CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In the early 1980s, a blue ribbon National Commission on Excellence in Education met to study the role of American education in international economic competition. The Commission's final report *A Nation at Risk* (1983) called for increased emphasis on accountability in regard to improved student outcomes (Goodman, 1995; Hertert, 1996; Hogan, 1985; Jackson, 1995; Kritek, 1996; Leslie, 1992; Tyack, 1992; Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Many school boards across the United States responded to this recommendation by charging superintendents to institute reform and restructuring initiatives designed to foster school improvement and promote student achievement. Tyack and Cuban (1995) describe many of the reforms as intensification mandates: "more days and hours of schooling, more academic courses, more attention to 'basics,' more discriminating standards for evaluating and compensating teachers, more standardized testing of pupil achievement, more elaborate reporting of test results by local districts to state officials" (p. 79). Similarly, Ottinger and Root (1994) point to "decentralized decision making structures, recruitment programs for minority teachers, multicultural curriculum, school-based self-assessment, and teacher professional development programs" in numerous school districts and cite them as examples of restructuring efforts (p. 5). Nevertheless, nearly one third of all students in public schools fail either to graduate, or they receive a diploma even though they are functionally illiterate (Schlechty, 1990). In addition, many more students are identified as being at-risk for failure.

At-risk children often do not enjoy the same kind of opportunity for health care or education as do other children, and they may experience a greater incidence of violence (Hodgkinson, 1989; Koppich, 1994; Kowalski, 1995). Current statistics about the conditions of American children indicate that one in five children live below the poverty line, 10 million children are without health insurance, and one child is killed every 98 minutes by a firearm (Children's Defense Fund, 1996). In addition, the school population in the United States is more diverse than it once was; an increasing number of students qualify for special education services, Section 504 accommodations, or Limited English Proficiency programs (Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990). Schorr and Schorr (1988) summarize the risks that may affect children's performance in school. Among these risks are premature birth; poor health and nutrition; child abuse; teenage pregnancy; delinquency; family stress; academic failure; persistent poverty;

inaccessible social and health services; and inadequate housing and medical treatment.

Consequently, many who advocate for children's issues argue that success in school depends on more than just the educational programs offered within schools; they propose a coordination of services across educational, social, health, and judicial agencies to better meet the needs of at-risk children (Adler & Gardner, 1994; Dryfoos, 1994; Gray, 1995; Kirst, 1994; Melaville, Blank, & Asayesh, 1993; Rigsby, Reynolds, & Wang, 1995; White & Wehlage, 1995). Tyack (1992) states "indeed, some reformers may argue that, without the support of multiple noneducational services, the primary goal - academic improvement for a significant percentage of students - is unachievable" (p. 29). The task of seeking higher academic standards and tending to the needs of a growing at-risk student population poses a provocative administrative challenge for school superintendents.

<u>Statement of the Problem</u>

The media is filled with stories questioning the effectiveness of public education. Crowson and Boyd (1995) note "much of the current effort to reform education finds its rationale in institutional failure" (p. 136). Moreover, for perhaps the first time in the history of the United States, the notion that America's industrial rivals might eventually overtake it has gained credibility (DeYoung, 1989; Goodman, 1995; Gray, 1995; Rigsby, 1995). Sailor and Skrtic (1996) suggest that "the uncertainty we feel today - in cultural, economic, and professional life - stems ... from the fact that western civilization is undergoing a fundamental change in world perspective, toward one that questions the very ideas upon which our modern institutions are premised " (p. 267).

Because schools tend to reflect the culture in which they operate (Kaestle, 1983; Kowalski, 1995; Tyack, 1974), superintendents in their role as chief executive officers of school districts face almost daily the type of uncertainty described by Sailor and Skrtic. For example, superintendents may be unaware that a problem exists with a program until the community cries out that their needs are not being met. According to Hannaway (1989), complaints can be "a call for action" (p. 57). Lately, superintendents have been most likely to field complaints about changes resulting from attempts toward school improvement. Most of these initiatives fall into one of three movements in educational reform: school restructuring, inclusion, or school-linked service integration (Sailor & Skrtic, 1996).

Of the three, school-linked service integration is perhaps the most ambitious type of school reform because it promotes a new ecology of schooling (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Crowson & Boyd, 1996; Jehl & Kirst,

<div align="center">2</div>

1992), making a variety of educational, health, judicial, and social services available to meet children's individual needs (Adler & Gardner, 1994; Cibulka & Kritek, 1996; Dryfoos, 1994; Gray, 1995; Kirst, 1994; Melaville et al., 1993; Rigsby et al., 1995; White & Wehlage, 1995). This approach is an attempt to reinvent children's services programs which in the past have tended to be fragmented at best (Bruininks, Frenzel, & Kelly, 1994; Garvin & Young, 1994; Hertert, 1996; Kirst, 1991; Koppich, 1994; Melaville et al., 1993; Rist, 1992; Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1995). Children and families have had to deal separately and alone with educators, health-care providers, social-service workers, and court officers within a system that is not "family-friendly" (Amato, 1996; U. S. Department of Education, 1994).

School-linked services, on the other hand, embrace a child-development ethic which does not distinguish between care and education (Kagan, 1989). This philosophy is illustrative of John Dewey's (1900) notion that what the best and wisest parents want for their children, the community must want for all its children. The idea is to assume the responsibility of improving both the life and educational prospects for all children (Miron, 1995; Rigsby et al., 1995).

Crowson and Boyd (1993) maintain that "public schools find it hard to merge these two responsibilities" (p. 146). They insist that "the encouragement of learning and the act of teaching are such difficult, time-consuming responsibilities, in and of themselves, that any enlargement of educator roles toward further 'caring' becomes more than most professionals can bear" (pp. 145-146). Nevertheless, the development of school-linked services has progressed to a point where educators might consider whether a change in their roles is needed.

Sullivan and Sugarman (1996) argue that two recent pieces of legislation - the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* and the reauthorized *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* of 1994, [*Improve America Schools Act*]- establish a basis for "federal support of school-linked integrated services"(p. 287). As Sullivan and Sugarman reason, the language of the two acts recognizes "the importance of health, nutrition, and social services to student achievement" (p. 287). The legislation also proposes such specific strategies as professional development for teachers, pupil services personnel and other staff as a means to coordinating education and human service reform (U. S. Department of Education, 1996).

In fact, different approaches for coordinating services have already emerged as a result of grass-root effort or by state mandate to improve children's services in such states as California, New Jersey, Florida, Kentucky, Illinois, and Louisiana (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Dryfoos, 1994; Edwards & Biocchi, 1996; First, Curcio, & Young, 1994; Miron,

3

1995; Smrekar, 1994; Sullivan & Sugarman, 1996; U. S. Department of Education, 1996). These states either have large numbers of impoverished children, many "minority-majority" communities, or increasing youth-against-youth violence (Kowalski, 1995). Often, but not always, the models for coordinated service activity include some form of school-linked integrated services and may contain a full-service school component (Dryfoos, 1994; First et al., 1994; Lawson, 1995; Rigsby et al., 1995). To date, no single model for collaborative school-linked services exists (Levy & Shepardson, 1992; Gardner, 1992; Dryfoos, 1994; First et al., 1994).

Gardner (1993) hypothesizes that "successful programs must be shaped by the history and current needs of the community, the politics of agency relationships and government entities, and the unique energies and talents of particular program leaders" (p. 141). What may be required is a break up of the old order of schooling and the creation of a new one, which will likely have a strong impact on the role of school superintendents. The scope and range of this transformation make successful integration of school-linked services a daunting proposition for school leaders and for those representing community agencies. According to Lugg (1994) moving from a policy that calls for a coordination of services into the actual practice of providing services "requires the resolution of a host of complex issues" (p. 1).

School superintendents are likely to play a major role in resolving these issues. Traditionally superintendents have been expected to implement and manage program changes resulting from the policy mandates of school boards (Blumberg, 1985; Kowalski, 1995; Spring, 1993). Their role is often perceived as one of "control" (P. Houston, personal communication, December 2, 1996; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). This role is sometimes compromised when a superintendent is held accountable for the success of policy mandates which the superintendent did not create or champion (Eaton, 1990; Jackson, 1996; Lutz, 1990; Willie, 1994). Because of a perceived lack of confidence in public schools in general, Johnson (1996) suggests that superintendents may have to expand their role "to build coalitions and negotiate agreements that will strengthen the standing of the schools in the community" (p. 274). Perhaps as a result, the role of the superintendency is increasingly being described by using such adjectives as instructional, managerial, political, and relational to describe the type of leadership required of the work (Drath, 1996; Hord, 1990; Jackson, 1996; Johnson, 1996; Konnert & Augenstein, 1995).

In the future and most immediately in urban school districts or those with high percentages of at-risk children, one of the strongest demands on the superintendent's time may be to implement a functional link between the school and the community. As a result, efforts will extend beyond the fragmented, crisis oriented design that characterizes the current system of

children's services toward one that addresses the whole child (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Bruininks et al., 1994; Crowson & Boyd, 1996; Kirst, 1991; Melaville et al., 1993; U. S. Department of Education, 1994; Wang et al., 1995). In anticipation of this change, it is important to learn what superintendents think about the challenges of administering schools with links to community agencies.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore through qualitative inquiry the views of selected superintendents about administrative issues involving school-linked service integration. The following research questions guide the data collection in this study:

1. What views emerge when superintendents discuss school-linked service integration?

2. What aspects of school-linked service integration do superintendents identify as most beneficial?

3. What administrative issues of school-linked service integration do superintendents identify as most challenging?

4.   What aspects of background, experience, or educational philosophy emerge when superintendents describe their views about administrative issues of school-linked service integration?

Justification of the Study

This is not the first time educators have been encouraged to participate in a coordination of services for children (Tyack, 1974). There have been many attempts to use the school as a point of contact to provide noneducational services to children (Tyack, 1992). Presently, the diversity and growth of school-linked integration efforts are expanding rapidly (First et al., 1994).

In order to fulfill the promise and to obtain the full potential of school-linked service integration, a better theoretical and practical understanding of the administrative issues must be acquired (Crowson & Boyd, 1993). Gardner (1993) refers to these administrative matters as "nuts and bolts issues" of governance and staffing (p. 141). Researchers such as Cunningham (1990), Gray (1991), Hannaway (1989), Herrington (1996), and Kirst (1991) classify these issues into concerns about professional turf, resources, accountability, risk management, and leadership.

Similarly, Crowson and Boyd, (1993) cite an evaluation of some 1960s school-based service-coordination experiments done by the Syracuse University Research Corporation (1971) and connect it to management problems identified by Cunningham (1990), Gray (1991), and Kirst (1991). Crowson and Boyd (1993) specify four key categories of

unresolved administrative issues on the institutional side of services integration:

(1) The institution and its connections which include issues of information sharing, resource mingling, and professional turf
(2) The professionalization of service coordination which is heavily constrained by a separation of training and certification systems
(3) The support threshold which includes resources, risks, and stewardship
(4) The issue of governance which involves the legitimacy and perceived neutrality to oversee collaboration

Other recent studies (Gray, 1995; Sullivan & Sugarman,1995; White & Wehlage,1995) examining school and community linkages emphasize the importance of resolving administrative controversies to ensure successful collaboration. White and Wehlage (1995) write that collaboration relies on reaching agreements among diverse groups of professionals about "how best to implement policy" (p. 25). Gray (1995) emphasizes that the obstacles to reaching such collaboration "are rooted in the philosophy and patterns of activity associated with what Robert Reich (1983) has termed the 'management era,' characterized by assumptions about stable environments, standardized mass production, and continued growth" (p. 75). Similarly, Sullivan & Sugarman (1995) insist that "administrative practices that preserve the status quo, but do not improve efficiency and effectiveness," inhibit coordinated service delivery (p. 289). Each of these studies note the importance of enlightened administration to successful implementation of coordinated service ventures.

Ultimately the success of current attempts at school-linked service integration will require what Stout (1989) characterizes as "forward-looking administrators who will establish the conditions for improvement" (p. 390). DeYoung writes, "While national and state commissions and agencies increasingly make proposals and recommendations for educational change, the governance and administration of educational programs are still the prerogative of the local school district and its administrative head, the superintendent" (p. 34). These ideas represent Fullan's (1982) belief that the superintendent "is the single most important individual for setting the expectations and tone of the pattern of change within the local district" (p. 159).

