988) write "Evidence that participation enhances employees' satisfaction with their jobs, their morale, and their attitudes toward their managers is quite compelling. Most people enjoy participating and value work environments that afford them the opportunity to do so" (p. 18). Additionally, Vroom and Jago document what has been written over and over again. "People support what they build" (p. 25). When opportunities for subordinates to influence decisions arise, managers have the chance, through shared decision making, to reduce resistance, secure a shared feeling of ownership, and speed implementation of the desired change. The use of participatory management in the school setting is in an infancy stage and the results of practicing sites will not be seen immediately (Bradley, 1989, p. 12). Interest is quite strong; however, there is a gap between the extent of existing practice and the desire for an introduction to the process (Halal & Brown, 1987, p. 22).

Chapter II is a summary of literature related to the characteristics of school-based management. It includes definitions of the process, the areas of critical control, the impact on roles people play, and a section on the school advisory committee as a vehicle for shared decision making.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Introduction

Methodology broadly defined is the process, principle, and procedure used to approach problems and discover answers. It is the means by which research is conducted (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975) and should be guided by the problem being studied. Borg and Gall (1983) write "Research has two purposes: (1) description and (2) exploration of relationships between variables" (p. 30). Descriptive research concerns itself with "what is."

The "what is" of this study centers on school-based management and is focused on the degree to which the characteristics of school-based management are practiced in Virginia’s elementary schools. A description of the research setting includes population selection, design of the data collection instrument, data collection procedures and final analysis of the information obtained from the survey intended to describe
the current status of school-based management in Virginia’s elementary schools.

Design of the Study

The study was designed to provide data that would describe the status of school-based management in the elementary schools of Virginia. Four basic questions were examined to accomplish the objectives for this research. They were:

1. What decisions can be made at the school level in the following areas?
   a. Personnel
   b. Budget
   c. Curriculum
   d. Instruction

2. According to principals, who in the school makes these decisions?
   a. The Principal
   b. The Teachers
   c. The Grade Chairmen
d. The School Advisory Team

3. Is there a relationship between bureaucratic complexity of a school division and the status of school-based management in that district's elementary schools?

4. What is the status of school-based management in the elementary schools of Virginia?
   a. Is traditional management practiced?
   b. Is school-based management emerging?
   c. Is progress significant?

The descriptive survey method was selected to accomplish the purpose of this study because it "secures evidence concerning an existing situation or current conditions" and "... to determine how to make the next step" (Good, 1966, p. 208). In addition, E. R. Babbie (1954) writes "survey research is probably the best method available to the social scientist ... for describing a population too large to observe directly" (p. 209). Ary, Jacobs, and Razavich (1972) write, "Descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current status of a phenomena. They are directed towards determining the nature of the situation as it exists at the time of the study ..." (p. 286).
Prior to survey development, a review of school-based management literature was conducted to identify items to be included on the questionnaire. Literature reviewed included textbooks, handbooks, government reports, periodicals, dissertations, unpublished research papers, other surveys, and personal interviews.

Population and Sample

This study was designed to collect data from a statewide sample of elementary school principals by using a self-administered, mailed questionnaire (see Appendix A). The population of principals was selected because it is believed that principals, as mid-level managers, have the best information about the scope and sequence of decision making in a district and would be able to provide the best data describing the status of school-based management and shared decision making in a school. School districts were selected to represent a geographic cross section of all areas of Virginia; a combination of large, medium, and small school systems; and to include urban, suburban, and rural districts.

The 1991-1992 Virginia Educational Directory was the source used as a "sampling frame" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 243) to identify the
population of elementary school principals in Virginia. Of the population, a systematic sampling technique was used to select 400 elementary principals from the 137 school divisions in Virginia. The process involved numbering the elementary schools in Virginia sequentially from 1 to 1142. Once numbers were assigned to each unit, the numeral four was arbitrarily selected as the beginning point for highlighting every third school until the number 400 was reached. Four hundred principals were chosen to give a general picture of what was happening in all elementary schools across the state.

Instrumentation

The attributes of school-based management were identified by reviewing the literature that provided information used to develop questions included on the survey instrument. Characteristics and major decision-making areas were selected by analyzing the frequency of their inclusion in the work of prominent authors, studies, and reports. Once identified, questionnaire items were developed around each issue or concept.
Specific items related to budget, personnel, curriculum and instruction included those decisions most often made at different levels of authority in every school organization.

The questionnaire was two sheets of paper measuring eight and one-half inches by fourteen inches. It was folded to make eight pages that included a cover page with a statement of purpose, inside pages with background questions, and decision making items related to personnel, budget, and curriculum and instruction issues. The back page included a statement and space for additional information if the respondent wanted to share opinions not included in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to be self-administering and all explanations, directions, and examples were edited for clarity and respondent understanding (See Appendix A).

The questionnaire had two parts. Part I included five questions that provided information needed to place a school in a school-based management category. Question four which read, "Who are the members of the advisory committee?" is an example of the items found in this section. To answer these questions, the respondent placed a check beside the appropriate answer.
Part II included fifty-six questions which represented a range of
decisions made during a school year. The respondent was asked to
assign points to five levels of authority for making decisions in a school
division. Viable decision makers included central office personnel
including the board, superintendent, and supervisory staff, building
administrators, all teachers, grade chairmen, and the school advisory
team composed of community persons, certified and uncertified staff,
and parents. To provide for ease of respondent understanding, one
example was given.

Prior to finalizing the questionnaire, a pilot survey was sent to five
elementary principals, one assistant superintendent, a director of
research, one science specialist, one assistant principal, one teacher and
one parent. Space was provided for respondents to comment about
ambiguities, items to include or delete, and any other suggestion which
would improve the instrument. This included item appropriateness,
format, directions, question clarity, ease of completing, length and bias.
Modifications were made based upon suggestions from the pilot group.
The average time for completing this survey was twenty minutes.
Data Collection Procedures

A cover letter was prepared which provided an explanation of the subject of the study, the timeliness of the study, its relevance to building level administrators, and the importance of the individual respondent to the study's success. A cover letter, survey instrument marked with an identification number, and self-addressed, stamped envelope was placed in a single package and mailed to principals on May 11, 1992. Each respondent was asked to return the survey directly to the researcher within seven days. Confidentiality of information was assured (see Appendix B).

One week later, a postcard was sent, as a follow-up, to recipients of the first survey. The note on this postcard was written as a thank you to those who returned the questionnaire, and a reminder to those who did not. Three weeks after the original mailing, a second follow-up was mailed to nonrespondents. This mailing included a cover letter which informed the recipient that their survey had not been received, restated the appeal of the original letter, included a replacement questionnaire, and an additional return envelope.
Data Analysis

The questionnaire had two parts. Part I included five questions which provided information needed to assign a school to a school-based management category. The school-based management categories were named Level One, Level Two, Level Three and Level Four. Criteria for placing a survey in one of the four levels were based on the presence and composition of a school advisory team.

**Level One:** in these schools there was no indication of a school advisory team.

**Level Two:** There was evidence that the school advisory team included the principal and teachers.

**Level Three:** There was evidence that the school advisory team included the principal, teachers, support staff, and parents.

**Level Four:** There was evidence of a school advisory team composed of the principal, teachers, parents, support staff, a community advisor and other persons not covered by the obvious choices listed on the survey. An example would be a student.

Part II included fifty-six questions that represented a wide range of decisions made during a school year. Ten points were distributed
according to the principal's perception of the responsibility of an individual or group for making the decision. A person or group could receive all or none of the points. The level of school-based management in a school division was determined by the degree to which decisions are reported to be made at the school site and the degree of participant involvement in making those decisions.

A mean of 5.0 or more points assigned to the central office was defined as a central office decision. Items for which five or more points were allocated to actors at the school site were labeled as "shared." These items were analyzed.

Additionally, comparisons were made among less complex, moderately complex and complex school divisions to determine if bureaucratic complexity is associated with school-based management. For the purposes of this study, bureaucratic complexity was defined by the number of elementary schools in a school division. A school was assigned the label "Less Complex," "Moderately Complex," or "Complex" based on the following criterion:

**Less Complex (LC):** This level included school divisions with 1-10 elementary schools.
**Moderately Complex (MC):** This level included school divisions with 11-25 elementary schools.

**Complex (C):** Schools assigned to this category are located in divisions with more than 25 elementary schools.

The survey data collected are displayed in tables to report frequencies, percentages, and/or means. Tables are designed to examine the dimensions of school-based management separately and in combination to describe the status of school-based management in Virginia.

**Summary**

Chapter 3 has presented the research methodology used to collect and compile data that describe characteristics applied to school divisions for the purpose of reporting the status of school-based management in the public elementary schools of Virginia. Outlined in this chapter is the basic research design and the strategy for developing the survey instrument. The procedure for selecting a sample from the population of Virginia’s elementary school principals and the strategy for gathering data are discussed with an explanation of the construction and the
contents of the survey questionnaire. This chapter concludes with an explanation of the school-based management categories and the levels of bureaucratic complexity used to analyze data compiled from Part I and Part II of the questionnaire.

A complete presentation, analysis and summary of the findings appear in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

Presentation and Analysis of Data

This chapter presents an analysis of data gathered to describe the status of school-based management in Virginia’s Elementary Schools. The data were collected using a survey instrument (see Appendix A) mailed to selected elementary principals in 119 city and county school divisions across Virginia. The survey has been used to answer research questions regarding principals’ perceptions of who makes key decisions about personnel, curriculum, budget and finance, and instruction.

The data, divided into two parts, focus on the degree to which characteristics of school-based management are practiced in the responding schools. Responses to part one of the survey have been used to establish a bureaucratic complexity and school-based management level for each site in the sample. Part two of the survey examines participation in decision making at the sites. The relationship of participation in decision making and assignment to a school-based management level is used to answer the research question "What is the status of school-based management in Virginia?"
Chapter 4 concludes with an attempt to determine if there is a relationship between bureaucratic complexity in a school division and the status of school-based management in that division's elementary schools. The assignment of a sample school to a bureaucratically complex level is discussed below.

Sample Selection by Bureaucratic Complexity

Displayed in Table 1 are the number of public elementary schools in 137 school divisions in Virginia. Once selected, the sample schools were divided into bureaucratically complex categories using the number of elementary schools operating in a division as a parameter. Schools were labeled Complex (C), Moderately Complex (MC), or Less Complex (LC) according to the following criterion:

* Complex (C) divisions include more than 25 elementary schools,
* Moderately Complex (MC) divisions include 11 to 25 elementary schools,
* Less Complex (LC) divisions operate 1 to 10 elementary schools.

Table 2 is a report of the number of surveys mailed and returned by bureaucratic complexity. Four hundred (400) surveys were mailed to
Table 1

**Sample Selection by Bureaucratic Complexity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucratic Complexity</th>
<th>Elementary Schools in the Population</th>
<th>Percent in the Sample</th>
<th>Number of Schools in the Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 Schools (Less Complex)</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 Schools (Moderately Complex)</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 25 Schools (Complex)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1142</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Surveys Mailed and Returned by Bureaucratic Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucratic Complexity</th>
<th>Mailed</th>
<th>Returned Usable Surveys</th>
<th>Non-Respondents/Unusable*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 (Least Complex)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 (Moderately Complex)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 25 (Complex)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes returned but unusable responses
elementary principals in the state of Virginia on May 11, 1992. Two
hundred seventy-one (271) were returned by June 23, 1992 for a return
rate of approximately 68%. Of those returned, 230 were usable
resulting in a usable return rate of approximately 58%. Nearly one
survey in six was unusable for the following reasons:

1. The directions, as presented, were not followed;
2. The sum of responses to survey items were consistently
greater than or less than the possible response value;
3. The survey was returned unmarked;
4. Part 1 of the survey was answered, but the recipient wrote
on the survey that Part 2 was "too involved" and they did
not have time to complete that section;
5. Some receiving principals wrote that district policy required
permission from the central office to participate in out of
system research; therefore, it would be necessary to
present a proposal to the appropriate office before a
completed survey could be forwarded.