Surprisingly, little research exists on the role superintendents play in the administration of school-linked service integration (Herrington, 1996; Hord, 1990; Jackson, 1995; Kowalski, 1995; Leithwood, 1995; Murphy, 1995). Some researchers view the superintendency as a difficult area to study and believe, like Kowalski (1995), that research about superintendents "is difficult to execute" (p. 147-148). For example, Leithwood (1995) claims that it is a formidable task to attach "leadership

6

practices with the achievement of central organizational goals" (p. 8). In addition, superintendents by virtue of their training and status in the community are often regarded as a type of "professional elite" (Hertz & Imber, 1995). For many researchers it is awkward to "study up" or to acquire access to those more powerful than the researcher (Lofland & Lofland, 1984). Others, such as Jackson (1995), suggest that studying superintendents is tricky because some researchers approach school organizational studies with a view of superintendents as "part of the problem" (p. 47). These researchers believe that it is difficult to get superintendents to take the time to reflect on the issues under study and that at times it is not in the best interest of the superintendent to provide candid answers about controversial topics. As a result, not much is known about how superintendents regard school-linked service integration or the conditions required to administer a successful implementation.

Because of the legal, political, and practical implications of these issues, superintendents, school board members, other human service agency personnel, and community leaders need guidance in establishing appropriate governance structures which can be administered well. The impetus for supplying this guidance could be the willingness of the superintendent to engage in school-linked service integration. The issue is: What could be achieved in the interests of children if superintendents were knowledgeable and open to working with other agencies in the community?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, definitions of terms include the following:

Administrative issues involve management and leadership matters associated with school-linked service integration. Issues may include concerns about governance, guidance, resources, funding, accountability, risk management, space, confidentiality, or professional turf (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Cunningham, 1990; Gardner, 1992; Gray, 1995; Hannaway, 1989; Kirst, 1991; Koppich & Kirst, 1993; Smylie, Crowson, Chou, & Levin, 1996; Sullivan & Sugarman, 1996; Syracuse University Corporation, 1971; Wood & Gray, 1991).

Collaboration occurs when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures to act or decide on issues related to that domain (Wood & Gray, 1991; Gray, 1995).

Educational reforms are planned efforts to change schools in order to correct perceived social and educational problems (Tyack and Cuban, 1995).

School-linked services are those in which integrated health, social, and judicial services are provided near a school with an administrative

7

structure that links the school system to the provider agencies. School-linked services may incorporate either a community-based approach in which services are administered by community agencies, serving as referral points for school practitioners or a school-based, or a full-service schools model in which services are delivered directly in school buildings (Dryfoos, 1994; Lugg, 1994; Rigsby et al., 1995).

$\qquad$ Superintendents are those individuals who are appointed to serve as the chief executive officer of a school district, providing professional leadership for a district's schools (Blumberg, 1985; AASA, 1994).

Methodology

Because the focus of this study is on issues of educational administration and leadership relating to school-linked service integration, data will be collected only from district superintendents. Elements related to superintendents' views about school-linked service integration will be explored holistically and the investigation will follow an iterative or self-correcting design (Langenbach, Vaughn, & Aagaard, 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Standardized open-ended interviews will be used as a technique for qualitative inquiry (McCracken, 1988; Patton, 1990; Seidman, 1991).

A qualitative methodology will be used for two reasons. First, the goal of this research is to acquire a deeper understanding of complex issues, complicated relationships, and slowly evolving events (Mason, 1996; McCracken, 1988; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Seidman, 1991). This kind of investigation demands in-depth understanding of a situation that is often best communicated through detailed examples and stories (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). A qualitative methodology results in the collection of a preponderance of data containing rich description to illustrate and interpret meaning as well as behavior (Frankel & Wallen, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Yow, 1994). Second, a qualitative methodology will be used because it provides the most appropriate means of generating meaningful data from a population that has sometimes been difficult to access (Hertz & Imber, 1995; McCracken, 1988; Ostrander, 1995; Patton, 1990; Seidman, 1991). Such a methodology provides a "manageable methodological context" within which subjects can express their views in a way that does not invade their privacy nor intrude on their day-to-day schedules (McCracken, 1988).

Delimitations of the Study

The study will be delimited by geographical restriction to states which mandate school-linked service integration for one iteration. The subjects in the study will include nine school district superintendents. A non-probability approach will be used for sampling.

<center>Limitations of the Study</center>

Generalizations that can be drawn will be limited as a result of using a qualitative methodology with fewer than ten subjects. Attempts to generalize beyond the contexts of those described would have to be evaluated in comparison to the circumstances of this study. Readers of this study might consider, as Langenbach et al., (1994) suggest, whether the descriptions of the findings provide enough information "to permit some transferability of results to other settings" (p. 88). Therefore, readers of the study, not the researcher, might determine whether or not the results are applicable to their own or other situations (Merriam, 1988).

<center>Summary of Chapters</center>

Chapter II contains a review of the literature pertaining to this study. Methodology used for implementation is detailed in Chapter III. Chapter IV includes the results of the study. Chapter V presents conclusions and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II
Review of the Literature

Chapter Overview
Chapter II is a review of the literature related to school-linked service integration and the superintendency. Background information on the relationship of school-linked service integration to school reform is included. Next, the concept of school-linked service integration is defined and explained. Then, administrative issues of school-linked service integration are discussed. The last section in this chapter pertains to the role of the superintendent in regard to school-linked service integration.

School Reform
Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, professional literature about education has focused on the topic of change in schools. Much has been written about educational reform and restructuring and school transformation. In fact, so much has been written regarding these efforts that they have often been described through the metaphor of "waves" (Goodman, 1995; Hertert, 1996; Jackson, 1995; Kritek, 1996; Leslie, 1992; Tyack, 1992; Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

According to Hertert (1996), shortly after *A Nation at Risk* appeared, "a flurry of legislation aimed at top-down, prescriptive control of public education" produced a first wave of reform (p. 379), stressing as Kirst and Kelley (1995) report, "the link between national competitiveness in the international arena and the development of the country's human capital" (p. 27). Murphy (1996) characterizes this wave as an "excellence movement" (p. 117) propelled by what Tyack and Cuban (1995) refer to as "intensification mandates"(p. 79). The mandates required students and teachers to work longer and harder to achieve higher educational standards. Results were to be measured through testing by local school district personnel and then reported to state officials.

Murphy (1996) writes that toward the end of the 1980s "the prevailing assumptions underlying the excellence movement came under attack" (p. 117). As a result, a second wave of reform emerged. Hertert (1996) identifies this wave as one "focused on restructuring the organizational and governance systems of public education through teacher professionalism, school-based management, and parental involvement" (p. 380). Murphy (1996) adds that central to the restructuring effort are the following assumptions about school reform:

1. Educational problems are attributable more to the failure of the system of schooling than to the shortcomings of individual educators.
2. Empowerment (of students, teachers, and parents) is a more effective tool than prescription.
3. Bottom-up, school-based strategies will lead to more satisfying results than will top-down, mandated ones. (p. 117)

Reflected in Murphy's list of assumptions is Sarason's (1990) belief that school reform will not occur until existing power relationships in schools are altered. The restructuring effort puts a greater emphasis on shared governance as well as on improving teacher education and the curriculum to upgrade schools (Jackson, 1995). Many restructuring efforts also emphasize the study of multiculturalism and the recruitment of minority teachers and administrators. In addition, attempts toward accountability often include a school-based self-assessment component (Ottinger & Root, 1994). Carter and Cunningham observe that a major theme in restructuring "is that change in education cannot be expert driven but must be shaped by all those who have an interest in the education process" (p. 40).

Although evaluation is ongoing, there is little evidence to date that restructuring efforts, such as shared decision making, have had a positive impact on student achievement (Liontos & Lashway, 1997; McNeill & McNeill, 1994; Miller, 1995). The nature of childrens' needs, changing demographics, increasing community violence, and deteriorating school facilities continue to strain the resources of even the most effective schools (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Hertert, 1996; Hodgkinson, 1989; Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990; Koppich, 1994; Kowalski, 1995; Schorr & Schorr, 1988; Verstegen, 1996).

Moreover, in many areas of the country, restructuring draws opposition from special interest groups. Norton, Webb, Dlugosh, and Sybouts (1996) note that the religious right or conservative citizen groups often try to stop restructuring efforts by seeking to block the adoption of an entire textbook series, an entire instructional program, or the strategies aimed at redesigning the traditional school day. These groups believe that schools should tend only to the "basics."

Challenges such as these have resulted in yet a third wave of school reform which Kritek (1996) concludes is ushering "in policies enabling families to choose the school of their choice from a menu of public and private options"(p. xiv). He refers to this wave as a "mechanism of the marketplace."

Norton et al. (1996) believe a marketplace mentality could have profound repercussions for public schooling. They report that Martha M. McCarthy, former president of the National Organization for Legal

11

Problems in Education, has observed that the primary goal of some special interest groups appears to be "to discredit public education to the point that the entire system will crumble and be replaced with unregulated vouchers" (p. 46). Verstegen (1996) maintains that marketplace proposals raise questions about access to equal educational opportunity and writes:

> In this context, equal educational opportunity is interpreted to mean student access and outcomes consistent with a quality education - not a basic or a minimum education. A major issue for the future is how to restructure the education system to achieve long-term, systemic change and improvement consistent with the definition of equal educational opportunity. (p. 272)

Alexander and Salmon (1995) argue that inherent to this issue is the continued existence of the public common school in which all persons rich and poor sit side-by-side and from which all benefit in common.

In the midst of these controversies about school reform, Goodman (1995) declares that no reform is likely to sustain itself unless reformers recognize and address "the values upon which people's actions and ideas are based" (p. 22). Carter and Cunningham (1997) also acknowledge the importance of identifying core values which they define as "the shared understandings and beliefs that should determine all action and behavior" (pp. 187-188). They cite the following as examples of core values and comment:

> Developing as lifelong learners
> Becoming active, contributing members of a global society
> Being technologically literate
> Believing that all students "can" and "will" learn
> Understanding that schooling represents preparation for life
> Respecting human differences
> These core values provide the impetus that moves the school district toward a shared vision. Because core values are shared and valued as norms in the district, they provide a checklist against which decisions can be assessed. (p. 188)

Goodman (1995) furthers the argument about the importance of recognizing shared values by incorporating the three previously mentioned waves of school reform into a larger context which he too calls a third wave. He contends that it is one premised on school transformation "for the coming 'information and technology' age" (p. 1). He maintains that this third wave is a response to outdated models of schooling developed when the American economy was dependent first on agrarian and later on industrial outputs. He identifies this larger third wave as one "emerg [ing] from the interrelated fields of educational technology, instructional design, and systems theory" (p. 1). Goodman speculates on the various definitions of school reform and writes, "Like other educational concepts (e.g.,

reflection, empowerment) that attain popularity, the meanings behind the words become so obscured that over time they take on whatever connotations a particular individual chooses to give them" (p. 23).

Goodman's concern about what constitutes school reform as well as its progress and the motivation of school reformers is only one of many currently articulated in the professional literature. In addition to articles printed in various educational journals, over a hundred national and state reports have appeared in the last ten years examining issues and problems related to educational reform (Jackson, 1995). Perhaps none of the reform measures have been as far reaching as the movement toward integrated services for children (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Crowson & Boyd, 1996; Jehl & Kirst,1992).

<center>School-linked Service Integration</center>

During the first half of the twentieth century, schools more often than not were administered according to a professional-technical model, premised on ideas of social efficiency, scientific management, and institutional foresight (Tyack, 1974). There was a prevailing notion that schools could do more with less. Both Tyack (1974) and Cibulka (1996) point out that educational administrators believed they knew best how to educate children and that the lay community and parents should play a secondary, supportive role to them. Furthermore, as Cibulka notes, most of these administrators assumed that they were working with stable family and community environments and that school leaders could provide adequate education primarily through the technical application of resources and their own skills.

Many of these assumptions have lost credibility in the later part of the twentieth century (Cibulka, 1996; Sailor & Skrtic, 1996; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Sarason (1990) writes that the educational community faces two challenges in the way it currently presents itself to the public. Sarason believes that educators must stop promising the public more than they can deliver and that they must educate the public about the problems of schooling. According to Sarason, educators can no longer "accept full responsibility for dealing with educational problems, most of which by their very nature are exacerbated by forces beyond the school" (p. 39).

Rist (1992) apparently concurs and quotes two school district superintendents whose activities and rhetoric are illustrative of this approach. Rist points to Tom Payzant, the superintendent who implemented San Diego's New Beginnings program, who says that on the one hand, "we worry about education and focus on our academic mission," and on the other, "we know we have to meet the child's needs" (p. 22). Then, Rist refers to Robert Donofrio, a superintendent who initiated a "web of in-house support services" for children in the Murphy Elementary

<center>13</center>

School District in Phoenix. Rist quotes Donofrio who addresses the following issue: "How do you teach to an empty desk? We make sure we get the student into school every day, not hungry, not embarrassed about his clothing, so we can do what we're traditionally expected to do" (p. 22).

Although more and more educators, like Payzant and Donofrio, recognize that students come to them with multiple and complex needs (Hodgkinson, 1989; Kirst and McLaughlin, 1990; Koppich, 1994; Kowalski, 1995), a strong tradition of separateness in health, education, and social services has persisted (Amato, 1996; U. S. Department of Education, 1996). Prior to the 1990s, services to children tended to be crisis-driven, fragmented, categorical, isolated, and at times impersonal (Bruininks et al., 1994; Kirst, 1991; Koppich, 1994; Melaville et al., 1993; Wang et al., 1995). Hertert (1996) describes the policies and programs that led to this approach as "fragmented, disconnected, and project-oriented" (p. 381). Moreover, this approach has resulted in a hodgepodge of costly, competing, and overlapping services whose effectiveness is difficult to assess (Garvin and Young, 1994).

The consequences of this fragmentation, according to Koppich (1994), have been threefold:

1. underservice - too many children slip through the social service cracks
2. limited focus on prevention - the state adopts a triage approach, treating problems as episodic rather than continuous
3. service fragmentation - little or no interagency collaboration (p. 57)

An increasing awareness about the outcomes of such fragmentation has engendered among proponents of school-linkages a belief that a coordination between education and such community services as health, welfare, juvenile justice, and social and rehabilitation services will lead to school transformation (Adler et al., 1994; Dryfoos, 1994; Gray, 1995; Kirst, 1992; Melaville et al.,1993; Rigsby et al., 1995; White et al., 1995). Similarly Kritek (1996) reasons that school-linked service integration is likely to result in a new focus in social policy "aimed more at prevention than remediation, at investment in children, [and] at designing structures that build and preserve families" (p. xi).

School-linked service integration, according to Sullivan and Sugarman (1996), does not typically result in "the merger of these service systems, but rather increased collaboration among them" (p. 285). A number of service agencies form partnerships to facilitate human service activities within the school setting (First et al., 1994) so that schools can operate as hubs for learning, child welfare, and family support-empowerment (Lawson, 1995). School personnel are not usually the

providers of services; however, they are often actively involved in identifying children who need services (Sullivan & Sugarman, 1996).

Although Adler (1994) reports a variety of definitions of what constitutes linking schools to various community agencies, Verstegen (1996) states that embedded within all successful efforts is the concept of partnership dependent "upon aligned education policies aimed at quality education for all children and all schools" (p. 269). Sullivan and Sugarman (1996) cite the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* and the reauthorized *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (*ESEA*) of 1994 as creating a basis for "federal support of school-linked integrated services" (p. 287). According to the U. S. Department of Education (1996), *The Goals 2000: Educate America Act* addresses school readiness; school completion; safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools; and parental participation. State and local education agencies are to create broad-based planning groups that include educators; parents; business leaders; and representatives of health, community, and human service agencies. In addition, Title I of ESEA provides to targeted assistance schools a portion of Title I funds if other public and private sources do not meet such needs as basic medical equipment; compensation for a school-linked services coordinator; or training for parents and professional development for teachers, pupil services personnel and other staff.

Additionally, Garvin and Young (1994) report that "in state after state, the legal challenges to how resources are distributed from district to district are causing entire school systems to reconsider linkages across multi-agency boundaries" (p. 95). School-linked services or full-service schools have been established through legislative mandate in states such as New Jersey, Kentucky, and Florida and through local and private sponsorship in various cities across the nation. Many of these programs seek to emulate Norway's national approach to linking services for children.

Norway provides a national model for school-linked service integration. In Norway, the school is not the primary service provider. Community agencies form partnerships with schools to work with children and their parents. Central to this effort is the institutionalized role of a child ombudsmen who acts not only as an advocate for children but for the family as well (Hagen and Tibbitts, 1994). The Norwegian system epitomizes Bronfenbrenner's (1979) holistic approach to meeting the needs of children, taking into account the connections between the multiple environments that influence child development. This approach continues despite efforts to transfer more and more fiscal responsibility to local municipalities.

Here in America, in 1988, New Jersey enacted the School Based Youth Services Program (SBYSP). Programs linking schools and social

services are located in or near the school and are not limited to a single statewide design. Family and mental health counseling, job training, substance abuse services, educational remediation, and recreation services are available to any student in a participating school. Students do not have to have an identified problem. There is no eligibility criteria; however, parental consent is required for all services.

The programs are operated jointly by the school system and one or more local nonprofit organizations, or by public health, mental health, or youth-serving agencies. Although schools are funded for collaborative projects through competitive grants, communities must contribute a minimum of 25% in direct funding or in-kind services and materials. Funds can be used only for expanded services and may not be substituted for existing services (Dryfoos, 1994; First et al., 1994).

In 1990, the New Jersey Supreme Court's decision in *Abbott v. Burke* found that disparities in curricular offerings constituted disparities in educational opportunities. Verstegen (1996) writes that "court-specified objectives for student attainment included the ability of students from poorer districts to compete for jobs with those from wealthier districts" (p. 274). Both Dryfoos (1994) and First et al. (1994) note that the decision in *Abbott v. Burke*, which also addressed the need for a variety of services for children and their families, further encouraged the development of additional school-linked service integration in New Jersey.

Another example of a state-initiated school-linked service integration is Kentucky's Family Resource/Youth Services Centers, authorized as a part of the The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) in 1989. Smrekar (1994) notes that KERA "establishes a system for statewide coordination of child serving agencies through a school-based collaborative arrangement" (p. 423). Throughout the state, Family Resource Centers are located either in or near schools in which 20 percent of the student population is eligible for free or reduced lunch (Dryfoos, 1994). The centers' mission is to co-ordinate and identify gaps in the existing service delivery system and to connect the academic needs of the student with the emotional and physical needs of the family (Russo & Lindle, 1994).

This connection is made in a way that is both acceptable for the families seeking assistance and for the school communities within which the centers are located. Local participants decide whether centers are to be situated inside the schools or in structures that are adjacent to the schools. The following services are provided: full-time preschool child care; referral to health and social services; employment counseling, training, and placement; drug and alcohol abuse counseling; and family crisis and mental health counseling (First et al., 1994; Russo & Lindle, 1994; Smrekar, 1994).

More recently, in 1990, Florida adopted The Full Service Schools Act, education reform legislation designed to provide services to high-risk students in need of medical and social services (Reynolds,1994). The Florida State Board of Education and the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (DHRS) work together to develop programs addressing substance abuse, teen-age pregnancy, and the risk of sexually transmitted disease (Dryfoos, 1994). State funding is provided to school districts which are then required to contract with other local community agencies to provide assistance through the district's full-service schools.

Currently, the programs operate using one of four collaborative models. The first type incorporates a full-service school model to provide comprehensive medical and social services to children in or near their neighborhood school. The second type involves school improvement projects which place public health nurses and aides in schools to conduct health screenings and referrals. The third type includes student support teams, comprised of a psychologist, social workers, and nurses who locate themselves in schools and evaluate and counsel students with behavioral or learning problems. The fourth type consists of locally designed plans that are initiated to develop programs specific to the needs of a particular community. According to Dryfoos (1994), in the future all schools in Florida will have a full service school component and will embody additional aspects of child care, vocational education, and mental and health services.

Additionally, school-linked integration efforts have also come into being as a result of grass-root effort at the local level (Adler, 1994; Dryfoos, 1994; First et al., 1994). The Yale Child Study Center's School Development Program, Philadelphia Children's Network, and New Beginnings in San Diego are examples of nationally recognized initiatives that include school-linked social and medical services (Adler, 1994). For example, New Beginnings seeks to improve outcomes for children and families through restructuring education, social services, and health systems. Three years of planning by a coalition of the San Diego City School District; the San Diego County Departments of Health, Social Services, and Probation; the City of San Diego; and the San Diego Housing Commission were devoted to bringing about this collaboration which now receives support from the Stuart Foundations and from the Danforth Foundation (Larson & Gomby, 1992).

Similarly, New Futures is a six-city community effort which develops formal collaborative structures among public and private organizations to address the problems of at-risk youth. Dayton, OH; Lawrence, MA; Little Rock, AR; Pittsburgh, PA; Savannah, GA; and Bridgeport, CT are the cities selected and sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation for participation in this project (White & Wehlage, 1995). The

purpose of New Futures is to affect the conditions that result in high rates of high school drop-outs, teen pregnancy, and young adult unemployment. The community-based collaboratives employ a case management approach to broker services from different community agencies, to serve as advocates of at-risk youth, and to provide feedback to city governments and the Foundation about the need for reforms in policy and practice concerning at-risk youth (White & Wehlage, 1995). New Futures is only one of several initiatives that receive financial support from a philanthropic organization. According to Herrington (1996), "the Pew Memorial Trust and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation have placed their considerable clout and funds behind such integrated-services approaches" (p. 202).

In some areas of the country, school-linked service integration is sponsored by universities in partnership with philanthropic organizations. A Chicago project *The Nation of Tomorrow* is such an example. According to Smylie et al. (1996), this five year old project's title is taken from a statement made by President Theodore Roosevelt: "When you take care of children, you are taking care of the nation of tomorrow" (p. 175).

In 1990, the University of Illinois began a coordinated children's services partnership with four low-income communities in Chicago. Funding comes from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and the University of Illinois.

The project has three components. Family Ties deals with parent education and involvement in the education of their children at school, employing Family Advocates to help parents determine child care needs and access appropriate community services. Partners in Health helps parents learn about health care available to them in their communities; elementary school nurses work with Family Advocates to facilitate their use. School Enhancement Activities are staff development programs aimed at helping teachers in each school understand how to address organizational problems which might hinder school improvement (Smylie et al., 1996).

The most elaborate effort thus far has been in New Orleans, Louisiana, where there are at least two examples of a community's awareness that children's needs could be met in a better way and that doing so would serve the whole community. One example represents an effort to reach a particular group of citizens; the other is a much broader initiative designed to facilitate reform across the entire system. In New Orleans, integrated children's services reach across the mayor's office, the local business community, the local public school system, the local archdiocesan school system, the local universities (public and private), the governor's office, the parent organizations, and local agencies to coordinate education, health, employment, mental health, juvenile court, and social services (Garvin & Young, 1994).

One of New Orleans' programs involves approximately forty families among three school sites. These families are in need of medical services and social services, which this program seeks to provide through the child's elementary school within a case management system. Attention in this program has centered around finding ways to coordinate available resources and use them in more creative ways (Garvin & Young, 1994). For example, a grant was obtained from the Toyota Corporation to supplement existing resource funding for this particular coordination effort.

The second venture sought to make New Orleans one of six Empowerment Zones within the nation. Warner (1994) reporting in the *Times-Picayune* wrote that if this attempt succeeded, the city would receive as much as $100 million in tax breaks and social services (Miron,1995). Although this effort did not succeed, the community's attempt to foster greater cooperation has resulted in an increased willingness toward further community collaboration (L. Miron, personal communication, February 10, 1997).

All of these efforts toward collaboration are representative of the various approaches to school-linked services integration. To date, no single model for collaborative school-linked services exists (Dryfoos, 1994; First et al., 1994; Gardner, 1993; Levy & Shepardson, 1992). In 1995, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation recognized 135 exemplary community and school partnerships from across the United States (Edwards & Biocchi, 1995) No two school projects among those recognized demonstrated exactly the same characteristics, yet all were deemed to be successful collaborations. The different approaches to school and community collaboration further demonstrate a growing awareness on the part of some citizens that community development is connected not only to improved social and health services but to improved public schooling as well (Miron, 1995; Garvin & Young, 1994).