Survey response is underrepresented in larger, more complex
districts by a usable response rate which is slightly less than 50%
compared to useable responses of about 63% in Less Complex and
Moderately Complex divisions, nevertheless, it is believed that responses received do provide an accurate description of what is occurring in small, medium, large; suburban, urban, and rural areas of the state with respect to the studied issues.

The remaining sections of Chapter 4 present:

* Characteristics of the respondents and their schools;
* Responses to 57 items in Part II which elicited respondents’ perceptions of school-based management practices in Virginia’s elementary schools;
* Responses to an open-ended query which invited respondents to share thoughts about school-based management in their school district;
* A summary of the data; and
* Analysis of the data responsive to key issues and questions identified in Chapter 1.

School-Based Management Characteristics

Part I of the survey asked respondents to answer five questions which were based on characteristics of school-based management found
in a review of the literature. Responses to these questions were used to establish background information about each school that includes the presence or absence of written policy to support school-based management, the duration of that policy, the presence or absence of a school improvement team, the composition of that team, and a procedure for selecting members. Answers to each item can be examined in Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5. These data are included for the purpose of comparing schools in the sample according to Bureaucratic Complexity and School-Based Management Levels.

**School-Based Management Characteristics: The Respondents**

Table 3 details characteristics of school-based management in the schools according to those who responded to the survey (N = 230). Forty-two (42) principals reported working in school divisions where a written policy defining school-based management has been in effect from a few months to five years. This is compared to 182 principals who reported no written policy.

Characteristic of school-based management is the presence of an advisory team composed of a cross section of adults with an interest in
### Table 3

**School-Based Management Characteristics: All Responses (N=230)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written policy to define school-based management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time written policy has been in effect</td>
<td>0-6 Months</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12 Months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of adults who serve as an advisory team</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the School Advisory Team</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Adv.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of the Committee</td>
<td>Principal Appoints</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the local school. A large number of respondents (87.8%) indicate that adult membership on the school advisory team is most often generated by principal appointment (N = 126) or a request for volunteers (N = 115). Approximately 76% of the schools have teams composed of a principal, teachers, and parents, while fewer than 34% report teams composed of a combination of principal, teachers, parents, support staff, community advisors or other representatives such as a student or business partner.

School-based Management Characteristics: Bureaucratic Complexity

Table 4 is a summary, by bureaucratic complexity, of responses to Part I of the survey in frequency and percentage which permits further examination of background information within another context. When disaggregating data using this variable, it was found that the 42 schools with written policies are distributed across each bureaucratic level, however, Complex divisions are more likely to have written policies (38%) than Moderately Complex (11%) or Less Complex (10%) divisions. Thirty schools have been operating with a policy for one to five years while 12 schools are just beginning to work with written guidelines.
Table 4

School-Based Management Characteristics: By Bureaucratic Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1-10 (Least Complex) (N=96)</th>
<th>11-25 (Moderately Complex) N=70</th>
<th>&gt; 25 (Complex) (N=64*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written policy to define school-based management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-6 Months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12 Months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of adults who serve as an advisory team</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the School Advisory Team</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Advisor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of the Committee</td>
<td>Principal Appoints</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-10 Schools = Least Complex  11-25 Schools = Moderately Complex  > 25 = Complex

*Respondents were able to select more than one item which is why the percentage does not equal 100.
Principals report high percentages of adult advisory teams serving all bureaucratic levels (Complex divisions: 86%, Moderately Complex divisions: 87%, and Less Complex divisions: 90%). Complex divisions are more likely to report support staff (41%) as members of the advisory team and Less Complex divisions may select members of the community as advisors (23%) to the team more often than the other groups.

Differences in committee selection procedures become apparent when data are disaggregated by bureaucratic level. The principal appoints members to advisory teams about 67% of the time in Less Complex divisions and 59% of the time in Moderately Complex divisions.

About one principal in three (33%) in complex school divisions reports that members of the school advisory team are appointed, and this bureaucratic level is more likely to utilize an election procedure for selecting members than either of the other groups. Team members are elected more often in Complex divisions (34%) when compared to this process for committee selection in Less complex (16%) or Moderately Complex (17%) divisions. Schools tend to utilize volunteers at about the same rate (Less Complex divisions: 46%, Complex divisions: 50%); Moderately Complex divisions utilize volunteering slightly more frequently (56%) for selecting advisory teams.
School-Based Management Characteristics: Levels of Implementation

Part I of the survey instrument (see Appendix A) was also used to assign each responding principal’s school to a School-Based Management Level. The criterion for assigning a school to one level as opposed to another was composition of the advisory team:

**Level One:** In these schools there is no evidence of a school advisory team. Twenty (20) principals marked "no" to Q3 which asks if there is a group of adults who serve in that building as an advisory team. Four surveys were placed in this group because the respondents did not answer Q3 and careful examination of the questionnaire revealed no supporting data to indicate shared decision making or the existence of a team. Therefore, 24 schools met the criteria for Level One.

**Level Two:** In these schools there is evidence that there is an advisory team which includes a principal and teachers. In this group, 25 principals answered "yes" and two respondents answered "no". The two negative responses were placed in this group because there was evidence from Part II that decision making was shared at the building level with teachers, and the
respondents indicated that committee selection was by appointment or a teacher who volunteered service. Level Two includes 27 schools.

Level Three: There is evidence that the school advisory team includes the principal, teachers, parents, and support staff. Meeting the criteria for this level were 135 elementary school advisory teams.

Level Four: There is evidence that the school advisory team is composed of the principal, teachers, parents, support staff, a community advisor and other persons not covered by the obvious choices listed on the survey. An example would be a student. Forty-four respondents met the criteria for Level Four.

Table 5 displays responses to items characterizing school-based management in means and percentages by designated school-based management level. Once the surveys were separated according to criteria establishing each level of school-based management, it was found that four principals reporting a written policy to define school-based management were functioning at the lower levels of implementation; 1 of 42 operates at Level One, and 3 of 42 operate at Level Two. The remaining 38 principals who answered "yes" to Q1
### Table 5

**School-Based Management Characteristics: By Management Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Item Response</th>
<th>Level One N=24</th>
<th></th>
<th>Level Two N=27</th>
<th></th>
<th>Level Three N=135</th>
<th></th>
<th>Level Four N=44</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written policy to define school-based management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19 79.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4 16.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time written policy has been in effect</td>
<td>1-5 Month</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12 Month</td>
<td>1 0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2 Yrs</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 Yrs</td>
<td>5 3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>23 95.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of adults who serve as advisory team</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20 83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4 16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the School Advisory Team</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ComAdvr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of the Committee</td>
<td>Principal Appoints</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were, by definition, functioning at Levels Three (23) and Four (15). Policy has guided 33 members of this group for two years or less; the remaining nine have worked with policy guidelines for three to five years.

Twenty principals at School-Based Management Level One reported that they did not have an adult advisory team. This was supported by a "no" response to questions four and five which address the sophistication and selection of the team. In contrast, 133 (98.5%) of Level Three and 44 (100%) of Level Four administrators report having well defined advisory teams. It should be noted that two administrators in Level Three answered "no" to the question concerning adults serving as an advisory team; however, examination of the surveys indicated that teachers and parents do serve in a decision making capacity. This was supported by the committee selection question and in the distribution of points in Part II. Whereas approximately 36% of an advisory committee may be elected at Level Four, the most frequently used methods for selection to the team are volunteer (Level Three: 57%, Level Four: 66%) and principal appointment (Level Four: 63.6%, Level Three: 62.2%). By comparison, Level Two administrators utilize principal appointment (51.9%) over volunteers (33.3%).
Summary of Background Information

Analysis of background information presented in Tables 1 through Tables 5 indicates the following:

1. The respondents represent a cross section of elementary principals (N = 230) across the state of Virginia verified by survey data from the one hundred nineteen (119) large, medium, and small; rural, suburban and urban city and county school divisions they represent. Schools in larger, more complex divisions are somewhat underrepresented in the study with a response rate slightly below 50%.

2. When divided according to criteria establishing bureaucratic complexity the respondents consist of:
   * Less Complex divisions (N = 96, 42%),
   * Moderately Complex divisions (N = 70, 30%), and
   * Complex divisions (N = 64, 28%).

3. Dividing the respondents by criteria establishing school-based management levels resulted in four groups represented by:
   * Level One Schools (N = 24, 10%),
* Level Two Schools (N = 27, 11%),
* Level Three Schools (N = 135, 59%),
* Level Four Schools (N = 44, 20%).

4. Four characteristics of school-based management (a written policy, a group of adults who serve as an advisory team, representation on the team that covers a variety of stakeholders, and multiple ways of selecting the team) are found at all bureaucratic levels. When comparing levels of complexity, Complex divisions (38%) are three times more likely to have written policies defining school-based management in the division than Moderately Complex (11%) or Less Complex divisions (10%). Written policy has guided practice in Complex divisions a longer period of time (3-5 years) for approximately 11% of the principals compared to 1% of the principals in Moderately and Less Complex divisions.

5. When sorted into school-based management levels, one of four characteristics, written policy, is responded to on surveys at all levels. When compared to other levels, Level Four schools report having a written policy to define school-
based management more often (34%) than those in Level One (4%). Level Four respondents reported that 100% of their schools have advisory teams composed of the principal, teachers, parents, support staff and community advisors, who are elected approximately 36% of the time. This compares with Level Three’s eclectic team (98.5%), and the presence of a team in Level Two (92.6%) schools. These scores are drastically different from Level One schools where principals report that they work in schools without advisory teams.

6. Formal recognition of school-based management is relatively new in Virginia when measured by the number (42) and length of time (zero months to five years) written policies have been in effect.

This summary was intended to present background information for establishing variables by which the data obtained from Part II of the questionnaire could be examined.
Part II: Survey Results

This section of Chapter 4 displays survey data related to each research question by presenting an overview of the responding elementary principal’s views regarding decision making in their school and school district. Each principal was asked to identify decisions made at the building level and to allocate responsibility points for those decisions to the person(s) or group making them. This was done by designating 10 "decision" points to be distributed across four groups of participants for each of the 57 survey items. The average number of points attributed to a person or group for a particular survey item was computed.

The mean, a measure of central tendency, was selected as the researcher’s preference for presenting summarized data because it is easily understood. For the purpose of this research, a mean greater than 5.0 was interpreted as a decision made by the individual or group receiving the higher mean. When looking for examples of shared decision making, the first step was to eliminate those items where the central office had clear responsibility (M ≥ 5.0). The next step was to analyze those decisions made at the site to determine who, at the
school, made decisions about personnel, curriculum, instruction, and budget and finance.

Research Question One: School Level Decision Making

Research question one was written to determine what decisions can be made at the school level in the areas of personnel, budget and finance, curriculum and instruction. Principal responses (N = 230) to survey items are presented by decision making category in Tables 6 through 9 within the text of this chapter.

Table 6 is a summary of personnel decision making responses as they appear in step one of the process for analysis. Of 19 items associated with this category, four (Q10, Q13, Q40, Q47) are retained by Central Office decision makers (M ≥ 5.0). These items are concerned with establishing criteria (e.g., establish criteria for selecting teachers, M = 5.4; establish criteria for evaluating school personnel, M = 6.2); and hiring practices (e.g., hire a new assistant principal, M = 5.8; replace one teaching position with two non-teaching positions, M = 6.4). Fifteen factors within the domain of personnel are delegated to the site for resolution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content Personnel Decisions</th>
<th>Central Office M</th>
<th>All Others M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Select new teachers</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Assign teachers to level in building</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Orient new teacher</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Establish criteria for selecting teachers</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Determine staff assignments</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Reassign teachers from one position to another in the building</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Hire a new assistant principal</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Organize professional growth and development activities</td>
<td>3.1*</td>
<td>6.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Plan inservice activities</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Conduct inservice activities</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Inform teachers for personnel decisions</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Evaluate teachers for personnel decisions</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Supervise classroom teachers for improvement</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Establish criteria for evaluating school personnel</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Plan and conduct faculty meetings</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Replace one teaching position with two non-teaching positions</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Send a teacher on a three day conference</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Change the work hours of a secretary</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Establish the agenda items for faculty meetings</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; ALL Others-Building Administrators, Teacher/Grade Chairman; School Improvement Team

*Numbers may not total 10 pts due to rounding.
Collective data displayed in Table 7 reveal that one of eleven budget and finance decisions measured by the survey is retained by Central Office decision makers. Once line items for the school budget (Q14) have been established, building level decision makers appear to have substantial autonomy for solving issues important to the individual site.

Table 8 includes 14 items related to curriculum design, procedure, evaluation, and materials selection. In this category, Central Office decision makers in responding school divisions are likely to delegate to the site over 80% of the curriculum decisions including items such as conducting a needs assessment (M = 8.8), selecting textbooks (M = 6.5), developing the school philosophy (M = 9.4), selecting supplies and equipment (M = 7.9), and developing school-wide procedures (M = 8.9). Two decisions retained in the central office are Q36 - selecting the curriculum for the building (Central Office M = 5.2), and Q - 58 establishing district policies (Central Office M = 8.5).

Table 9 provides a visual representation of 13 items from the survey used to describe instructional decision making. This area also presents a picture of building level autonomy in that approximately three fourths of the decision making items related to instruction are determined.
Table 7

Summary of All Budget and Finance Decision Making Responses By Mean (N = 230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content Budget and Finance</th>
<th>Central Office</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Establish line items for school budget</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Decide where to deposit school funds</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Schedule a fund raiser</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Purchase supplies and equipment</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Develop a school budget</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Decide how to spend funds allocated to the school</td>
<td>1.5*</td>
<td>8.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Select fund raising projects</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Identify the resource needs of the school</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Select vendors</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Approve requisitions and expenditures for a school</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Accept or reject request from non-school group to use the facility</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; ALL Others-Building Administrators, Teacher/Grade Chairman; School Improvement Team

*Numbers may not total 10 pts due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content Curriculum Decisions</th>
<th>Central Office</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Conduct a school needs assessment</td>
<td>1.3*</td>
<td>8.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Select textbooks</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Evaluate school progress toward established goals</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Order materials and supplies</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Select instructional materials such as manipulatives</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Select supplies and equipment</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Select the curriculum for the building</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Represent the school on a textbook selection committee</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Develop school-wide goals and objectives</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Develop school-wide policies</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Develop school-wide procedures program</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Establish educational procedures</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Establish district policies</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Develop the school philosophy</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CO-Central Office; ALL Others-Building Administrators, Teacher/Grade Chairman; School Improvement Team**

*Numbers may not total 10 pts due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content Instructional Decisions</th>
<th>Central Office</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Establish criteria for evaluating the instructional program</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Approve a pilot program within the building</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Approve out of district field trips</td>
<td>5.3*</td>
<td>4.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Select instructional methodology</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Determine deviation in the use of instructional time</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Establish class size</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Implement after-school programs</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Establish homework policy</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Determine student academic performance standards</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Establish grading and reporting criteria</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Establish school discipline policies</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Maintain student conduct standards</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Group students for instruction</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; ALL OTHERS-Building Administrator; Teacher/Grade Chairman; School Improvement Team

*Numbers may not total 10 pts due to rounding.
mostly at the school site. Establishing class size (M = 5.6), establishing grading and reporting criteria (M = 5.5), and approving out of district field trips (M = 5.3) are the three decisions more likely to be made at the Central Office.

In brief, Central Office is likely to retain decisions related to establishing system policy or criteria for selecting and implementing system procedures. All other decisions measured by this survey are decided primarily at the school site according to the respondents.

Current literature about this topic suggests that school-based management, as a governing process, does not necessarily include shared decision making; therefore, in order to establish the status of that phenomenon, the following research question sought answers to "who" in the building makes the decisions which are delegated to the school site.

Research Question Two: Participants In Shared Decision Making

Research question two asks, "According to principals, who in the school makes these decisions?"

a. The Principal

b. The Teachers
c. The Grade Chairmen

d. The School Advisory Team

The survey (Appendix A) asked respondents to assign points to five groups of individuals (CO = Central Office, BA = Building Administrator, T = Teachers, GC = Grade Chairman, SAT = School Advisory Team) responsible for making decisions, but tables report data for only four groups (CO = Central Office, BA = Building Administrator, TGC = Teachers and Grade Chairmen, SAT = School Advisory Team). This occurs because grade chairmen received relatively few points on any survey and since they are teachers in the elementary school, it was decided that these categories could be collapsed into one group without compromising the results of this study. Points assigned to grade chairmen (GC), were added to points given teachers (T) so both groups are represented in tables by the letters TGC (teachers and grade chairmen).

Tables 10 through 13 illustrate the second step used to analyze the data by providing mean scores assigned to each decision making group on all survey items. Nineteen factors identified with the personnel function are displayed in Table 10. The building administrator received a mean greater than 5.0 on 11 of 15 items suggesting that responding principals are primarily responsible for 73% of the personnel decisions
Table 10

**All Personnel Decision Making Responses By Mean (N = 230)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content Personnel Decisions</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Select new teachers</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Assign teachers to level in the building</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Orient new teachers</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Establish criteria for selecting teachers</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Determine staff assignments</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Reassign teachers from one position to another in the building</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Hire a new assistant principal</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Organize professional growth and development activities</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Plan inservice activities</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Conduct inservice activities</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Inform teachers of new educational research</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Evaluate teachers for personnel decisions</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Supervise classroom teachers for improvement</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Establish criteria for evaluating school personnel</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Plan and conduct faculty meetings</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Replace one teaching position with two non-teaching positions</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Send a teacher on a three day conference</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Change the work hours of a secretary</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Establish the agenda items for faculty meetings</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; ALL Others-Building Administrators, Teacher/Grade Chairman; School Improvement Team
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delegated to the school site. With the exception of Q21, Q22, and Q23 which deal with professional growth and development, personnel decisions appear to be site-based but not shared.

Planning and conducting faculty meetings is an item from the survey which illustrates site-based management but not shared decision making. For example, responses to an item in Table 10 (planning and conducting faculty meetings) indicate that autonomy for making related decisions at the site is extremely high (M = 9.8). This mean includes the mean for building administrators, the mean for teachers and grade chairman and the mean for the school advisory team (7.8 + 1.6 + 0.4 = 9.8). According to the criteria established for determining where the decision is made, a mean equal to 7.8 clearly establishes this item as the building administrator's responsibility.

The highest mean score for teacher input into decision making in the personnel category is for Q8, orienting new teachers (M = 2.8). The advisory team did not fare as well on any item measured and all mean scores for advisory team are less than 1.0. However, since advisory committees did not exist in more than 20 schools they could not have received any points in those schools thus depressing the mean.
To summarize briefly, personnel decision making is a category where authority (15 of 19 items) has been transferred to the local site; however, in the respondents’ schools, the building administrator retains most of the decision making authority with little, if any, authority allocated to teachers or school improvement teams.

Responses to research question one indicate that of all decision making categories, building level decision makers have the most authority to make decisions in the areas of budget, finance, and curriculum. Table 11 arrays the distribution of authority for budget and finance decision making at the local school. The data displayed illustrate that 10 items are decided at the building level and that seven of those are determined primarily in the principal’s office. The mean scores for the building administrator range from $M = 5.1$ (deciding how to spend funds allocated to the school) to $M = 7.2$ (selecting vendors).

Whereas the building Administrator may share decision making authority with stakeholders under certain circumstances, in no situation does a teacher and grade chairmen group (TGC) have a mean score greater than 3.0. Likewise, the school advisory team (SAT) received a mean score greater than one on only four occasions. Including among
Table 11

**All Budget and Finance Responses By Mean (N = 230)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Establish line items for school budget</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Decide where to deposit school funds</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Schedule a fund raiser</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Purchase supplies and equipment</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Develop a school budget</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Decide how to spend funds allocated to the school</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Select fund raising projects</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Identify the resource needs of the school</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Select vendors</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Approve requisitions and expenditures for a school</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Accept or reject request from non-school group to use the facility</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CO-Central Office; ALL Others-Building Administrators, Teacher/Grade Chairman; School Improvement Team**
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the four scores was the highest mark assigned to this group of decision makers (SAT) of \( M = 2.8 \) for selecting fund raising projects.

Table 12 displays data which indicate authority for making 12 of 14 curriculum decisions at the building level. With the exception of ordering materials and supplies (where the building administrators received a mean of 5.1 compared to the collective mean of 3.8 received by teachers and school advisory team) there is real evidence of shared responsibility with teachers (and to a lesser extent with others) in this category.

Teachers actually receive the highest scores related to selecting instructional materials (TGC = 5.9), selecting textbooks (TGC = 4.8), selecting supplies and equipment (TGC = 4.7) and representing the school on a textbook committee (TGC = 6.8).

About 50% of the school advisory team’s mean scores in the curriculum category were greater than 1.0. This cluster of decision makers received a low score (\( M = 0.2 \)) for ordering materials and supplies and their highest score (\( M = 2.3 \)) for developing school-wide goals and objectives. When mean scores for the school advisory team (SAT) were added to mean scores for the teacher, grade chairmen group (TGC), additional examples of decisions being shared by the building
Table 12

**All Curriculum Decision Making Responses By Mean (N = 230)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content Curriculum Decisions</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Conduct a school needs assessment</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Select textbooks</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Evaluate school progress toward established goals</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Order materials and supplies</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Select instructional materials such as manipulatives</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Select supplies and equipment</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Select the curriculum for the building</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Represent the school on a textbook selection committee</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Develop school-wide goals and objectives</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Develop school-wide policies</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Develop school-wide procedures program</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Establish educational procedures</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Establish district policies</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Develop the school philosophy</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; **ALL Others**-Building Administrators, Teacher/Grade Chairman; School Improvement Team
principal become evident. Two such illustrations are developing school-wide goals and objectives (BA M = 3.9; TGC M = 3.1; SAT M = 2.3) and developing the school philosophy (BA M = 3.6; TGC M = 3.6; SAT M = 2.2). With few exceptions, the area of curriculum appears to be one where decision making is shared.

Table 13 represents instructional decision making items most frequently determined at the school level. Of factors measured, building administrators are likely to share decisions with teachers when grouping for instruction (BA M = 4.6; TGC M = 4.8), maintaining student conduct (BA M = 4.8; TGC M = 3.7), and selecting methodology (BA M = 3.7; TGC M = 3.3).

Other survey items identified on Table 13 indicate that teachers may share decision making with the building administrator when establishing homework policy (BA M = 2.9; TGC M = 2.6), determining academic performance standards (BA M = 2.5; TGC M = 2.9), and establishing school discipline policies (BA M = 3.7; TGC M = 2.5).

The school advisory team received its highest score in this category (M = 1.0) for establishing school discipline policies. Where instruction is concerned, data suggest that the range of input by the school advisory team is limited to M = 1.0 or less. Teachers, on the
Table 13

All Instructional Decision Making Responses By Mean (N = 230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content Instructional Decisions</th>
<th>CO M</th>
<th>BA M</th>
<th>TGC M</th>
<th>SAT M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Establish criteria for evaluating the instructional program</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Approve a pilot program within the building</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Approve out of district field trips</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Select instructional methodology</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Determine deviation in the use of instructional time</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Establish class size</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Implement after-school programs</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Establish homework policy</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Determine student academic performance standards</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Establish grading and reporting criteria</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Establish school discipline policies</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Maintain student conduct standards</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Group students for instruction</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; ALL Others-Building Administrators, Teacher/Grade Chairman; School Improvement Team
other hand, share decision making with the building administrator in several areas included in this category.