Administrative Issues of School-linked Service Integration
Surprisingly, according to Herrington (1996) "little has appeared within the educational administration literature investigating the managerial and leadership issues raised for educational administrators by these new programmatic linkages" (p.198). Research about school-linked service integration typically focuses on the growing needs of children, the fragmentation of the children's services system, and the need for school and human service agency collaboration. Various phases of collaboration are usually discussed and described in terms of the following three steps: problem identification, goal setting, and implementation (Gray, 1995). There are many illustrations and explanations describing the context for participation, planning, information exchange, and consensus building

essential to service integration. Conversely, not enough attention has been given to the problems of managing school-linked service integration nor to the leadership issues that surround them (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Gardner, 1993; Herrington, 1996; Hord, 1990; Smylie & Crowson, 1996; Smylie et al., 1996).

Gardner (1993) calls these concerns "nuts and bolts issues" of governance and staffing (p.141); whereas Herrington (1996) refers to them as technical or administrative problems, and Crowson and Boyd (1993) and Smylie et al. (1996) call them "deep structure" problems.   Some researchers categorize more specifically the issues as having to do with professional turf, resources, accountability and risk management (Cunningham, 1990; Gray, 1995; Hannaway, 1989; Kirst, 1991; Syracuse University Research Corporation,1971; Wood & Gray, 1991). Koppich and Kirst (1993) also cite "barriers" to an integrated services approach and include funding, space, confidentiality, staff training, and governance in their list (p. 126). For the most part, say Sullivan and Sugarman (1996), three major barriers affect service delivery:

1. Administrative practices that preserve the status-quo, but do not improve efficiency and effectiveness
2. Difficulties in blending various funding streams
3. Staff who have not yet been trained, coached, inspired, and managed to assume new roles and responsibilities (p. 289)

Gray (1995) comments that the issues, in whatever manner they are defined or presented, represent "formidable obstacles" to implementing school-linked service integration (p. 75). Generally, the issues affecting the administration of school-linked services fall into the following three broad areas of concern: governance, resources, and accountability.

One of the most perplexing administrative issues of school-linked service integration involves governance (Crowson & Boyd, 1993). The issue involves stewardship and leadership. As Koppich and Kirst (1993) ask: "If one agency assumes primary governance responsibility, will the other participating agencies consider themselves full partners? If no agency takes the lead, then where does responsibility for service delivery rest?" (p. 126). Successful governance, according to Gray (1995), "means clarifying who has the authority to act on agreements that are reached and who will assume responsibility for ensuring that they are carried out" (p. 86).

The governance choices about who should oversee school-linked services come from among three options: the schools or another existing social service, health, or judicial agency; a new non-profit agency; or a consortium of agencies that establish an operation that is co-equal, more or less (Gardner, 1992; U. S. Department of Education, 1996). Gardner suggests that it is probably not a good idea for any one agency to take the

lead, implying that the latter two choices are more likely to be successful. He further points out that "it has proven difficult for a school-dominated governance system to operate successful school-linked services" (p. 91). He lists the following five primary reasons:

1. the difficulty of attracting other agencies' funds if schools are seen to be in charge
2. the difficulty of structuring the hierarchy so staff members from other agencies report only to school personnel
3. the possibility that only one or two agencies will come under school management, rather than the broad array that can be attracted to a system of genuine partnership
4. the need for space that many cramped urban schools face
5. the enormous challenges faced by schools in responding to the tasks for which they are most directly responsible - reforming the education system and raising levels of academic achievement (p. 91)

Additional concerns about governance arise because schools and agencies have traditionally delivered their services on an individual, categorical, and contractual basis (Gray, 1995). Relationships between clients and providers are clearly defined and limited (Sullivan & Sugarman, 1996; White & Wehlage, 1995). Where collaborative forms of governance develop, turf battles emerge and are expressed in questions about confidentiality, information sharing, and ownership (Dryfoos, 1993).

Smylie and Crowson (1996) characterize these problems within a cross-agency perspective, referred to as the "the New Institutionalism." They argue that "institutions matter" and present significant challenges to any form of governance involving service coordination (p. 5). The idea is that organizational behavior cannot be explained only through the behaviors of individual members. "Deep structure problems" evolve from organizational histories and conventions which create a kind of "organizational persistence" toward any kind of change. Other authors describe similar problems within the change process and categorize them among challenges basic to the transformation of any organizational culture (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Handy, 1989; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992; Wheatley, 1994). The implication for school-linked services is that professionals whether from schools or community agencies get their professional identities and tend to give their loyalties to the organizations they represent rather than to the children they serve (White and Wehlage, 1995).

Several other researchers address this problem from different perspectives. According to Rist (1992), "Agency and school leaders alike say the obstacles begin with institutional regulations and legal mandates" (p.

22). Sullivan and Sugarman reason that such guidelines were first put into place in order to assure "proper and efficient administration" of categorical programs; however, guidelines sometimes impede collaboration (p. 286).

Others point out that controversy and misunderstanding among diverse groups of professionals are inevitable. For example, teachers are trained in schools of education, social workers in schools of social welfare, and health professionals in medical schools; all have a technical vocabulary unique to their own areas of expertise. The specialized and distinctive nature of their training does not encourage a shared language in which to discuss their differences (Adler, 1994; Koppich & Kirst,1993; Mitchell & Scott, 1994).

Still others lament the lack of synergistic leadership which is capable of managing the kind of change that school-linked service integration requires of organizations (Gardner, 1994; Garvin & Young, 1994; Payzant, 1992; Zetlin, 1995). Senge (1990) comments on the limitations of conventional leadership perspectives and writes:

> Our prevailing leadership myths are still captured by the image of the captain of the cavalry leading the charge to rescue the settlers from the attacking Indians. So long as such myths prevail, they reinforce a focus on short-term events and charismatic heroes rather than on systemic forces and collective learning. At its heart, the traditional view of leadership is based on assumptions of people's powerlessness, their lack of personal vision and inability to master the forces of change, deficits which can be remedied only be a few great leaders. (p. 340)

Senge calls for a new vision of leadership and describes leaders as designers, stewards, and teachers rather than managers. He states that leaders "are responsible for building organizations where people continually expand their capabilities to understand complexity, clarify vision, and improve shared mental models - that is, they are responsible for learning" (p. 340).

As representatives from business and various sectors of government join educators and agency workers on an informal basis to share information and expertise, decisions about how to proceed are likely to be made from a bottom-up approach rather than a top-down one. Administrative roles and behaviors must therefore shift from control to facilitation (First et al., 1994; Carter & Cunningham, 1997). In other words, someone must provide the glue which connects the policy makers, the practitioners, and the community. This someone is a leader who can build capacity among the members of an organization to respond and react effectively to changing conditions. A new vision of leadership, like the one described by Senge (1990), is at present a missing component of many school-linked initiatives and serves to further complicate the issues

associated with who holds ultimate authority and responsibility for those initiatives.

Gardner (1992) suggests that eventually these "governance issues become finance issues. The agency that contributes the most funding wants and perhaps needs to maintain control" (p. 91). As Farrow and Joe (1992) note, "The issues that surround the financing of school-linked services are really issues of priorities, authority, and control over resources" (p. 57). They add that trying to combine resources to support a unified school-linked program further accentuates differences among participants. Categorical funding, a crisis orientation, and the lack of a universal entitlement approach create what Farrow and Joe (1992) describe as a "patchwork approach" to funding school-linked services (pp. 61-62).

Many states, according to Verstegen (1996), have separated children's services within "funding channels" and "have been hesitant to collaborate with outside agencies due to perceived increased administrative burdens and turf questions" (p. 285). As the number of school-linked initiatives increase, questions about the extent of services, the nature of services, and the constituencies receiving services further challenge the current ways of funding services (Herrington, 1996).

Moreover, current funding patterns do not encourage or reward collaboration (Koppich & Kirst, 1993). According to Crowson and Boyd (1996), programs are most often financed through "soft funding," which tends to leave school-linked projects "on the organizational periphery." As a result, rules concerning "allocations of professional space, powers, and prerogatives" do not change (p. 257).

Further complicating the financial administration of school-linked service integration is the issue of accountability, which Kahne and Kelley (1993) define as "organizational procedures or incentives that monitor, reward, and sanction organizational behavior and employee performance" (p. 195). They acknowledge that "accountability mechanisms affect the legitimacy of particular agencies" and by association the reputations of the administrators who run them (p. 195). As they point out, accountability implies that funds are being spent for the appropriate categories of activities and that an appropriate number of cases are being processed. "In short," write Kahne and Kelley, "the predominant accountability structures used to monitor the provisions of children's services focus on process and neglect outcomes" (p. 196).

Gomby and Larson (1992) describe process evaluations as ones which concentrate on "what services are provided to whom and how" (p. 70). They may be used to monitor program implementation, to identify changes to make programs operate as planned, or to examine how various agencies interact during implementation. In contrast, outcome evaluations determine whether the services provided led to desired changes among

those served by the programs. Their purpose is not only to measure changes in outcomes but to show that the school-linked program under evaluation caused the changes (Gomby & Larson, 1992).

Examining multicomponent programs or the effects of services provided by those programs is a difficult and complex task (Dolan, 1995; Dryfoos, 1994). First, school-linked service efforts are characterized by flexibility and variability, both in terms of services offered and administrative structure. Moreover, they are often embedded into larger reform efforts with multiple and overlapping intervention strategies (Dolan, 1995; Gardner, 1992; Gomby & Larson, 1992). Dolan writes that although this redundancy of services creates a "safety net" for children, "it causes difficulty for evalutators who need to pinpoint the relative effectiveness of specific components" (p. 396). At times, the issue is not only what is most effective but also what a district can afford (Norton et al., 1996). Second, because evaluation may result in the diverting of resources from service delivery, Dolan (1995) believes that "most program staff resist evaluation" (p. 396). Consequently, evaluators are likely to find poor records, no meaningful contrast samples, scanty information on the nonusers of services, and little consistency in program administration from site to site (Dolan, 1995).

In order to avoid these pitfalls, Kahne and Kelley (1993) suggest that evaluators "carefully examine the ways in which traditional accountability structures may inhibit successful implementation, undermine the efforts of reformers, and prevent service providers from attending to global conceptions of program quality" (p. 197). Similarly, First et al. (1994) urge restraint and patience until more appropriate forms of evaluation are constructed. They emphasize that the implementation of school-linked programs has barely begun, that time and support are needed to make a difference, and that "constant manipulating, probing, and tinkering" will hinder "meaningful development" of this promising reform (p. 72).

Nevertheless, proponents of school-linked services face increasing pressure to show results. Crowson and Boyd (1996) believe that "there is at present a deep sense of unease regarding children's services coordination" and that "some clear evidence of success in coordinated endeavors must soon be demonstrated" (p. 254). They imply that this unease is particularly prevalent within school systems.

In their study of The Nation of Tomorrow, Smylie and Crowson (1996) state that schools have significant barriers to service coordination. Among those barriers are previously discussed issues of professional fragmentation and turf. In addition, Smylie and Crowson comment on the "prevalence of incentive systems that reward individual achievement and discourage inter-professional cooperation and accomplishment of group goals" (p. 8). They note that rewards for teachers are tied to the work they

do individually within their own classrooms. They also report that principals, in particular, are rewarded for accumulating resources, avoiding problems, and maintaining order, rather than seeking out progress and change. Smylie and Crowson write that "there is little incentive for schools to pursue inter-professional collaboration and manage the accompanying threats to individual autonomy and organizational stability" that accompany reforms such as school-linked service integration (p. 8). Absent from this discussion, as in most other studies of school reform, is information about the role of the superintendent.

Superintendents' Role in School-linked Service Integration

In 1994, the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association issued a joint position statement on the roles and relationships of school boards and superintendents which states, "The superintendent is the professional educator chosen by the board to implement policies and to provide professional leadership for a district's schools" (p. 6). As Norton et al. (1996) point out, defining the superintendent's role seems to be "the major issue in superintendent and school board relationships" (p. 46).