When looking at the big picture, Tables 10 through 13 depict data representing substantial authority for making decisions at the school level and a distribution of that authority across multiple stakeholders. Results indicate:

* Most personnel and budget and finance decisions are made by the building administrator.

* Teachers share responsibility with school based administrators for about half of the issues in the areas of curriculum and instruction.

* School Advisory Teams have their greatest influence in the area of curriculum and in making budget decisions dealing with fund raising.

* Building administrators make most of the decisions located at the school site with some input from teachers and the school advisory team but, exceptions noted, most decision making is not shared.
Research Question Three:

School-Based Management and Bureaucratic Complexity

Research question three was written to determine if a relationship exists between bureaucratic complexity and the status of school-based management in that division’s elementary schools. Bureaucratic complexity refers to the number of elementary schools in a division which, for the purpose of this research, have been classified as Less Complex (1-10 elementary schools), Moderately Complex (11-25 elementary schools), and Complex (greater than 25 elementary schools). Dividing the respondents in this manner resulted in the following distribution of school divisions: Less Complex; 42%, Moderately Complex; 30%, and Complex; 28%.

Tables 14 - 17 are designed to compare decision making autonomy by bureaucratic complexity. The tables present summarized mean scores for surveyed items in each decision making category and compare like roles to each other. There are no pivotal differences within the categories but there are some variations by division complexity. Schools in Complex divisions appear to have more freedom to make
additional personnel and budget decisions while schools in less complex divisions are more likely to decide curriculum and instruction issues.

Within each classification of school divisions there are variations in the ability to determine outcomes of an issue which do not appear when using averaged scores and group means for the respondent group. Personnel examples for which Complex divisions have assigned additional responsibility to the schools include replacing one teaching position with two non-teaching positions and establishing criteria for selecting teachers (see Q10 and Q47; Table 14). These are central office decisions in Less Complex and Moderately Complex school divisions but become school-based decisions in Complex divisions. Using Q47 (Replace one teaching position with two non-teaching positions) as an example, the difference between the score $M = 2.7$ (M for BA + M for TGC + M for SAT) for local decision makers in Less Complex divisions compared to the score $M = 5.4$ (3.1 + 0.8 + 1.5) for local decision makers in Complex divisions is $M = 2.7$. Decision makers in Complex school divisions are twice as likely to make this personnel decision as those in the other two sub-categories. Another example of decision making autonomy in Complex divisions compared to Less Complex divisions is seen when deciding to send teachers on a three day
# Table 14

Personnel Decision Making Responses By Assigned School-Based Management Level in Means (N = 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Content Personnel Decisions</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Select new teachers</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Assign teachers to level in building</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Orient new teachers</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Establish criteria for selecting teachers</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Determine staff assignments</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Reassign teachers from one position to another in the building</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hire a new assistant principal</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Organize professional growth and development activities</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Plan inservice activities evaluating personnel</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Conduct inservice activities</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Inform teachers of new educational research</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Evaluate teachers for personnel decisions</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Item Content</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>TGC</td>
<td>SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Decisions</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Supervise classroom teachers for improvement</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Establish criteria for evaluating school personnel</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Plan and conduct faculty meetings</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Replace one teaching position with two non-teaching positions</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Send a teacher on a three-day conference</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Change the work hours of a secretary</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Establish the agenda items for faculty meetings</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; BA-Building Administrator; TGC-Teacher/Grade Chairman; SAT-School Improvement Team; LC-Least Complex; MC-Moderately Complex; C-Complex
conference. A difference of 2.9 separates the total score for site decision makers (Complex M = 8.3) from the low (MC M = 5.4).

When compared to the Moderately Complex category, Complex divisions have higher mean scores for establishing criteria to select teachers (C M = 5.8; MC M = 3.9), and determining staff assignments (C: M = 8.7; MC: M = 6.9).

In the respondent schools 4 of 19 items measuring personnel decision making remained at the Central Office level. When the respondent group is classified by bureaucratically complex units, Complex divisions appear to have additional autonomy for making some of the decisions previously assigned to the Central Office in the area of personnel. Two of four decisions (Q10, Q47) retained by central office in the respondent group may be made at the site in Complex divisions but not Less Complex or Moderately Complex divisions.

It appears that autonomy for budget and finance decision making at the school is high (10 of 11 items are delegated to the local unit). Table 15 presents data showing that Less Complex divisions have more authority to develop a school budget (M = 7.4) and select vendors who will work with the school (M = 9.1). Moderately Complex divisions have almost total autonomy for selecting fund raising projects (M = 9.9),
Table 15

Budget and Finance Decision Making Responses By Bureaucratic Complexity in Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content Budget and Finance</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Establish line items for school budget</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Decide where to deposit school funds</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Schedule a fund raiser</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Purchase supplies and equipment</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Develop a school budget</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Decide how to spend funds allocated to the school</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Select fund raising projects</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Identify the resource needs of the school</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Select vendors</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Approve requisitions and expenditures for a school</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Accept or reject request for non-school group to use the facility</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; BA-Building Administrator; TGC-Teacher/Grade Chairman; SAT-School Improvement Team; LC-Least Complex (1-10); MC-Moderately Complex (11-25); C-Complex (> 25)
scheduling a fund raiser (M = 9.6), and deciding how to spend funds allocated to the school (M = 8.9). Complex divisions have the highest mean scores for 5 of 11 items which include identifying the resource needs of the school (M = 9.2), deciding where to deposit school funds (M = 8.2), purchasing supplies and equipment (M = 8.7), approving requisitions and expenditures (M = 7.2), and accepting or rejecting a request for use of the facility (M = 7.4). Bureaucratic complexity does not appear to favor one group over another when deciding curriculum issues since approximately 78% to 81% of these decisions are most likely made at the building level in every bureaucratic category (Table 16). Curriculum issues offer some of the best examples of shared decision making between the building administrator (BA), teachers and grade chairman (TGC) and the school advisory team (SAT).

One item (Q58) which concerns division policy is retained at the Central Office across all sub-groups. Another item (Q36) which involves curriculum selection may be made at the site in Less Complex divisions (BA + TGC + SAT: M = 5.4), but is most likely retained at the Central Office in Moderately Complex (CO: M = 5.1) and Complex divisions (CO: M = 6.3). All other decisions, represented by consistently high scores, are made by site decisions makers. The greatest range in scores
Table 16
Curriculum Decision Making Responses By Bureaucratic Complexity in Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Issues</td>
<td>LC  MC  C</td>
<td>LC  MC  C</td>
<td>LC  MC  C</td>
<td>LC  MC  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Conduct a school needs assessment</td>
<td>1.5 0.8 1.6</td>
<td>4.6 5.1 4.0</td>
<td>2.7 2.6 2.1</td>
<td>1.2 1.5 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Select textbooks</td>
<td>2.4 3.9 4.8</td>
<td>1.1 1.0 1.3</td>
<td>6.0 4.5 3.4</td>
<td>0.6 0.6 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Evaluate school progress toward established goals</td>
<td>1.9 2.0 1.9</td>
<td>4.0 3.6 3.4</td>
<td>3.0 2.7 2.3</td>
<td>1.1 1.8 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Order materials and supplies</td>
<td>1.2 1.1 0.6</td>
<td>4.9 4.9 5.7</td>
<td>3.7 3.7 3.4</td>
<td>0.2 0.2 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Select instructional materials such as manipulatives</td>
<td>1.0 1.3 1.0</td>
<td>2.6 2.6 2.9</td>
<td>6.2 5.7 5.5</td>
<td>0.3 0.4 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Select supplies and equipment school</td>
<td>1.5 2.9 2.0</td>
<td>3.2 2.3 2.7</td>
<td>5.1 4.2 4.7</td>
<td>0.2 0.6 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Select the curriculum for the building</td>
<td>4.6 5.1 6.3</td>
<td>2.9 2.9 2.7</td>
<td>2.3 1.8 1.2</td>
<td>0.2 0.5 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Represent the school on a textbook selection committee</td>
<td>0.7 1.1 2.0</td>
<td>1.4 1.3 2.3</td>
<td>7.5 7.0 5.5</td>
<td>0.4 0.6 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Develop school-wide goals and objectives</td>
<td>0.7 0.7 0.7</td>
<td>4.5 3.9 3.2</td>
<td>3.3 2.8 2.9</td>
<td>1.5 2.7 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Develop school-wide policies</td>
<td>1.6 1.8 1.6</td>
<td>4.8 3.8 3.9</td>
<td>2.8 2.8 2.3</td>
<td>0.9 1.6 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Develop school-wide procedures</td>
<td>1.2 1.0 1.2</td>
<td>5.1 4.4 4.5</td>
<td>3.0 3.1 2.5</td>
<td>0.7 1.6 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Establish educational procedures</td>
<td>2.1 2.1 2.1</td>
<td>4.3 3.4 3.6</td>
<td>2.8 2.8 2.1</td>
<td>0.7 1.7 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Establish district policies</td>
<td>8.1 8.7 8.8</td>
<td>1.1 0.7 0.6</td>
<td>0.6 0.4 0.5</td>
<td>0.3 0.1 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Develop the school philosophy</td>
<td>0.4 0.8 0.3</td>
<td>4.2 3.4 3.1</td>
<td>3.7 3.7 3.2</td>
<td>1.7 2.1 2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; BA-Building Administrator; TGC-Teacher/Grade Chairman; SAT-School Improvement Team; LC-Least Complex (1-10); MC-Moderately Complex (11-25); C-Complex (>25)

NOTE: Highlighted scores show that there is almost no difference in the levels of participation at the central office level in every bureaucratic layer.
for site autonomy occurs between Less Complex (M = 7.7) and Complex (M = 5.2) divisions when the issue is that of selecting textbooks (Q26).

Instructional decision making is another domain where school decision makers may decide what to do as often as three out of four times. Of 13 items, schools in Less Complex divisions have primary responsibility for 11 of the issues, Moderately Complex divisions 10 issues, and Complex division decision makers, nine. Issues remaining with the Central Office tend to be concerned with policy, standards, or organization (see Table 17).

In summary, findings concerning research question three suggest that the status of school-based management and bureaucratic complexity may be a factor once the parameters for decision making are defined by the central office. For example, schools in Complex divisions are able to make more personnel and budget decisions, but schools in Less Complex divisions are more likely to decide curriculum and instructional issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content Instructional Decisions</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Establish criteria for evaluating the instructional program</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Approve a pilot program within the building</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Approve out of district field trips</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Select instructional methodology</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Determine deviation in the use of instructional time</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Establish class size</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Implement after-school programs</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Establish homework policy</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Determine student academic performance standards</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Establish grading and reporting criteria school</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Establish school discipline policies</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Maintain student conduct standard</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Group students for instruction</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; BA-Building Administrator; TGC-Teacher/Grade Chairman; SAT-School Improvement Team; LC-Least Complex (1-10); MC-Moderately Complex (11-25); C-Complex (>25)
Question Four: The Status of School-Based Management in Virginia’s Elementary Schools

To determine the status of school-based management in Virginia’s Elementary Schools, responses to questions one and two were analyzed within school-based management levels to see if differences in autonomy for decision making exist at the local school level.