The history of the superintendent's role is described as evolving through various stages (Blumberg & Blumberg, 1985; Hord, 1990; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1976; Leithwood & Musella, 1991; Tyack, 1974). The job developed from one that was essentially clerical in the nineteenth century into one which combined the duties of instructional supervisor and business manager during the first half of the twentieth century (Eaton, 1990; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1976; Tyack, 1974). The superintendent became the spokesperson for education and the policy advisor to the school board (Jackson, 1996). The career path was often through coaching and the principalship. The role took on an aura of control (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Superintendents looked to the business community for their model of behavior (Eaton, 1990; Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Today the role is increasingly described as a political one (Blumberg, 1985; Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Cuban, 1988; Jackson, 1996; Johnson, 1996; Konnert & Augenstein, 1995; Leithwood & Musella, 1991). Recently some researchers also have said that superintendents should be perceived more as advocates for children (Jackson, 1996; Johnson, 1996; Konnert & Augenstein, 1995). Jackson (1996) believes that a school superintendent is "viewed by many as the guardian of the community's children" (p. 2); yet, the political and managerial nature of the position has almost always eclipsed the instructional and advocacy ones (Blumberg, 1985; Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Cuban, 1988). Eaton summarizes the forces and movements between 1950 and 1990 that caused the superintendency to move into this direction. He writes:

In the 1950s the massive school building programs created difficulties for the superintendent who could not plan and execute brick and mortar operations. In the 1960s the major problems were civil rights, desegregation, and busing. In the 1970s school discipline, drugs, special education, accountability, and shrinking enrollments that led to reductions in the teaching force and the closing of schools were central issues. In the 1980s the emphasis shifted to curriculum and student achievement (p. 28).

As a result of their highly visible role in dealing with these issues, superintendents came to be viewed as public property (Blumberg, 1985). During this time superintendents were held more and more accountable for unsuccessful programs or failing initiatives (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Under these circumstances many superintendents found it difficult to execute the educational or advocacy aspect of their role.

In the current reform movement if the superintendency is mentioned in any way, it is generally described in terms similar to that of a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). The superintendent, like the CEO, is recognized as a leader, a manager, and a politician who must deal with problems associated with school finances, cost reduction, budget cuts, staff reduction, and curriculum improvement (Glass, 1992).

It may be a bit unrealistic to compare a superintendent to a CEO. In contrast to CEOs, superintendents do not act with the same degree of autonomy nor can they exercise the same level of leadership (Hord, 1990; Jackson, 1996; Konnert & Augenstein, 1995). Because their responses are guided by the school board policy, they must obtain school board approval of many administrative recommendations (Johnson, 1996; Konnert & Augenstein, 1995). According to Carter and Cunningham (1997), superintendents "can do little if anything, unless the school board empowers them to make changes" (p. 96). Konnert and Augenstein (1995) insist that "much is left to the discretion of the board" (p. 7). Whether or not the school board approves a proposal depends on the extent of the services being proposed, the nature of those services, and the constituencies receiving the services (Herrington, 1996). Moreover, there is pressure from school boards for superintendents to comply to mandated policy rather than to innovate for educational improvement (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

In addition, superintendent effectiveness is not measured in terms of particular job description but by the superintendent's relationship with the school board (Glass, 1992). Carter and Cunningham (1997) report that the number one reason for leaving a superintendency is the loss of board support. Confusion about roles, poor communication, and personal agendas can "destabilize the superintendent's relationship with the board"

(p. 98). "Everything," they write, "depends on good relationships" (p. 93). Consequently, superintendents are increasingly encouraged to hone their political skills as a means of surviving the vulnerability of the position (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Eaton, 1990; Jackson, 1995; Johnson, 1996; Konnert & Augenstein, 1995; Norton et al., 1996).

Carter and Cunningham (1997) observe that in the 1990s "reports examining the superintendency suggest that the average tenure [of a superintendent] ranges between two and one-half years and six years" (p. 5). They characterize the superintendency as "a hot seat, a pressure cooker, a highwire act" (p. 8). They identify certain "red flags" that present themselves in the form of critical incidents that can "irreparably damage the superintendent's ability to carry out his or her duties" (p. 108). Some of these areas involve student expulsion, sex education, cultural and racial diversity, violence, and gang activity. Carter and Cunningham emphasize that these incidents hold "great potential for repercussion regardless of the decision that is made" (108). In addition, Norton et al. (1996) state that "the reform movement, the increasing demands of special interest groups, and the increased politicization of board members themselves have brought increased tensions to what historically has been a strained relationship" (p. 46). Jackson (1995) reasons that "unlike the business executive, the superintendent has numerous constituencies to please - students, parents, teachers, principals, the community, and most important, the school board" (p. 3). Therefore it is understandable for superintendents to be wary of endeavors which might create risk.

The tendency toward caution is a consequence of management function (Hannaway, 1989). Managers, according to Hannaway (1989), are expected to oversee an organization and ensure its efficiency; negative outcomes are unexpected and result in "lopsided" performance feedback (p. 57). In other words, nobody notices if a job is done well; notice is only taken if problems occur. Hannaway suggests that little is to be gained by giving praise or expressing satisfaction about work that is done well and asserts that "in the face of these feedback biases, the self-protective or risk-reducing behavior is quite reasonable" (p. 57). She believes that managers often seek to distribute the risk by involving as many others as possible so as not to be held accountable if problems materialize. "Managers know how to limit their risks; but to beat the target, to be an exceptionally high performer, is difficult," claims Hannaway (p. 58). This analysis might well apply to superintendents because the social system in which they work is an unforgiving one. Failure for them is unacceptable (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

Others writing about the superintendency also discuss risk management and advise caution (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Johnson, 1996; Kowalski, 1995; Norton et al., 1996). For example, the authors of

two recently published books about the superintendency refer to the following quote by Machiavelli when describing the hazards associated with implementing school reform: (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Kowalski, 1995).

> There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things (W. K. Marriatt, translator, 1948, p. 43)

Superintendents, therefore, may have a vested interest in not taking the lead in reform efforts such as the school-linked services movement. Writers such as Carter and Cunningham (1997) recognize the precarious nature of superintendent and school board relationships and the personal risks that accrue to superintendents as a result of promoting personal agendas associated with innovation aimed at school improvement. They propose a new role for superintendents, one in which the superintendent "changes from expert to facilitator and information provider" (p. 131). Carter and Cunningham describe the following process:

> The role of superintendents is shifting from one of directing and controlling to that of guiding, facilitating, and coordinating. This is difficult within the current context of intense public pressure and criticism. There is very little consensus on how school improvement should be achieved and little trust that educators are able to make the needed reforms. Yet the future of public education depends on the superintendents' ability to reclaim and take charge of the public discourse needed to improve American schools (p. 238).

Ironically, Carter and Cunningham's description of the new role of the superintendent reflects Senge's (1990) ideas about new roles for senior managers in business corporations. Senge (1990) believes that these managers should act as researchers and designers and writes:

> What does she or he research? Understanding the organization as a system and understanding the internal and external forces driving change. What does she or he design? The learning processes whereby [other] managers throughout the organization come to understand these trends and forces. (p. 299).

Superintendents willing to take on this new role might form a new perspective about the dangers of reform. They might develop an attitude toward risk proposed by Bernstein (1996) who writes: "Risk is no longer something to be faced; risk has become a set of opportunities open to choice" (p. 110). In other words, risk, like death and taxes, is a fact of superintendents' lives; their goal might be to minimize the negative effects of that risk.

<u>Chapter Summary</u>

The purpose of this chapter was to present a review of the literature related to school-linked service integration and the superintendency. Background information on the relationship of school-linked service integration to school reform was discussed. Definitions and examples of various school-linked service initiatives were presented as well as the administrative issues involved in implementing such services. The last section in this chapter examined the role of the superintendency in regard to school-linked service integration.

Chapter III presents research methodology. Chapters IV and V address findings and implications of the study's results as well as suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER III
Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the research methods that were used for this study. Included in this chapter are an overview of the design used in the study, a description of the methods used for sampling procedures, data collection, and data analysis, and a discussion of issues relating to validity, reliability, and ethics.

Overview of the Study's Research Design

This study was designed to investigate superintendents' views about administrative issues involved in school-linked service integration. The study was exploratory using standardized open-ended interviews as a technique for qualitative inquiry (McCracken, 1988; Patton, 1990; Seidman, 1991). The study followed an iterative or self-correcting design (Langenbach et al., 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Grounded in literature on school-linked services, school reform and restructuring, and the role of the superintendency, the following research questions guided data collection for this study:

1. What views emerge when superintendents discuss school-linked service integration?

2. What aspects of school-linked service integration do superintendents identify as most beneficial?

3. What administrative issues of school-linked service integration do superintendents identify as most challenging?

4. What aspects of background, experience, or educational philosophy emerge when superintendents describe their views about administrative issues of school-linked service integration?

In this study, elements related to superintendents' views about school-linked service integration were explored holistically. A qualitative methodology was used because it provided the most appropriate means of generating meaningful data from a population that has sometimes been difficult to access (Hertz & Imber, 1995; McCracken, 1988; Ostrander, 1995; Patton, 1990; Seidman, 1991).

Qualitative methods of data collection and analysis are applicable when the researcher wants to obtain a more "holistic picture" of a particular phenomenon (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Langenbach et al., 1994; Mason, 1996; McCracken, 1988; Merriam, 1988; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Yow, 1994). The goal of such research is to acquire a deeper understanding of complex issues, complicated relationships, and slowly evolving events (McCracken, 1988; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Seidman, 1991). McCracken (1988) pointed out that a qualitative methodology

provides the researcher with a means "to explore the broader implications of a problem and place it in its historical, political, or social context" (p. 52). This kind of examination demands in-depth understanding of a situation that is often best communicated through detailed examples and stories (Langenbach et al., 1994; McCracken, 1988; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1990; Seidman, 1991).

Qualitative researchers concentrate on "foreshadowed problems" and look for "thick" descriptions to illustrate and interpret meaning as well as behavior (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Yow, 1994). McCracken (1988) emphasized that "the questions for which data are sought are likely to cause the respondent greater difficulty and imprecision" (p. 65). Consequently, as Lofland and Lofland (1984) indicated, the aim of such research "is not to elicit choices between alternate answers to preformed questions on a topic or a situation" (p. 12). Rather, as Rubin and Rubin (1995) wrote, it is "to make broader statements about more complex responses than yes or no, approve or disapprove" (p. 72). The standardized open-ended interview provided a technique appropriate for this type of qualitative inquiry (McCracken, 1988; Patton, 1990; Seidman, 1991); it is a technique that fostered the collection of a "preponderance" of data (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Interviewing allowed the researcher to determine how respondents understand details of experiences from their own perspectives (Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Seidman, 1991). Merriam (1988) insisted that interviewing is necessary when the researcher wants to know "how people interpret the world around them," particularly when the variables within the study are deeply embedded in context and difficult to study in isolation (p. 73). Standardized open-ended interviews provided the researcher with a means to hear and understand what superintendents think and to identify the "silent assumptions" in which behavior is grounded (McCracken, 1988). The respondents were able to reflect upon the content of the questions and offer interpretation as well as factual information in the answers (Yow, 1994).

The objective of such interviewing was to elicit direct quotations which described firsthand experience (Patton, 1990; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Stainback and Stainback (1988) wrote than an understanding of individuals' interpretations and perceptions is critical to a qualitative investigation. The inference was that people make sense out of their experiences and use that knowledge to guide their action (Patton, 1990; Seidman, 1991). McCracken (1988) suggested that in-depth interviewing allows the researcher to capture this kind of "rich" data "without participant observation, unobtrusive observation, or prolonged contact" (p. 11) while at the same time, according to Rubin and Rubin (1990), "gaining

depth, detail, and nuance that are the strength of qualitative research" (p. 83).

Moreover, interviewing was a way of acquiring unique insights into what Rubin and Rubin (1995) identified as a "cultural arena," a realm "not defined by a single belief or rule, or by a handful of phrases unique to the group, but by a whole set of understandings that is widely shared within a group or subgroup" (p. 22). In the words of Yow (1994), interviewing provided a means to "reveal the informal, unwritten rules of relating to others that characterizes any group" (p. 13).

Yow (1994) also pointed out that in the twentieth century, much business is transacted orally. Managers in almost every field spend the majority of their time engaged in conversation (Hannaway, 1989). Consequently, superintendents are accustomed to conveying their ideas through talk and exhibit behaviors characteristic of professionals described by Ostrander (1995) as having a "tendency to converse easily, freely, and at great length" (p. 142). The standardized open-ended interview offered a "manageable methodological context" within which superintendents could express their views in a way that did not invade their privacy nor intrude on their day-to-day schedules (McCracken, 1988).