Prevailing evidence, found in current literature, suggests that the most sophisticated school-based management occurs when decisions made at the local level are shared by a school advisory team which is diverse in its inclusion. Using this information for justification, the surveys were divided into four levels and categorized by the principal’s response to survey question four which asked the respondent to identify members of the school advisory team. School-Based Management Level One (SBML1) is characterized by no advisory team and School-Based Management Level Four (SBML4) has advisory teams which are composed of people with a variety of jobs and interests in the school and community. The criteria for distribution into the various levels are outlined in the section of this text entitled School-Based Management Characteristics: Levels of Implementation (p. 94).
Question 10 (establish criteria for selecting teachers) was a Central Office decision in the respondent group and remains with that decision making body in levels one, two, and three; however, when looking at the data broken into SBM Levels, establishing criteria for selecting teachers (Q10) is a site decision in Level 4 schools. In general, data displayed in this manner show authority at the central office level for personnel decision making decreases as a division’s school-based management level increases. Table 18 presents several good examples (Q21, Q22, Q23) of increasing decision making scores by Teachers and Grade Chairmen (TGC) and School Advisory Teams (SAT) at Level 4 when compared with decision making at Level 1.

Table 19 provides a display of the data comparing budget and finance decision making by School-Based Management Levels. Establishing line items for the school budget remains with the central office at all levels. School-Based Management Level One school administrators retain the right to make 100% of the budget decisions delegated to the unit, while building administrators (BA) at levels three and four share opportunities 50% of the time with other building decision makers. Scores for teachers and grade chairmen (TGC) and school improvement teams increase on the highlighted items (purchase supplies
### Table 18

**Personnel Decision Making Responses By Assigned School-Based Management Level in Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content Personnel Decisions</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Select new teachers</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Assign teachers to level in building</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Orient new teachers</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Establish criteria for selecting teachers</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Determine staff assignments</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reassign teachers from one position to another in the building</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hire a new assistant principal</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Organize professional growth and development activities</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Plan inservice activities evaluating personnel</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Conduct inservice activities</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO, BA, TGC, SAT: Levels of agreement or response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content Personnel Decisions</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Inform teachers of new educational research</td>
<td>3.2 3.8 3.3 3.0</td>
<td>6.0 4.6 5.1 5.1</td>
<td>0.8 1.4 1.2 1.5</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.4 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Evaluate teachers for personnel decisions</td>
<td>1.0 1.1 1.3 0.9</td>
<td>7.9 8.8 8.5 8.7</td>
<td>0.2 0.2 0.1 0.4</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Supervise classroom teachers for improvement</td>
<td>1.3 0.7 1.3 0.8</td>
<td>8.3 8.9 8.3 8.7</td>
<td>0.4 0.3 0.3 0.4</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Establish criteria for evaluating school personnel</td>
<td>6.2 6.3 6.3 5.6</td>
<td>2.4 1.9 2.3 2.0</td>
<td>1.2 1.4 1.2 2.1</td>
<td>0.1 0.4 0.2 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Plan and conduct faculty meetings</td>
<td>0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2</td>
<td>8.5 7.8 7.9 7.3</td>
<td>1.4 1.6 1.5 2.2</td>
<td>0.0 0.5 0.5 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Replace one teaching position with two non-teaching positions</td>
<td>8.9 6.0 6.2 6.0</td>
<td>1.0 3.6 2.7 2.1</td>
<td>0.0 0.4 0.4 1.1</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.7 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Send a teacher on a three-day conference</td>
<td>4.7 2.7 3.7 3.5</td>
<td>4.6 6.0 5.1 4.7</td>
<td>0.5 1.0 0.9 1.4</td>
<td>0.1 0.3 0.2 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Change the work hours of a secretary</td>
<td>4.7 2.4 3.2 3.8</td>
<td>5.3 7.6 6.5 6.1</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Establish the agenda items for faculty meetings</td>
<td>0.3 0.3 0.4 0.5</td>
<td>7.5 6.3 6.9 6.0</td>
<td>2.2 2.4 2.1 3.1</td>
<td>0.0 0.4 0.6 0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; BA-Building Administrator; TGC-Teacher/Grade Chairman; SAT-School Improvement Team; L1-Level 1; L2-Level 2; L3-Level 3; L4-Level 4
### Table 19

**A Comparative Summary of Budget and Finance Decision Making Responses By Assigned School Based Management Level in Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content Budget and Finance</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Establish line items for school budget</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Decide where to deposit school funds</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Schedule a fundraiser</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Purchase supplies and equipment</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Develop a school budget</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Decide how to spend funds allocated to the school</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Select fund raising projects</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Identify the resource needs of the school</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Select vendors</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Approve requisitions and expenditures for a school</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Accept or reject request for non-school group to use the facility</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; BA-Building Administrator; TGC-Teacher/Grade Chairman; SAT-School Improvement Team; L1-Level 1; L2-Level 2; L3-Level 3; L4-Level 4
and equipment, develop a school budget, spend allocated funds, select fund raising projects, identify resource needs) at SBM Levels 3 and 4 to a status representative of a balance in power for decision making at these sites.

When considering all categories measured by the survey, decisions related to curriculum received higher mean scores for building decision makers in the respondent group. When displayed by SBM Levels, Table 20 shows that one additional item (Q36) - selecting the curriculum for the building (a central office decision in the respondent group) becomes a site decision at Level 4. In this category, building administrators share authority for making decisions with teachers and there are even a few examples, highlighted on Table 20, where input from the school improvement team at SBM 3 and SBM 4 is equal to or greater than $M = 1.5$.

Table 21 is an arrangement of instructional decision making scores which is very different from the same scores arrayed in Table 12 (p. 116) for the total respondent group. Three of 13 items (approve out of district field trips, establish class size, establish grading and reporting criteria) were central office decisions in that clustering of data. The same 13 items arrayed by SBM Levels in Table 21 show that central office
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content Curriculum Issues</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Conduct a school needs assessment</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Select textbooks</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Evaluate progress toward established goals</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Order materials and supplies</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Select instructional materials such as manipulatives</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Select supplies and equipment school</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Select the curriculum for the building</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Represent the school on a textbook selection committee</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content Curriculum Issues</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Develop school-wide goals and objectives</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Develop school-wide policies</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Develop school-wide procedures</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Establish educational procedures</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Establish district policies</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Develop the school philosophy</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; BA-Building Administrator; TGC-Teacher/Grade Chairman; SAT-School Improvement Team; L1-Level 1; L2-Level 2; L3-Level 3; L4-Level 4
Table 21

A Comparative Summary of Instructional Decision Making Responses By Assigned School Based Management Level in Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Content Instructional Decisions</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Establish criteria for evaluating the instructional program</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Approve a pilot program within the building</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Approve out of district field trips</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Select instructional methodology</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Determine deviation in the use of instructional time</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Establish class size</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Implement after-school programs</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Establish homework policy</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Item Content Instructional Decisions</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>TGC</td>
<td>SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Determine student academic performance standards</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Establish grading and reporting criteria school</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Establish school discipline policies</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Maintain student conduct standard</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Group students for instruction</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO-Central Office; BA-Building Administrator; TGC-Teacher/Grade Chairman; SAT-School Improvement Team; L1-Level 1; L2-Level 2; L3-Level 3; L4-Level 4
decision makers retain six items at SBM Level 1 (Q33- establish criteria for evaluating the instructional program, Q34-approve a pilot program within the building, Q35-approve out of district field trips, Q49-establish class size, Q51-establish homework policy, Q53-establish grading and reporting criteria), four items at SBM Level 2 (Q34-approve a pilot program within the building, Q35- approve out of district field trips, Q49-establish class size, Q53-establish grading and reporting criteria), three items at SBM Level 3 (Q35-approve out of district field trips, Q49-establish class size, Q53-establish grading and reporting criteria) and no items at SBM Level 4. In this category, the school advisory team has some input into 12 decisions at SBM Level 4, and all decisions at SBM Level 3 compared with only two items at SBM Level 1.

Summary

One way to look at the status of school-based management in the elementary schools of Virginia is to consider the distribution of surveys across levels by established criteria.
School-Based Management Level One (SBM1) is composed of 24 elementary schools without a school advisory team or shared decision making by a group of interested parties.

Level Two (SBM2) consists of 27 elementary schools where the principal shares some decision making with teachers.

A total of 179 (SBM3 = 135 + SBM4 = 44) elementary school principals report advanced levels of participation and movement toward school-based decision making. In these schools principals, teachers, parents, support staff, community advisors, and other interested parties collaborate to make some decisions about the local elementary school.

An indicator of the status of school-based management in Virginia's elementary schools surfaced through comments made by principals. The survey provided space for the respondent to make additional statements about the process.

Six principals from two Complex divisions indicated that their organizations were preparing to change to school-based management and were in the early stages of developing policy and electing management teams.
* Four respondents from the same Moderately Complex school division wrote of a pilot program activated in 1991-92 with implementation for all schools planned for the year 1992-93.

* Principals representing eight different Less Complex divisions wrote that they are: (a) studying school-based management with the intent to implement; (b) determining what responsibilities will go to the advisory group; (c) pursuing more information about the process; (d) identifying pilot schools; and (e) moving in the direction of school-based management.

* Additionally, 43% of the survey respondents requested a summary of the findings and 50% of those who made comments on the survey asked for the results.

Other comments by respondents indicate some anxiety about the advancement of school-based management as a process. One administrator wrote that the division had moved towards and then retreated from local control especially in the area of budgeting.

Principals mentioned time as a constraint, role definition as critical, schools run by committees as unthinkable, political problems revolving
around power and the loss of jobs, the need for more than "lip service" from superintendents and school boards, expectations which are Utopian rather than practical, and increased pressure on building administrators as issues of concern.

A synthesis of the summary data surrounding the status of school-based management in the elementary schools of Virginia is:

1. All elementary schools in Virginia have autonomy for making some decisions which affect their school. Though power delegated by the central office to make decisions at the building level is substantial, it is not widely shared with teachers, parents, support staff or community advisors.

2. Interest in the process of school-based management is increasing in the respondent group.

3. Decision makers at School-Based Management Level Four have more autonomy for making decisions which affect the local school and the building administrator is more likely to share decision making responsibility with the school advisory team.
4. One hundred seventy-nine respondents were identified as School-Based Management Level Three or Level Four schools.

5. There are some concerns by building administrators relative to the implementation of school-based management. Comments made by respondents could be characterized as positive, wait and see, and against. A small percentage (3-5%) of the building administrators were definitely opposed to any management process which fosters shared decision making. In general, building administrators are at least open minded to the concept or positive about its implementation (15 - 20%).

The results and analyses of data obtained from A Survey Of School-Based Management Practices In The Elementary Schools Of Virginia have been reported in Chapter 4. Results of background information used to establish parameters for this research are presented in tables located within the text of this chapter and the scoring of Part II has been described to facilitate understanding of data presented in tables and text representing responses to four research questions.
designed to determine the status of school-based management in the elementary schools of Virginia.

Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study with conclusions, discussion and recommendations for future research.
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CHAPTER 5

Summary, Findings, Conclusions, Discussion, and Implications for Future Research

Introduction

School-based management has become a frequently talked about strategy for directing school improvement based on two assumptions gathered from a collection of current literature. One concept presents this process as a form of decentralization in which decision making authority is redistributed under the assumption that improvement in the instructional program and school climate will occur when members of the school team have the interest needed to make it happen. The other assumption is that long-lasting school reform will be more successful as additional stakeholders in the educational process become involved.

As rhetoric involving school-based management continues to flourish and pressures to implement the procedure increase, logic dictates a need to determine the status of this strategy for improving the public schools if one is to profit from the experience of others and to plan for
the future. This study has attempted to address that need which is to describe the status of school-based management in Virginia’s elementary schools. Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from analyses of the data, discussion of the findings, and recommendations for future research.

Population

The study was designed to collect data from a statewide sample of elementary school principals by using a self-administered, mailed questionnaire (see Appendix A). The sample of principals was selected because, as mid-level managers, they have the best information about the scope and sequence of decision making in a school division and can provide current data for analyzing the status of school-based management and shared decision making in a school. School divisions were selected to represent a geographic cross-section of Virginia and to include a combination of Least Complex (small), Moderately Complex (medium), and Complex (large) school systems; urban, suburban and rural divisions.
The 1991-1992 edition of a Virginia Educational Directory was used as the source to identify a population of elementary school principals in Virginia. Of the population, 400 elementary principals from the 137 school divisions were selected using a systematic sampling technique.

Data Collection

A cover letter (see Appendix B) was prepared giving a reasonable explanation of the subject of the study, timeliness of the study, its relevance to building level administrators, and the importance of each individual respondent to the study’s success. This cover letter, a survey instrument marked with an identification number, and a self-addressed stamped envelope were placed in a single package and mailed to principals May 11, 1992. The process resulted in a return rate of approximately 68%. Of questionnaires returned, 230 were usable resulting in a usable return rate of almost 58%. Survey response is underrepresented in larger, more complex districts by a usable response rate which is slightly less than 50% compared to useable responses of about 63% in Less Complex and Moderately Complex divisions.
nevertheless, it is believed that responses received do provide an accurate description of what is occurring in small, medium, large; suburban, urban, and rural areas of the state with respect to the studied issues.

The characteristics of school-based management and major decision-making domains were identified and validated using a matrix to determine frequency of reference to an item found in the work of prominent authors, studies, and reports. The results of this process formed the basis for developing pertinent research questions included on the survey. Individual decision items were assigned to the categories of curriculum, budget and finance, personnel and instruction.

The questionnaire had two parts (see Appendix A). Part I included five questions that provided information used to assign an individual respondent’s school into a school-based management category; Part II included 56 questions representing the range of decisions made during a school year in most school divisions. Respondents were asked to assign points to personnel and community members representing five levels of authority for making decisions in a school division. Decision making roles covered a wide range of stakeholders beginning with central office personnel (CO) including the board, superintendent, and
supervisory staff. Building administrators (BA), teachers and grade chairmen (TGC), and the school advisory team (SAT) composed of community persons, certified and uncertified staff and parents were also represented as choices for decision making.

The returned data were entered into the *Number Cruncher Statistical System* (Hintze, 1989) which was selected to produce the descriptive statistics appropriate to this study. These statistics were used to help answer four basic questions designed to present a "snapshot" of school-based management practices in the elementary schools of Virginia.

**Summary of Data**

Part One of the study was designed to establish parameters for looking at decision making in school divisions across the state and Part Two asked who, in a division, made what decisions. The data were studied by looking at the total responses and two variations of that group including bureaucratic complexity and school-based management level. A summary of these data follow:
Total Response

The survey respondents represent a cross section of elementary principals in the state of Virginia:

* Two hundred thirty usable surveys representing 119 of 137 large, medium, and small; rural, suburban, and urban city and county school divisions were returned.

* Administrators in larger, more complex districts are slightly underrepresented (slightly less than 50%).

* Approximately 18% of all respondents work in districts with written policy which defines school-based management. These policies have been in effect from zero months to five years. Nearly 80% of the respondents did not report having a written policy in their school divisions.

* Approximately 88% report that they have adults who work on an advisory team.

* About 76% of these teams include parents, teachers and an administrator. The most frequently used method to select members for this team is by principal appointment (54.8%). About 50% report that they also use volunteer members on the teams.
When divided according to criteria establishing bureaucratic complexity the respondents were represented in the following manner:

* Less Complex divisions (N = 96, or 42%),
* Moderately Complex divisions (N = 70, or 30%), and
* Complex divisions (N = 64, or 28%).

Dividing the respondents into school-based management levels resulted in four groups:

* Level One schools (N = 24, or 10%),
* Level Two schools (N = 27, or 11%),
* Level Three schools (N = 135, or 59%), and
* Level Four schools (N = 44, or 20%).

School Based Management Characteristics

Four characteristics of school-based management (a written policy, a group of adults who serve as an advisory team, representation on the team covering a variety of interested parties, and multiple ways of selecting the team) are distributed as follows:

* Complex divisions (38%) are three times more likely to have written policies than Moderately Complex (11%) or Less Complex (10%) divisions.
* Written policy has guided practice for administrators (11%) in Complex divisions for a longer period of time (3-5 years) compared to their peers (1%) in Moderately Complex and Less Complex divisions.

* In Less Complex (90%) division administrators report groups of adults serving on an advisory team more often than those in Moderately Complex (87%) or Complex (86%) divisions.

* School-Based Management Level 4 schools report written policies more often than any other level (SBM4 = 34%; SBM3 = 17%; SBM2 = 11%; SBM1 = 4%).

* All Level Four (100%) schools have school advisory teams composed of an administrator, teachers, parents, support personnel and community advisors.

* No school advisory teams were reported by administrators in Level One schools.
School Level Decision Making

When looking at the total responses across categories, it is clear that substantial autonomy is transferred from central office to the local site. That shift in power is demonstrated by the following:

* In personnel, major responsibility for nearly 79% of the items in this category is assigned to the school site.

* Autonomy for about 90% of all budget decisions is allocated to the school.

* In curriculum, 12 of 14 items are assigned to the school for decision making. It is in this category that teachers have their greatest responsibility for shared decisions.

* Ten of 13 instruction items are delegated to the site. Mean scores for teachers equal or are greater than 3.0 for 4 of 10 curriculum issues.

* The School Advisory Team received its highest score when the issue was selecting a fund raising project.

* Building administrators make a majority of the decisions delegated to the site with some input from teachers and the school advisory team but, exceptions noted, *most decision making is not shared.*
Bureaucratic Complexity and Decision Making

Personnel

There were 19 items on the survey associated with personnel decision making. Four of the items retained by central office in the respondent group were distributed differently when separated into bureaucratically complex units.

* Two of four decisions (establishing criteria for selecting teachers and replacing one teaching position with two non-teaching positions) were assigned to the site in Complex divisions but not Less Complex or Moderately Complex districts.

* Of items assigned to the building, the building administrator is likely to reserve the right to decide all but three issues (organize professional growth and development activities, plan inservice activities and conduct inservice activities).

* Decisions most likely to be shared with other groups are those concerned with planning and conducting professional growth and development and inservice activities.
Budget and Finance

Ten of the 11 budget and finance items are delegated to the site in every bureaucratic level.

* Less Complex divisions have more authority to develop a school budget and select vendors who will work with the school.

* Moderately Complex divisions have the highest mean scores for selecting fund raising projects, scheduling a fund raiser, and deciding how to spend funds allocated to the school.

* Complex divisions have the highest mean scores for identifying resource needs of the school, deciding where to deposit school funds, purchasing supplies and equipment, approving requisitions and expenditures, and accepting or rejecting a request for use of the facility.

Curriculum

Many decisions are made at every bureaucratic level in the area of curriculum that reflect the thinking of involved stakeholders. Central Office retains the right to establish district policies concerning curriculum
and to select the building curriculum in Moderately Complex and Complex divisions. Twelve of 14 decisions are made at the site.

* When making curriculum decisions, there is almost no difference in central office scores across bureaucratic levels; however, at the site the distribution of that power gives a slight edge to teachers in Less Complex divisions and to the School Improvement Team in Complex divisions.

* School Improvement Teams in Moderately Complex and Complex divisions received many of their highest scores when the issue involved curriculum.

Instruction

School decision makers make instructional decisions as often as three of four times. Issues that remain with central office are more concerned with policy, standards, or organization.

* Many instructional decisions are shared between the building administrator and teachers across all bureaucratic levels. Bureaucratic complexity does not seem to influence one group (C, MC, LC) over another by district or instructional decision.
School Based Management Levels and Decision Making

**Personnel**

Personnel issues assigned to the school are made primarily by the building administrator.

* In general, decision makers at the building level in School-Based Management Levels Three and Four have more power to make personnel decisions than do their counterparts at School-Based Management Levels One and Two.

* Several examples of shared decision making are seen in School-based Management Levels Three and Four. When decisions are shared with teachers, they tend to be in issues related to teacher orientation and professional growth.

**Budget and Finance**

Eleven items examined budget and finance decision making. In ten cases primary responsibility was assigned to the school.
* Budget and finance decisions allocated to the site are most likely made by building administrators at SBM1 and SBM2.

* School Improvement Teams are more likely to have input when the issue concerns resource needs identification and fund raising at SBM3 and SBM4.

* Teachers are likely to be involved in making decisions when the issues are identifying resource needs and purchasing supplies at SBML1; however, they are most likely to be involved in shared decision making at SBM4 schools where they have relatively high input into five items that include identifying resource needs of the school, developing the school budget, selecting a fund raiser, deciding how to spend funds allocated to the school and purchasing supplies and equipment.

Curriculum

In the respondent group, 12 of 14 curriculum items surveyed were delegated to the site for decision making.

* The building administrators at SBM1 assume responsibility for making five of the 12 decisions, assigns three and is
likely to share the four that remain with teachers. Participation from the school improvement team is negligible in all cases.

* One additional item (select the curriculum for the building), a central office decision in the total respondent group, is delegated to the site in Level 4 schools.

* Building administrators are more likely to share decision making with teachers when the issue concerns curriculum.

* Building administrators and teachers at School-Based Management Levels 3 and 4 are most likely to share decision making with school improvement teams in this category. The highest degree of allocation of decision making points to school advisory teams was found at these levels where mean scores received by this group (School Improvement Teams) were equal to or greater than $M = 1.5$ on seven items.

**Instruction**

When instruction data are broken into school-based management levels, considerable differences are noted. Three of 13 instruction items
were decided by central office decision makers when total responses are examined. The redistribution of power and allocation of decision making when analyzed by school-based management level illustrates increased authority for problem solving at the school site as school-based management level increases.

* Central office (CO) makes 6 of 13 decisions at SBM1 and the building administrator controls four of the remaining seven.

* Four decisions remain with central office decision makers in schools designated as SBM2. Building administrators at this level reserve two items of the remaining nine to their office.

* The number of decisions retained by central office is reduced to three at SBM3. Principals control the determination of instructional time use, and share the remaining matters with teachers and the advisory team.

* All 13 items are delegated to the school level in SBM4 sites where the building level administrator is also likely to retain responsibility for use of instructional time. At this level, three items (approving pilot programs, approving out of
district field trips, establishing class size) which tend to be central office decisions at the other levels are more likely to be a collaborative effort between central office and the building administrator rather than a shared endeavor with teachers and the advisory team.

* The school advisory team has more input into decision making at SBM3 and SBM4; however, their contribution is still marginal. There are no school advisory teams reported by building administrators at schools labeled SBM1.

Using the characteristics of school-based management as a parameter, this summary has looked at respondents’ reactions to questions designed to determine how authority is distributed among participants at selected school sites. The discussion of issues related to the categories of personnel, budget and finance, curriculum, and instruction was limited to responses of the whole group and responses of sub groups based upon bureaucratical complexity or the respondent’s school division and the level of sophistication (SBM) within the respondent’s school.
Findings

Based on summarized information, the findings of this study are as follows.

1. In the respondent group, 179 schools fall into the categories labeled School-Based Management Level Three and School-Based Management Level 4.

2. Formal recognition of school-based management is relatively new in Virginia when measured by the number (42) and length of time (zero months to five years) written policies have driven practice.

3. The existence of written policy to support school-based management is more than three times greater in Complex school divisions (38%) than in Less Complex (10%) and Moderately Complex (11%) districts.

4. Written policy has been in effect for a relatively short period of time; however, it has existed longer (3-5 years) in Complex divisions (11.0%) compared to Less Complex or Moderately Complex divisions (1.0%).
5. Twenty-four schools (10%) in the respondent group do not have school advisory teams.