Because in a qualitative study the collection of data is ongoing (Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Mason, 1996; Ostrander, 1995; Patton, 1990; Seidman, 1991; Yow, 1994), what the researcher asked throughout the research process depended on what was or was not learned during previous interviews (Mason, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). As the interviews proceeded in this iterative or self-correcting design, the questions changed from time to time as the research progressed (Mason, 1996; McCracken, 1988; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). For that reason, the interview iterations proceeded according to a "tiered" approach described by McCracken (1988) as "being especially useful when qualitative methods are being used for exploratory purposes" (p. 48). Respondents were divided into various levels or "tiers" and asked specific questions that were added to the interviews as the project progressed. Rubin and Rubin (1995) claimed that this approach provides a means to "test out ideas along the way" (p. 92). The design was advantageous because it allowed the researcher to pursue themes and topics as they emerged in the study (McCracken, 1988; Patton, 1990).

Sampling Procedures

A non-probability approach (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Patton, 1991) was used to select respondents to participate in this study. This procedure enabled the researcher to choose subjects from whom the researcher could learn the most (Patton, 1991). Choices about who would

participate were based on prior information that indicated which of the potential respondents might provide the kind of data needed for the study.

There was one significant challenge to acquiring this kind of information. The difficulty had to do with gaining access to dependable and conversant respondents who were willing to commit to such a study.

There is a belief among social scientists that it is easier to "study down," as in those less powerful than the researcher, than to "study up," those more powerful than the researcher (Lofland & Lofland, 1984). Because of their training, work experience, and prominent position in both the school and local community, the superintendents in this study qualified as a type of professional elite (Chase, 1996). According to Hertz and Imber (1995) "the common source of [elite] prestige is the long years of education toward advanced degrees and the specialized apprenticeships that precede becoming a professional" (p. x). Hertz and Imber also reported that "few social researchers study elites because elites are by their very nature difficult to penetrate [and] establish barriers that set their members apart from the rest of society" (p.viii).

As a result, it was challenging to find superintendents who were knowledgeable about the role the superintendency plays in school-linked service integration and who at the same time represented the population being studied. Moreover, Eaton (1990) reported that "the size of school districts varies immensely" and affects how the superintendent operates within the district (p. 31). In order to study possible differences and similarities of views of superintendents in divergent settings, it was critical to select a sample who spoke from the perspectives of those working in large, medium, and small school districts. For the purposes of this study, size distinctions specified large districts as those classified as a Group A district with a pupil enrollment of 25,000 and included three subgroups: school districts with 100,000 or more students, those with 50,000 to 99,999 students, and those with 25,000 to 49,999 students. Medium districts or Group B districts ranged from 3,000 to 24,999, and Group C or small districts were those with a pupil enrollment between 300 and 2,999 students (Eaton, 1990).

<div align="center">Study Sample</div>

The researcher elicited expert nomination from a group of educational professionals who were familiar with school-linked service integration, informed about the superintendency, or were willing to enlist possible candidates for this study. This group was composed of university and regional educational leaders who, at the time of this study, were educational administration professors at Virginia Tech or were officers of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), a national professional association of 14,500 members, 90% of whom were superintendents (T. Daberkow, personal communication, March 14, 1997).

The three superintendents in the first iteration of the study were selected purposively on the basis of their knowledge about school-linked service integration, their availability and their willingness to participate. In addition, preference was given to those who were either present or past members of the Executive Board of the AASA, consisting of nine members, all of whom but one were elected to three-year terms. The ninth member was appointed by the incoming President for a two-year term. Because this board has acted as the policy-making body for AASA, election or appointment to the board has generally been recognized by other superintendents as an indicator of outstanding performance in the field of education. Additionally the members of this board have been presumed to be informed and to have an understanding about the issues which confront the superintendency.

Selection for the second iteration of interviews differed only slightly from the selection process of the first iteration. Nominations were elicited both of the experts that contributed to the selection of the participants in the first group and of the three superintendents participating in the first round of interviews. The nominators were asked to suggest names of superintendents who worked in states with legislative mandates dictating school-linked service integration. The experiences of the three superintendents who were eventually selected for this iteration were of particular interest because they provided insight on issues involving the implementation of public policy in regard to school-linked service integration. Each of the three superintendents in the first iteration were asked at the end of the interview: "Among the superintendents that you know in states where there are laws mandating school and agency collaboration, who is likely to know the most about the issues that we have discussed today?" A question such as this one helped the researcher to determine who among potential subjects was most apt to provide data appropriate to the study (McCracken, 1988; Ostrander, 1995; Patton, 1991; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). The three superintendents who were chosen for the second iteration and who agreed to participate worked in Florida, Kentucky, and New Jersey, states which have mandates for forms of school-linked service integration. The particular forms of school-linked service integration for each of the selected states are described in Chapter II.

The third group of three superintendents to be interviewed was selected to supplement a national perspective of superintendents' views on school-linked service integration. This group of superintendents was chosen according to three criteria. First, their names were mentioned by other interviewees as being among superintendents who might be knowledgeable about school-linked service integration. For example, the superintendents in the second iteration were asked to consider: "Among the

superintendents that you know, who is likely to know the most about school-linked service integration?" Second, the superintendents who were selected for this iteration were available to be interviewed between July, 1997, and September, 1997. Third, they were employed in regions of the country that were not represented in iterations one and two.

In the event that more than three names were nominated in each iteration, a random sample was drawn (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1996).

Thus, the researcher was able to avoid what Fraenkel and Wallen (1996) distinguish as the major pitfall of qualitative sampling, the researcher's own ability to correctly estimate "the representativeness of a sample or the expertise regarding the information needed" (p. 101). Consultation with others more knowing about the topic and population under study served to facilitate and substantiate the selection of the sample.

Data Collection

Data were generated using standardized open-ended interviews that incorporated a combination of interviewing strategies suggested by McCracken (1988), Patton (1990), and Seidman (1991). An approach involving a "tiered" pattern of interviewing was used (McCracken, 1988; Ostrander, 1995; Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

The researcher interviewed nine respondents in three successive groups; each group was composed of three superintendents. The first group of superintendents was interviewed using questions drawn from a literature review about administrative issues of school-linked service integration and the role of the superintendency.

After the first group was interviewed, data analysis was undertaken in order to narrow objectives and refine questions as well as establish an inventory of any further categories for investigation. Then a second group of three superintendents was interviewed and further analysis was conducted. Finally, a third set of superintendents was interviewed about topics which emerged from the responses to the other two sets of interviews (McCracken, 1988; Ostrander, 1995; Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

The exact wording and sequence of questions for the interviews were determined in advance and included "grand tour questions" (McCracken, 1988) concerning school-linkages, preparation for the superintendency, and the role of the superintendency. All questions were worded in an open-ended format (Patton, 1990). Question probes were used following some responses in order to promote a relaxed, conversational style (Seidman, 1991). The interview protocol for the interviews is included as Appendix A.

The progression of interviews advanced according to a strategy proposed by Ostrander (1995). When interviewing groups of elites, this researcher recommended "starting at the top." Ostrander believed that

initial contacts with notable, distinguished, and reputable subjects lend a credibility to the study that both impresses and encourages the participation of other subjects who might follow. Additionally, such an approach may also result in the introduction to other suitable subjects about whom the researcher may not be aware. In an iterative design, it is not unusual to hear subjects speak about others with whom the interviewer should talk (McCracken, 1988; Ostrander, 1995; Patton, 1991; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Referrals of this nature led to the collection of more meaningful data.

The length of time required for each interview ranged from thirty to ninety minutes. Interviews were sought by telephone or letter, and parties were informed about the nature of the research (see Appendix B). During the interviews the researcher took field notes, recording observations or thoughts that occurred to the researcher as the interviews progressed. Responses that seem unusual or inconsistent were noted and checked later against other remarks or observations. The interviews were audiotaped and portions were transcribed. Follow-up telephone calls were made in order to clarify unclear points or to pursue contradictions contained within the transcripts (McCracken, 1988; Ostrander, 1995; Seidman, 1991).

A process proposed by Rubin and Rubin (1995) was used to organize and catalog the data contained in the transcripts. The process included using interview notebooks which were compiled for each of the three sets of interviews. They contained notes describing the contents of each transcript and indicated sections in which the respondents clarified points for the researcher in follow-up telephone conversations. The notebooks also contained clean copies as well as marked-up transcripts. The "mark-ups" included annotations consisting of underlined words and phrases as well as in-text comments noted to indicate reflections drawn from the researcher's notes (Dey, 1993; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

A section in the notebooks was kept as a journal of the researcher's experiences. Field notes, summaries of what was learned during the interviews, and a running file of ideas were recorded. Notes were also made about correspondence with the chairperson and research member of the dissertation committee as well as memoranda describing when and how certain decisions were made concerning the progress of the study (Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Merriam, 1988; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). In addition the researcher wrote "self-conscious notes" as reminders about the context of the data (Langenbach et al., 1994).

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

Although questions are posed at the beginning of a qualitative study, hypotheses emerge from the data, and the expectations of the researcher may change as the study progresses. Analysis of data relies primarily on inductive reasoning and is undertaken as the data is being collected,

continuing through the writing of the final research report (Langenbach et al., 1994; Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Ostrander, 1995; Patton, 1990; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Seidman, 1991; Yow, 1994). Analysis of the data for this study included reviewing notes and transcripts, hand-sorting and coding the text of transcripts into categories, searching for patterns and connections within the coded data, and creating categories or classifications for the various types of data to ascertain possible themes (Seidman, 1991).

Immediately following each interview, the researcher recorded in field notes a few sentences describing the researcher's initial impressions of the interviews. Then, audio tapes and written notes were reviewed and marked for transcription. Five copies of each transcription were reproduced on paper of different colors. For example, five copies of each interview in iteration one were made on white paper; five copies of the interviews for iteration two were made on pink paper, and the copies of the interviews for iteration three were made on green paper.

Analysis began as the transcripts were read and annotated. Three sets of annotations were completed for each interview. The first annotation involved a cold reading. Comments that seemed unusual or surprising were underlined, key words or unfamiliar terms were circled, comments that reminded the researcher of points illustrative of the literature review were bracketed, and portions that prompted further questioning were noted with a question mark in their margins.

The second annotation consisted of a guided reading using the administrative issues identified through the literature review as a reference to focus the reading (Dey, 1995). This technique was used because the role of the superintendency in school-linked integration is most likely to deal with the management of policy implementation which was documented in Chapter II of this study (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Cunningham, 1990; Gardner, 1992; Gray, 1995; Hannaway, 1989; Herrington, 1996; Kirst, 1991; Koppich & Kirst, 1993; Smylie et al., 1996; Sullivan & Sugarman, 1996; Syracuse University Corporation, 1971).

In the third annotation, the research questions were used as a guide for the reading. Each question was color-coded. Corresponding highlighters were used to mark text which specifically addressed particular research questions. For example, a green highlighter was used to mark text in which the benefits of school-linked service integration were discussed. A cross-reading (Chase, 1996) of the annotations for each interview was then used to note similarities and differences among each of the three sets of annotations.

Portions of the transcripts were next divided into small sections of dialogue focusing on particular topics and were hand-sorted categorically to order information into similar groups which could be given temporary codings. The initial codes are included in Appendix C. Portions of coded

transcript were placed in envelopes and given such labels as money, space, accountability, culture, and so forth. Dey (1993) cautioned that "even in structured interviews with open-ended questions, all the responses produced cannot be assigned to categories in advance of the data" (p. 97). As a result, other codes or categories were devised as the analysis of the data suggested, and labeled as "open."

Next, reading through the dialogue contained in each envelope, the researcher then wrote a statement describing what the superintendents appeared to be saying about these various topics. Possible themes were identified from the transcript data and were submitted for peer examination to two other doctoral students in educational administration who were also engaged in qualitative research about school-linked service integration. They were asked to review and comment on the findings of the study as they emerged from the data (Merriam, 1988). Their questions, comments, and suggestions about the preliminary coding of the study were taken into consideration as the researcher reconsidered the data for a second time. The researcher then reread all of the information and did another cross-reading among all the interviews from the three iterations of interview data (Chase, 1996). This step led to the identification of the themes and findings which emerged from the interview data.

<u>Validity</u>

Validity, according to Fraenkel and Wallen (1996), "refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the inferences researchers make based on the data they collect" (p. 461). In a qualitative study internal validity has to do with how truthful the study is while external validity deals with how transferable the findings of the study are (Merriam, 1988). As Rubin and Rubin (1995) reasoned, "If research is valid, it closely reflects the world being described" (p. 85).

To ensure internal validity two strategies were incorporated into this study. First, the researcher attempted to keep records of the research process in such a way that others might be able to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the data collection process (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Transcripts of interviews, memos, and journal entries were shared with other qualitative researchers to ascertain the "transparency" of the researcher's methods (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Second, the researcher submitted findings for peer examination. Two other doctoral students in educational administration who were also engaged in qualitative research about school-linked service integration were asked to review and comment on the findings of the study as they emerged from the data (Merriam, 1988). Using these two strategies strengthened the "credibility" of the study (Langenbach, et al., 1994).

Miles and Huberman (1994) stated that external validity determines "whether the conclusions of a study have any larger import" (p. 279). In other words it refers to the extent to which the findings apply to other situations (Merriam, 1988). According to Langenbach et al. (1994), "external validity can be achieved if enough thick description is available to permit some transferability of results to other settings" (p. 88). These descriptions should provide the reader with enough information about how to decide whether or not the findings can be generalized. Fraenkel and Wallen (1996) suggested that "the value of a generalization is that it allows us to have expectations about the future" (p. 464). Consequently, readers of the study, not the researcher, should determine whether or not the results are applicable to their own or other situations (Merriam, 1988).

<center>Reliability</center>

In qualitative research, reliability is defined in terms of dependability (Fraenkel & Wallen,1996; Langenbach et al., 1994). Miles and Huberman (1994) stated, "The underlying issue here is whether the process of the study is consistent, reasonably stable over time and across researchers and methods" (p. 278). The research should be conducted and documented in such a way that it can be replicated by other researchers. Creating an "audit trail" is one way of achieving "consistent" results (Merriam, 1988; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Subjecting procedures and findings to peer review is another. A third approach defines the role and status of the researcher to further enhance reliability (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Consequently all research was attempted in an open and clearly articulated manner. In this study a journal was kept detailing the researcher's experiences and the procedures followed in the collection and analysis of data. Materials were submitted for peer review. Although the researcher assumed the role of "outside researcher," described by Lofland and Lofland (1984) as "an outsider seeking admission to individuals for the purpose of interviewing them" (p. 25), her twenty-five years of teaching and administering programs in public schools contributed to a knowledge about the workings and cultures of public schools and public school officials. In addition, before the study began, the researcher completed doctoral level courses in school-community linkages, educational governance and policy, and school finance and law which added to a base of knowledge necessary to facilitate a study of this kind.

Ethical Issues

The responsibility of conducting research in an ethical manner belongs to the researcher (Merriam, 1988). Rubin and Rubin (1995) argued that "when you encourage people to talk to you openly and frankly, you incur serious ethical obligation to them" (p. 93). They cited three ethical considerations which this researcher observed. These included protecting the identities of the informants, keeping promises made to informants to gain their participation, and being honest both about the intended use of the research and in its reporting.

Chapter Summary

This chapter described the methodology which was used for this study. Data collection was drawn from standardized open-ended interviews. Data was coded and categorized, themes were developed and applied to the research questions. Findings are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V includes conclusions and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER IV
Results

Introduction
The purpose of this study was to investigate superintendents' views about administrative issues involved in school-linked service integration. Elements related to those views were explored holistically through standardized open-ended interviews within an iterative or self-correcting study design. The superintendents were chosen through an expert nomination process that identified superintendents who were knowledgeable about the role the superintendency plays in school-linked service integration, were representative of those working in large, medium, and small school districts, and were available and willing to be interviewed. Literature on school-linked services, school reform and restructuring, and the role of the superintendency was used as framework for this study.

The following research questions guided data collection in the study:

1. What views emerge when superintendents discuss school-linked service integration?

2. What aspects of school-linked service integration do superintendents identify as most beneficial?

3. What administrative issues of school-linked service integration do superintendents identify as most challenging?

4. What aspects of background, experience, or educational philosophy emerge when superintendents describe their views about administrative issues of school-linked service integration?

This chapter contains five sections. Sections one and two include a description of the participants and the setting for the data collection. Major themes from the interviews are stated in section three; significant differences are noted. In section four, general comments of the superintendents are examined with regard to the superintendent's role in school-linked service integration. The chapter ends with a summary.

The Participants
Nine participants were selected purposively through expert nomination on the basis of their availability, their willingness to participate, and their knowledge of school-linked service integration. Selections were also made according to the size and geographical location of districts in which the superintendents worked in order to study possible differences and similarities in divergent settings.

The researcher approached the selection process in three phases in order to facilitate the iterative or self-correcting design of the study

(McCracken, 1988). This process provided the researcher with a means to pursue themes and topics as they emerged in the study (McCracken, 1988; Patton, 1990).

The first iteration of the study was composed of three present or former members of the Executive Board of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). These three superintendents were selected because as members of the policy-making body for AASA they are generally recognized by other superintendents to have demonstrated outstanding performance in the field of education, having been elected through a national election by the association's membership. Additionally, they are presumed to be informed about and to have an understanding of the issues currently confronting the superintendency.

The three superintendents for the second iteration were selected on the basis of their working in states which have legislative mandates dictating school-linked service integration, specifically Florida, Kentucky, and New Jersey. Their insights were of particular interest because of their experience involving the implementation of existing public policy in regard to school-linked service integration.

The third group of three superintendents was chosen according to three criteria. First, their names were mentioned by other interviewees as being among superintendents who might be knowledgeable about school-linked service integration. Second, they were available to be interviewed between July, 1997 and September, 1997. Third, they were employed in regions of the country that were not represented in iterations one and two. These three superintendents were picked to round out a national perspective of superintendents' views on school-linked service integration.

The nine superintendents who participated in this study were an ethnically diverse group of five men and four women. Six were white, two were African-American, and one was Hispanic. All had doctoral degrees. During the time in which the interviews were conducted, two of the nine superintendents were serving in their third superintendency, six were in their second superintendency, and one was a first-time superintendent.

All of the superintendents had a background in teaching in the public schools. Three superintendents also had taught at the university level. Seven of the nine had served previously as school principals, four as elementary school principals, two as high school principals, and one as a principal at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Only one of the seven superintendents had gone directly from a principalship to a superintendent's position. The other six superintendents left their principalships to work in various central office positions, eventually becoming either assistant superintendents or deputy superintendents.

Two of the nine superintendents were never building administrators. They went from teaching positions into staff development jobs, then onto supervisory positions in curriculum and instruction or in personnel. Both later became superintendents, one after being an assistant superintendent and the other after being both an assistant and a deputy superintendent.

Four of the superintendents described their districts as suburban; the other five identified their districts as urban ones. The district enrollments ranged in size from over 150,000 to a little more than 3,000. Four were located on the East Coast, two were in the Mid West, two were on the West Coast, and one was in the Southwest. Specifically, they were serving as superintendents in the following states: California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Missouri, New Jersey, Oregon, Texas, and Virginia. Seven of the superintendents described their students as diverse, which was later determined to mean that "we have a little bit of everything" or that "we have a cross-section of students." Two of the superintendents stated that their students were middle class or upper-middle class.

Setting for the Data Collection

The researcher met individually with the nine superintendents between June 1997 and September 1997. Standardized open-ended interviews were used to provide respondents a non-intrusive forum in which to share their views, beliefs, and experiences (McCracken, 1988; Patton, 1991). Observation data gathered during the interviews were recorded as field notes and entered into a research log and in some cases noted on the transcripts of the interviews.

The nine superintendents gave permission to have their interviews audio-taped, six of whom asked for assurances of confidentiality. The other three sought confirmation that neither their names nor their school districts would be used nor would any identifying information about them be disclosed. One requested that the tape recorder be turned off during portions of his interview. In another instance, one respondent contacted the researcher after an initial interview to provide additional information; that particular conversation was not audio-taped.

Ranging in length from thirty to approximately ninety minutes, the interviews were conducted in a number of settings. Two of the interviews took place in the superintendents' offices, three were held in hotel lobbies, and four were completed by telephone. Five of the interviews began with a ten to fifteen minute get-acquainted session that was then followed at a later date with a longer more in-depth conversation. Two of the interviews were postponed because of conflicts in the superintendents' schedules; three other interviews were interrupted and had to be continued at a different time. Four of the superintendents were contacted a second time

by telephone to clarify points or to provide additional answers to the researcher's follow-up questions.

The interviews included "grand tour questions" (McCracken, 1988) concerning school-linkages, preparation for the superintendency, and the role of the superintendency. Depending on their answers, the researcher employed certain probes and follow-up questions to ascertain their views on the benefits, barriers, and issues involved with school-linked service integration as well as the role of the superintendent in such efforts. Generally, as the superintendents responded to the questions and provided examples to illustrate particular points, they divulged information about their various districts. The interviews tended to end with the researcher asking questions about the superintendents' career paths. The interview guide is included in Appendix A.

<u>Major Themes</u>
<u>Preparation for the Superintendency</u>

The superintendents were asked to talk about their preparation for the superintendency and to identify any aspects they deemed essential to it. One superintendent did not specify any prior training or experience as having been particularly important to her preparation. Instead she replied, "Nothing really prepares you for this job. You learn to be a superintendent by being a superintendent" (Superintendent 6, p. 37).

The other eight superintendents, however, did identify one of three aspects as being essential to their preparation for the superintendency: (a) academic course work, (b) diverse work experience, or (c) mentor relationships.

<u>Academic course work</u>

Three superintendents described their academic preparation as "unique." Their course of study focused on the managerial and political functions required for the superintendency.

Two of the three superintendents stated that their doctoral programs had been highly selective, having been organized specifically for the preparation of superintendents. One said that his program helped him to understand what works and what doesn't work in an educational setting and referred to his training in this way:

Our program was made up of a combination of seminars and various internships. The unique seminars brought experts to us while we worked on our degree program. Working in the field, we were buried in the educational issues of the day. What we were taught in the classroom was validated in our field experience (Superintendent 3, p. 22).

The other superintendent described his training as making him aware of the politics of school issues. He said:

We frequently find ourselves in situations where we know we have to make a decision. We know that it is going to be political in terms of how the board is going to have to react to it. I learned that I have to structure options for myself and for the board to look at. If I don't do that, the political foes will certainly present options that will get addressed. I thought that was one of the best parts of the whole program. It has served me as nothing else has (Superintendent 2, p. 21).

The third superintendent, after listing his academic credentials, maintained that the management courses he took in his MBA program were the most meaningful to him. He commented on the importance of learning how to create options. He said his MBA training prepared him "to figure out how to arrange and manage and organize" (Superintendent 5, p. 3). He expanded on this belief and said:

The MBA was the most essential part of my preparation for the superintendency. The case study method that is used in the instruction particularly in the area of management and personnel and finance has been critical to me. Making sure that we have covered all the points in proposals to boards and to taxpayers when we are trying to justify expenditures was something I learned in business school. There is no training I had, for example, in the schools of education that trained me for that comparable to what they did in the business school (Superintendent 5, p. 5).

Diverse work experience

Two other superintendents believed that varied work experience was the essential element of their preparation. Both of these superintendents stated that they did not begin their careers aiming for the superintendency.

One pointed out that she believed she had gotten her first superintendency because she had been "at the right place at the wrong time." She named a number of positions that she had held, such as, special education teacher, coordinator, director of school and community and public information, staff developer, elementary principal, state education department consultant, assistant superintendent, and foundation worker. She said, "I've held almost every position that you can think of. You get something from each one that leads to the next one and helps you succeed there" (Superintendent 9, p. 19).

The other one said that she had come up through her school district, having been a teacher, an elementary school principal, a supervisor, and an assistant superintendent. She said that she learned the most in her job as an assistant superintendent because in supervising certain programs she was able to work closely with members of special interest groups. This experience, she believed, gave her some perspective on the political pressures that superintendents often encounter. After leaving the district to become a superintendent in another district, she said, "At first, we started

doing some similar kinds of things here. What I had done and seen before, you know, gave me a basis, if you will, for how I operate here" (Superintendent 8, p. 31).