6. The preferred method for committee selection in the respondent group is principal appointment ($N = 126$) followed closely by volunteering ($N = 115$). The same may be said of Less Complex (appoints: 67%; volunteers: 46%) and Moderately Complex (appoints: 59%; volunteers 56%) divisions, but in the most bureaucratically Complex divisions the selection style is volunteers (50%), followed by election (33%) and then principal appointment (33%).

8. The central office delegates to the site a broad range of responsibility for decision making involving personnel, curriculum, instruction, budget, and finance issues that influence the local school.

9. Across the groups, autonomy for decision making at the building level is greatest in the areas of budget and finance, curriculum, and instruction.

10. Across the groups, building decision makers have the least autonomy for making personnel decisions.
11. Generally, central office retains autonomy for making decisions that relate to establishing standards and policy for the division.

12. Principals report autonomy for problem solving across all decision making categories. The building administrator may use teacher opinion when solving some issues but, for the most part, decisions in all decision making categories are made without assistance from the school advisory team.

13. With few exceptions personnel decisions are site-based but not shared.

14. When the building administrator shares decision making responsibility with teachers, the sharing is most likely to include issues related to curriculum and instruction.

15. When asked to share in the decision making process the school advisory team tends to fare better with curriculum issues and best when determining financial concerns related to raising money.

16. When categorized by bureaucratic complexity, marginal differences occur between the sum of mean scores for decision making autonomy; however, when looking at the
items which make up those scores, there are some differences in the kinds of decisions Complex division schools can make. For example, Bureaucratically Complex divisions delegate two additional personnel items to the building that are concerned with establishing criteria for selecting teachers and deciding to replace one teaching position with two non-teaching positions.

17. School-based Management Level Four decision makers have more autonomy for making decisions in every category than their comparison group, School-based Management Level One. In general, as SBM levels increase so does autonomy.

18. There is a difference in the kind of decisions that can be made by School-based Management Level Four decision makers in personnel and instruction. Level Four school sites have additional responsibility for shared decision making when the issues are establishing criteria for selecting teachers, approving out of district field trips, and establishing grading and reporting criteria.

19. Approximately 90% (largest percent) of budget and finance decisions measured by the survey were delegated to the
school while about 77% (least percent) of instructional issues were assigned there. The ability to decide at least 3 of 4 issues in all measured areas of decision making at the local site represents school-based management in the elementary schools of Virginia.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to describe the status of school-based management practices in the elementary schools of Virginia. Based on responses to survey questions by elementary school principals who have presented the facts as they see them, several conclusions may be extracted from this study.

1. There has always been autonomy at the site for making some personnel, budget and finance, curriculum, and instruction decisions that affect the school.

2. The heart of school-based management is shared decision making. Although principals have authority to make decisions at the local school, this power is not readily shared. Principals report that they make most decisions
with some participation from teachers but little, if any, from the school advisory team.

3. Formal recognition of school-based management supported by written policies that establish parameters for the process is a relatively new phenomenon (five years or less) in Virginia.

4. Written policy may be an important factor in the achievement of school-based management and the degree to which school advisory teams make decisions in the elementary schools of Virginia.

5. There is increasing interest in and movement toward school-based management which is supported by respondents' written comments that describe efforts in their divisions to study the feasibility of beginning the process or to carry out School-based Management pilot programs.

6. As we approach the year 2000, more elementary schools will have teams of interested people and professionals making decisions that affect organization and student outcomes. The process may look as different as the individual school and may be called by a multiplicity of
names, but common threads will be interested people making decisions about that which they know best and accepting the accountability that accompanies this freedom to try new ideas, make mistakes and ultimately, achieve success.

Discussion

Carl Marburger (1985) writes that school governance provides increased responsibility and authority to the principal and gives parents and teachers the right to participate in making decisions which are important to the school (p. 19). The author continues by describing the work advisory teams do together as they strive to make budget, personnel, and curriculum decisions within the parameters established by federal, state and local guidelines. In his remarks, Marburger identifies characteristics repeated continuously in the literature describing school-based management; therefore, it is appropriate to consider those factors when deciding the extent to which school-based management is being carried out in Virginia’s elementary schools.
Once the surveys were analyzed, it was found, as expected, that every elementary school exhibits some characteristics associated with school-based management. It was also expected that all schools would not exhibit these characteristics to the same degree; however, twenty-four principals in the respondent group reported that they did not have an advisory team (advisory teams, a primary characteristic of school-based management, are mandated under the Standards of Quality for Virginia schools and are often used as the forum to facilitate decision making) operating in the schools.

Marburger and Hansen (1989) wrote that parent involvement is related to higher self esteem for their children, more positive attitudes toward school by students, and greater pupil achievement. Additionally, parent satisfaction is positively related to participation and influence in decision making; therefore, it is important for parents to become a part of advisory councils that change the structure of management. It is emphasized that advisory councils have been around in one form or another for a long time but under school-based management, the extent of their power changes to advising the principal on matters dealing with discipline policy, program planning, hiring new faculty, and the allocation of school resources.
Except for School-Based Management Level One schools, every other School-Based Management Level and each level of Bureaucratic Complexity reported advisory teams that serve with varying, usually small, degrees of participation in decision making by parents and other interested stakeholders. Although there are some positive trends to include parents when making decisions at School-Based Management Levels Three and Four and in Complex school divisions this study found that, in general, parents were able to advise the principal in very limited areas (i.e. when decisions being considered were related to items such as establishing discipline policies, scheduling fund raisers, selecting fund raising projects, and identifying resource needs of the school). Rarely are elementary school advisory teams in Virginia involved in curriculum, finance or personnel decision making. This is consistent with the work of Smith, Mazzarella and Piele (1981) who found that although parent involvement enhances public support, once these teams are formed and begin to operate one often realizes that the members serve no real function except to provide the suggestion of lay involvement in decision making.

Research question one asked the respondent if the district had written policy defining school-based management because this is the
characteristic that clarifies parameters for operation based on federal, state, and local guidelines. The purpose for this research did not include details of the written policy but it is suspected that these policies, like the Kentucky mandate, describe who participants will be and how they are to be involved in making decisions since schools with policy show increased decision making by teachers and definite trends toward more inclusion for parents and other interested parties. All schools did not report elevated measures of involvement in school-based management in those districts where written policy exists because some divisions are moving toward school-based management and are involved in selected pilot projects. Where written policy exists for a division and responding schools within that district are not involved in pilot projects, decision making differences between schools occur like those that appear in decision making activities at School-Based Management Level One schools compared to School-Based Management Level Three or Four schools.

Within the collected data there are promising signs for stakeholders in some schools at every bureaucratic level and especially in School-Based Management Levels Three and Four. When the schools that operate in a decentralized manner consistent with formalized school-
based management and shared decision making are isolated from other schools in the respondent group and when the isolated schools are supported by written policy to guide practice, there is a higher incidence of relevant shared decision making such as that described by Marburger and Hansen (1986). Advisory teams, in these schools, that include administrators, teachers, parents and other community leaders play more important roles in personnel, curriculum, instruction, and budget decision making.

Concerns about declining economic conditions in the country, our standing in the greater world market, and the Nation's growing social problems have become the focus of all who feel they have a self interest in the schools and a compelling desire to participate in deciding the course of action that will give direction to the future. When one considers the public outcry over problems (real or perceived) expressed about the quality of public schools and programs that are being offered perhaps it is time for all school divisions to rethink policy and the roles stakeholders play in providing service to schools at the "grass roots level" where involvement can enhance or diminish public support needed to go forward with school reform. One timely example occurred Wednesday, September 15, 1993, when the Governor of Virginia
abandoned the Common Core of Learning, a controversial centerpiece of the Department of Education’s *World Class Education Plan*, because of parental and political pressure (Thiel, 1993, p. D3).

One objective of this research was to decide whether bureaucratic complexity (school division size) made a difference in the achievement of school-based management. Complex (large) school divisions are likely to assign personnel decisions to the school site than either of the other groups and data linking bureaucratic complexity and written policy clearly indicate that where written policy drives practice, schools are more actively engaged in shared decision making which is relevant and consequential. An example is the trend toward more School-Based Management with shared decision making in Complex divisions where the greatest number (38%) of school administrators report the presence of written policy.

Some respondents in small school divisions wrote that they have always had school-based management and had to make decisions because there was no one else to make a choice for them, but most of the decisions were made by the building administrator without participation of others.
Respondents from the same districts report discrepancies in what decisions are made and who is involved in the decision making process. This could occur because one school is involved in a pilot program with parameters established for decision making in that school and the other one is not. For whatever reasons, not discernible by this research, the schools in districts that report a wide range of decision making have written policy to guide practice. With that in mind, bureaucracy probably does make a difference in the grand scheme of things because 38% of the schools in Complex divisions have policy to guide procedures for making decisions. When the parameters for practice are well defined by central office, decision makers have latitude to decide issues within established boundaries that are extensive and beyond old paradigms.

Dignity and high self-esteem for administrators seem to accompany the ability to make decisions that influence the work place and student outcomes. Respondents from one district of the state where School-Based Management has been established for several years wrote positive comments about the district’s implementation efforts and 95% of those who received the survey returned a questionnaire that was thoughtfully done.
Ultimately it can be said that some findings of this study support the results of the prestigious Carnegie Foundation's survey (1988) which was a comprehensive inquiry about the conditions of teaching. The Carnegie survey polled public school teachers in 50 states to determine the degree of teacher involvement in shaping classroom and school policy and reported state-by-state and collective results. It was found that most teachers help choose textbooks and shape curriculum but do not participate in "crucial" decisions about budget, staff, and school policy. In particular, the Carnegie report established that teachers in Virginia felt that they were involved in choosing textbooks and instructional materials (82%), and shaping the curriculum (61%). The same teachers felt they were not very involved in deciding issues related to school budgets (84%), and selecting new administrators (96%).

According to the Harris and Associates' (1992) survey of 1,252 adults across the nation, there is support for getting teachers and parents involved in more aspects of schooling and for reforming schools through decentralization and shared decision making. Of those surveyed, 95% felt an urgent need to give schools much more authority over their teaching and spending decisions, allowing teachers to make decisions about what is taught and how, involving parents in making decisions
about their children’s schools, and getting principals to share decision-making with teachers and parents.

Elementary principals in Virginia have authority to determine the future of school-based management with shared decision making by deciding how power will be redistributed to include teachers, parents and others when making personnel, budget and finance, curriculum and instruction decisions like those measured by the survey instrument and cited in the Carnegie Report on Teaching (1988) and the Harris and Associates (1992) survey. There is evidence that some promising trends exist under certain circumstances; however, there are some questions that, if answered, may move this initiative forward. These questions are examined in the final section of this chapter.

Recommendations

This study has presented the status of school-based management practices in the elementary schools of Virginia. Based on this research, recommendations for future study include the following:

1. What are the barriers, perceived or real, that block the achievement of school-based management with shared
decision making in the elementary schools of Virginia? Are they self imposed by design? If so, how can the comfort level with school-based management and shared decision making be increased?

2. Do demographics of administrators make a difference in how site-based management and shared decision making progress in school systems?

3. Is staff development important if school-based management is to be achieved? What types of training do participants feel that they need and how much is necessary?

4. What is the impact of written policy on parameters for school-based management? Does this insure implementation and inclusion of all interested parties in shared decision making?

5. Is there one best model for school-based management that would be accepted by most and voluntarily implemented?

6. How are school-based management and total quality management alike? If a school practices school-based management, can it incorporate total quality applications?
Is school-based management another correlate for school effectiveness?

7. What technical assistance will administrators need to be successful with school-based management and shared decision making?

8. How do the roles of people change under school-based management and what is the best way to make a smooth transition from bureaucratic control to local control?

9. Does school-based management make a difference? Is it a viable way to improve student outcomes and job satisfaction for those involved?
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A SURVEY OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF VIRGINIA

For the purpose of this study:

School-Based Management is a process designed to shift the
responsibility for making certain decisions from the central office to a
smaller educational unit, the school. In this definition central office refers
to the school board, the superintendent, and supervisory personnel.

Part I: For each item, please check the most appropriate answer. IT IS
IMPORTANT TO ANSWER ALL ITEMS. YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE
KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

Q-1. Does your school division have a written policy which defines
School-Based Management?

  ____ YES
  ____ NO

(If NO, go to Q-3)

Q-2. How long has this policy been in effect?

  ____ MONTHS
  ____ YEARS

Q-3. Does your school have a group of adults who serve as an advisory
team or who work cooperatively with the principal to plan for your
school?

  ____ YES
  ____ NO
Q-4. Who are the members of the advisory committee? (Please place a check beside each that applies.)

___ PRINCIPAL
___ TEACHER(S)
___ PARENTS
___ SUPPORT STAFF (IE: SECRETARY)
___ COMMUNITY ADVISOR
___ OTHER (PLEASE LIST)________

Q-5. How are the members of the advisory committee selected? (Please place a check beside each that applies)

___ THE PRINCIPAL APPOIN TS THE MEMBERS.
___ MEMBERS ARE NOMINATED AND VOTED UPON BY ALL INTERESTED PARTIES.
___ INTERESTED PARTIES VOLUNTEER TO SERVE ON THE COMMITTEE.
___ OTHER (PLEASE EXPLAIN): ____________________
PART II: DECISION MAKING RESPONSIBILITY

The following items represent a range of typical decisions which must be made during a school year. Think carefully about the school division in which you work and answer the questions as they describe the current decision making process in your system. There are no right or wrong answers, so do not hesitate to mark the items frankly. Again, all answers will be kept confidential. PLEASE DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.

Directions: For each question below you may distribute ten (10) points among one or more persons responsible for making decisions. If one person or group makes the decision alone, that person would be assigned all ten (10) points. If the decision is made by more than one person, divide the ten (10) points among those who have the most authority for making the decision. Please see the example. All other items should be answered in the same manner using the following key.

EXAMPLE:

**********************************************************************
DECISION MAKING RESPONSIBILITY THE DECISION TO BE MADE

1  1  4  2  2
CO BA T GC SAT
SELECT COMPUTER SOFTWARE
FOR THE SCHOOL

********************************************************************************

Key to abbreviations:
CO = Central Office BA = Building Administrators T = Teachers
(Superintendent, Board, Supervisory Staff) (Principal/Assistant Principal) (All Categories)
GC = Grade Level Chairperson SAT = School Advisory Team

********************************************************************************

Q-6. SELECT NEW TEACHERS
Q-7. ASSIGN TEACHERS TO A LEVEL IN THE BUILDING
Q-8. ORIENT NEW TEACHERS
Q-9. CONDUCT A SCHOOL NEEDS ASSESSMENT
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| Q-10. ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR SELECTING TEACHERS |
| Q-11. DETERMINE STAFF ASSIGNMENTS |
| Q-12. REASSIGN TEACHERS FROM ONE POSITION TO ANOTHER WITHIN THE BUILDING |
| Q-13. HIRE A NEW ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL |
| Q-14. ESTABLISH LINE ITEMS FOR THE LOCAL SCHOOL BUDGET |
| Q-15. DECIDE WHERE TO DEPOSIT LOCAL SCHOOL FUNDS |
| Q-16. DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT TO SCHEDULE A FUND RAISER |
| Q-17. PURCHASE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT |
| Q-18. DEVELOP A BUDGET FOR THE LOCAL SCHOOL |
| Q-19. MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS ALLOCATED TO THE SCHOOL |
| Q-20. SELECT FUND RAISING PROJECTS |
| Q-21. ORGANIZE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES |
Q-22. PLAN INSERVICE ACTIVITIES

Q-23. CONDUCT INSERVICE ACTIVITIES

Q-24. INFORM TEACHERS OF NEW EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Q-25. IDENTIFY THE RESOURCE NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL

Key to abbreviations:

CO = Central Office  BA = Building Administrators  T = Teachers
(Superintendent, Board, Supervisory Staff)  (Principal/Assistant Principal)  (All Categories)
GC = Grade Level Chairperson  SAT = School Advisory Team

Q-26. SELECT TEXTBOOKS

Q-27. EVALUATE SCHOOL’S PROGRESS TOWARD ESTABLISHED GOALS

Q-28. ORDER MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES

Q-29. SELECT VENDORS (ie: SCHOOL PICTURES)

Q-30. SELECT INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS (ie: MANIPULATIVES)

Q-31. SELECT SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT (ie: TAPE PLAYERS VS OVERHEAD PROJECTORS)
Q-32. APPROVE REQUISITIONS AND EXPENDITURES FOR A SCHOOL

Q-33. ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Q-34. APPROVE A PILOT INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN THE BUILDING

Q-35. APPROVE OUT OF DISTRICT FIELD TRIPS

Q-36. SELECT CURRICULUM FOR THE BUILDING

Q-37. SELECT INSTRUCTIONAL METHODOLOGY FOR THE SCHOOL

Q-38. EVALUATE TEACHERS FOR PERSONNEL DECISIONS

Q-39. SUPERVISE CLASSROOM TEACHERS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Q-40. ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Q-41. REPRESENT THE SCHOOL ON A TEXTBOOK SELECTION COMMITTEE

Q-42. PLAN AND CONDUCT FACULTY MEETINGS
Q-43. DEVELOP SCHOOL-WIDE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Q-44. DEVELOP SCHOOL-WIDE POLICIES

Q-45. DEVELOP SCHOOL-WIDE PROCEDURES

Q-46. ESTABLISH EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES

Q-47. REPLACE A TEACHING POSITION WITH TWO NON-TEACHING POSITIONS

Key to abbreviations:
CO = Central Office  BA = Building Administrators  T = Teachers
(Superintendent, Board, Supervisory Staff)  (Principal/Assistant Principal)  (All Categories)
GC = Grade Level Chairperson  SAT = School Advisory Team

Q-48. DETERMINE DEVIATION IN THE USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

Q-49. ESTABLISH CLASS SIZE

Q-50. IMPLEMENT AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Q-51. ESTABLISH HOMEWORK POLICY FOR THE SCHOOL

Q-52. DETERMINE STUDENT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
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Q-53. ESTABLISH GRADING AND AND REPORTING CRITERIA

Q-54. ESTABLISH SCHOOL DISCIPLINE POLICIES

Q-55. MAINTAIN STUDENT CONDUCT STANDARDS

Q-56. GROUP STUDENTS FOR INSTRUCTION

Q-57. ACCEPT OR REJECT A REQUEST FROM A SPECIFIC NON-SCHOOL GROUP TO USE THE SCHOOL FACILITY

Q-58. ESTABLISH SCHOOL DISTRICT POLICIES

Q-59. DEVELOP THE SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

Q-60. SEND A TEACHER ON A THREE DAY CONFERENCE

Q-61. CHANGE THE WORK HOURS OF A SECRETARY

Q-62. ESTABLISH AGENDA ITEMS FOR FACULTY MEETINGS
Is there anything else you would like to share about School-Based Management in your district, or your personal thoughts about School-Based Management? If so, please use this space for that purpose.

*********************************************************************************

CODE ________________
If you would like to have a summary of this study, include your name and address in the space provided.

Yes, I would like a copy of the results.

Name__________________________

Address__________________________

City______________________________

ZIP Code ____________

If you have any questions, call:

(804) 393-1555 Home
(804) 393-5070 Work

Please return to:

Betty J. Bartlett
4706 Westmoreland Terrace
Portsmouth, VA 23707

PLEASE RETURN BY MAY 28, 1992
A SURVEY OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF VIRGINIA

MAY 1992
This questionnaire has been designed to better understand a major reform now sweeping our country. Of particular interest is the impact of school-based management on Virginia’s elementary schools. Please answer all of the questions. If you wish to comment on any questions or qualify your answers, please feel free to use the margins. Your comments will be read and taken into account. Thank you for your interest and thoughtful response.
A SURVEY OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF VIRGINIA

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Betty J. Bardett
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APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE
May 12, 1992

Dear Fellow Principal:

School-based management is a process which is being promoted as a major strategy for restructuring schools in this decade. Important data are being collected to determine the best way to distribute authority for decision making among those interested in educational outcomes.

As a practicing principal working to complete the requirements for a Doctorate in Educational Administration from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I have selected School-Based Management Practices in the Elementary Schools of Virginia as my dissertation topic.

The primary purpose of this research is to determine the level of implementation of school-based management practices in our elementary schools. As a building level manager, I believe that we have the best information about the scope and sequence of decision making in our districts. Your participation is essential if this research is to reflect the status of school-based management in Virginia.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has a coded number on the inside back cover which will be used for mailing purposes only. This is so that your name can be checked off the mailing list once the questionnaire is returned.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call collect. My home telephone number is (804) 393-1555.

Thank you for spending a few thoughtful moments to complete and return this survey.

Sincerely,
Betty J. Bartlett, Principal
Churchland Elementary School
Portsmouth, Virginia
Last week a questionnaire was sent to you seeking your opinion about School-Based Management Practices in the Elementary Schools of Virginia.

If you have already completed and returned it, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please take the time today to share your thoughts with me. **It is extremely important that your opinion be included in this study if the results are to accurately represent the status of school-based management in our elementary schools.**

If by some chance you did not receive the survey, or if it has been misplaced, please call collect to my home (804-393-1555) or to Lee’s Yachting (804-484-2652). I will get another one in the mail to you today. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my topic.

Sincerely,

Betty J. Bartlett, Principal
Churchland Elementary School
CHURCHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
5601 Michael Lane  
Portsmouth, Virginia 23703  

Office of the Principal  

June 6, 1992  

Dear Colleague:  

As of today, I have not received your completed questionnaire concerning school-based management practices in Virginia. To my knowledge, this is the first statewide study to describe the extent to which this method is being practiced in our elementary schools. An accurate interpretation of the results is very important to those educators in districts across the state who are considering school-based management as a major reform strategy. Its usefulness depends on how accurately I am able to describe what is happening.  

The large number of questionnaires returned is encouraging; however, complete accuracy depends on you. Research suggests that those who have not yet sent in a questionnaire may be doing very different things than those who have already responded. It is for this reason that I am making a special plea requesting that you return the enclosed questionnaire by June 15, 1992.  

As a practicing elementary school principal, I am aware of the demands placed upon our time as we close school for the year. However, your contribution to the success of this study is critical. Please take a few minutes to share your thoughts with me.  

If you will not participate in this study, please return the unmarked questionnaire in the envelope provided. Upon receipt, I will withdraw your school from my list of participants.  

If you have any questions, please call collect (804) 393-1555, or leave a message on the answering machine. I will return your call as soon as possible.  

Most sincerely,  
Betty J. Bartlett
VITA

Betty Justice Bartlett
4706 Westmoreland Terrace
Portsmouth, VA 23707

Education


C.A.S. Educational Administration, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, 1987.

M.S. Elementary Education, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, 1976.


Experience

1993-Present Principal on Special Assignment

1987-1993 Principal, Churchland Elementary School, Portsmouth, Virginia.


1979-1983 Assistant Principal, Highland Biltmore Elementary School, Portsmouth, Virginia.

1978-1979 Assistant Principal, Churchland Elementary School, Portsmouth, Virginia.

1973-1976  Reading Specialist, Portsmouth Public Schools, Portsmouth, Virginia.


1961-1962  Fourth Grade Teacher, Indian Valley Elementary School, Floyd County, Virginia.


Betty J. Bartlett