<u>Mentorships</u>

Three other superintendents believed that their relationships with the people for whom they had worked had had the greatest impact on their preparation. These superintendents characterized these relationships as mentorships. They credited their mentors with placing them in positions in which they could learn. Additionally, these three superintendents believed that their mentors had provided guidance about how to make decisions and handle mistakes.

One of the superintendents in this group said that there were many things about the superintendency that he did not learn in his course work. He said that he believed that "you learn about this job by working in the trenches with good people." He believed that one of his most important lessons was about dealing with mistakes.   He said:

I was fortunate that I had in coming up through the ranks good mentors and two I remain very close with now. They really prepared me to be a superintendent. They allowed me to make decisions, they gave me the parameters to work in. Obviously, there were times when I made mistakes but we always worked under the premise that we fix the problem and not the blame. They taught me that and it's been a pivotal thing (Superintendent 1, p. 3).

A second superintendent also referred to the important role her mentors had played. She spoke about the value of getting their advice when making difficult career decisions. She said:

I think one of the things that had an impact was that I not only had good friends but mentors who always helped you to reflect on where you were, what your skills and talents were, how you could best utilize those and be in a position not only to serve but to enjoy. I came to a career bend where I could have stayed in the suburban district I was in and become the superintendent or take a lateral move to an urban district. It was hard. I mean it was home. I had lots of good anchors and reasons to stay and be comfortable. One of my mentors helped me to see that this was a one-time only opportunity. He was right. In that position, as it turned out, I spent a lot of time in the court room, having to learn and understand the politics of that community. It was probably career changing (Superintendent 4, p. 9).

The third superintendent in this group believed that without mentors he would never have had the opportunity to be in a position to learn about what superintendents do. He said:

The most important thing to me and to my preparation has been the people that I have worked for who have offered me opportunities and who have mentored me and helped with those opportunities. I have always been a

learner and I love to get involved in new things. I have always felt that I was working for wonderful people and they helped to put me in places where I could learn. I think it's relationships with people, absolutely, relationships with the right people (Superintendent 7, p. 5).

The superintendents distinguished aspects which they considered crucial to their preparation for the superintendency. They discussed the circumstances in which they had obtained an enhanced perspective about how to institute and manage instructional programs and the political issues that might surround them. They also reflected on their training as it pertained to the advancement of their careers. Their preparation was acquired in three ways: (a) through academic course work, (b) through various jobs, or (c) through the advice and sponsorship of mentors.

School-linked Service Integration

Within each interview the discussion about school-linked service integration began with the same question. The superintendents were asked what came to mind when they heard the terms school-linked service integration or school and community agency collaboration. They responded in several ways: (a) by either attempting to give or get a definition of school-linkages, such as, "What it means to me is..." or "What do you mean by school-linked?"; (b) by citing examples of such programs in their own districts, such as, "Oh, yeah, well, a few of our schools have special projects like that ..."; or (c) by launching into a discussion of their reservations about the topic of school-linked service integration in general, such as, "There is always the danger...." Sometimes they used a combination of the three types of responses.

Definitions of School-linked Service Integration

Six of the superintendents offered their own definitions of school-linked service integration. They talked about schools and community agencies working together to provide a variety of services for the community. School-linkages were most often characterized as partnerships, as in "a variety of partnerships that strengthen our schools" (Superintendent 6, p. 1). The superintendents portrayed the various partnerships as "our relationship with the city government" (Superintendent 9, p. 11) or "providing easy access and a kind of seamless continuum of services for children and families right there in the school site" (Superintendent 8, p.1) or "how we work with others in the community to help kids who are poor" (Superintendent 2, p. 3) or "schools that are like community schools built and designed around all of those other community services" (Superintendent 3, p. 11). A superintendent in a state mandating school-linkages described her understanding of school-linked service integration by saying, "I guess what comes to mind is the ability to accomplish more, sometimes with less effort, sometimes with

more grace but always generally for the benefit of the students or the community" (Superintendent 4, p. 10).

The idea that schools and agencies working together might serve the public interest was implied in a few of their responses. A superintendent in a southwestern suburban school district stated:

What does it mean to me? Not having redundant services and sort of blurring the boundaries between agencies and creating partnerships. I think education and other agencies need to look at what we can do collaboratively and who does what best as opposed to continuing to duplicate effort. There is over a ninety percent redundancies [sic] of library collections. Schools use them for an 8 to 5 kind of thing, and the cities basically have that operation open for that same period of time to serve a small population. Some communities are actually combining those kinds of services so there is not a redundancy in effort. I guess that is what it means to me (Superintendent 9, p. 1).

Another district leader said, "We've brought in other agencies to try to build a kind of network to assist kids and their families." He went on to say, "We have done it in a number of ways. So I don't know how to describe a particular model for schools to use." He continued:

Right now, I see the government using the term when they do not want to duplicate services (for children); but I think it can mean whatever you want it to mean. If you want to set up any kind of agreement between the school district and an outside agency, you do what you can do. The idea is to use what you've got the best way you can (Superintendent 3, p. 24).

As these superintendents talked about what school-linked service integration meant to them, they offered examples of programs in their own districts to illustrate how their school districts work with other community agencies. Among the examples were programs which provide readiness activities for preschoolers, medical screenings for disadvantaged elementary school children, child-care facilities for teen-aged parents, substance abuse counseling for students with drug and alcohol-use problems, and assistance from local judicial authorities for dealing with disruptive students. One superintendent also talked about an arrangement for sharing information with social services about suspected child abuse. Three superintendents explained how they assist in making schools available to the public at-large so that students and their families might have convenient access to other community services. "The schools are out there in every community and basically available," declared one West Coast superintendent (Superintendent 3, p. 25). Similarly, a superintendent on the East Coast observed, "We happen to have the one place where in fact service providers can get to all or the majority of the population that needs to be served" (Superintendent 2, p. 1). Another superintendent from the Southwest said, "If we are not using the space, we try to open it up for

others. The parks and rec people sometimes use our gym and fields and the seniors [citizens] use our library or our auditorium for meetings" (Superintendent 9, p. 13).

Two superintendents who described their districts as suburban ones requested that the researcher furnish definitions of school-linked service integration for them. The following definition was read to them: School-linked services are those in which integrated health, social, or judicial services are provided near a school with an administrative structure that links the school system to the provider agencies. They may incorporate either a community-based approach in which services are administered by community agencies, serving as referral points for school practitioners or a school-based, or a full-service schools model in which services are delivered directly in school buildings (Dryfoos, 1994; Lugg, 1994; Rigsby et al., 1995).

One superintendent's initial reply to the question was "I am sorry. Nothing comes to mind when I hear those terms. It is not something I am familiar with." Upon hearing a definition, he replied:
I guess if I were to reason it out, what comes to mind is the relationship with county government and how we link those services together. I can also think of some partnerships or involvements that I have had of late with the county charitable campaigns.

What comes to mind first is that we have just done some things with a meeting with the [county] judges to talk about our really disruptive students and how they interact with the courts and whether they are going on the street and sort of how we can work better together.

The police department would be another one where we now have in all of our high schools full-time police officers as school resource officers. Basically they are providing the link as well as helping with violence issues and disruptive issues and rumor issues and gang issues and those kinds of things.

I certainly think about the services we offer where we take a case-approach to working with troubled families who are involved with food stamps and medical care and that kind of thing.   So, I think needy kids, unusual kids; and then I think just general services like police (Superintendent 7, p. 5).

Near the end of his interview he returned to this question and said:
I don't see that the increased school community linkages is the major thrust right now. Now that I think about it, it has been on the agenda before and I am sure it will come back.

I think the issue right now is on standards and achievement and expectations and raising-the-bar kinds of things and that is not the same agenda as school-links and community services. I think the standards thing is really about setting goals and I think the school-community linkages

thing is really about better service, better focus, more focus on the child in the case of the school issue and more focus on the family and how to support the family in the case of the community groups.

I don't think the focus right now is on better coordinated services to meet the needs of the family. I think it is at the local level, but I am not sure it is at the state level. I do think it is a strong commitment at the local level because of the fact that our county government is re-engineering the whole human services area. It seems to be a long and difficult process, but I think they recognize that need for more integrated, better coordinated delivery of services. So I think at the local level we really work hard at that. I don't see that being the thrust at the state level. I don't see the governor talking about it. I don't hear people on the state board of education talking about it.

I hear them talking about standards and achievement and expectations and higher course requirements and parental choice. I think the standards of accountability are much, much higher for school systems. I mean I agree with the premise that our standards of accountability should be higher than other agencies. I don't hear that with community services (Superintendent 7, p. 26-27).

Concerns of School-linked Service Integration

The other superintendent who asked for a definition of school-linked service integration responded in the following manner after hearing the definition read to him:

Oh yeah, well, a few of our schools have special projects that are like that. What we've done is linked up the county services with one of our high schools and one of our elementary schools. We have a social worker, a probation officer in the high school, and we have some mental health help, and obviously we have our own nurse there. We are able to take care of a student's needs in that one location because of the special projects (Superintendent 1, p. 6).

He then expressed his concern about committing school districts to initiatives that might "inappropriately" connect schools with community agencies. He commented that he wanted "to get out of the social service business." He went on to explain that he believed that the mission of schools is to educate and that tending to students' "other needs" interferes with that mission. He said:

To the extent that services that are given to kids, it's fine. To the extent that it is something I want to continue or not; no, it is not. I don't think so, no. My job is to educate. You can't do everything. I want to get out of the social service business. My job is to educate kids. I believe that the home and the community have that obligation. And I think sometimes now in the schools, they are overburdened in taking up those responsibilities and just frankly in our district I believe those are above and beyond the call of

what I think is appropriate. It is not a matter of problems. No, no. It is just a philosophical point of view, of what is appropriate for schools. Our county is great and the people in those agencies do a good job. We have great working relationships. I just believe that some of those areas are cutting in on our time to educate the kids (Superintendent 1, p. 6-7). He questioned whether the schools' mission should include services other than academic ones and maintained that "the mission of anyone who works in the school system is always primarily about academics." He continued, "You have to be careful that the mission of each individual agency is understood and that they stay with their emphasis. You don't want them tripping over each other" (Superintendent 1, p. 7).

Another superintendent whose district is in a state mandated school-linked service integration observed, "There is always the danger that their agenda becomes your agenda." He worried that working with outside agencies might distract educators from their own goals. He claimed that social workers, health care providers, and juvenile justice officers "try to impose their vision of the future, and their implementation model and their procedures somewhat just sort of get laid on top of school system practices" (Superintendent 5, p. 2). He pursued this point later in the interview in saying:
What I would really wish is that all those agencies would coalesce around keeping kids in school in those families who have school-age kids. The philosophy is set up here to do that through school and agency collaboration; but, the school agency thing is like a parallel agency to many of the welfare agencies and social services. So they have their functions and we have ours, and we don't see eye-to-eye that the most important thing is to keep kids in school. There are other things that they want to talk about which is fine, but nonetheless the end result should be that kids should be in school.

In our system, as small as it is, it often mirrors what is happening in the large industrial cities - the same problems, the same drill that we have here - the dysfunctional homes, the poverty, the drugs, all those things with the kids coming into schools with that kind of background. We are making some progress, but it is slow. I think the next step requires what I am talking about and that is integration with these agencies with one major goal, and that is to keep kids in school to try to help them succeed in school so they can have a chance. We need to help them succeed in school so that they can have a saleable skill (Superintendent 5, p. 17-18).

It is obvious that the superintendents' views about school-linked service integration were as diverse as their backgrounds. Several of the superintendents appeared to be inclined toward school-linked service integration while other superintendents expressed concern that such efforts might interfere with the school's academic mission.

Benefits of School-linked Service Integration

Although the superintendents did not agree about the extent or the form that school-linked service integration should take, each superintendent specified at least one advantage to integrating services. At some point in the interviews, all nine superintendents referred to the benefits of school-linked service integration. Generally these discussions consisted of one of three points. School-linked service integration might benefit school districts (a) in coping with disadvantaged or disruptive children, (b) in developing preventive measures to address childrens' problems, or (c) in gaining access to additional funds.

Disadvantaged or disruptive children

The first point involved helping schools to cope with disadvantaged or disruptive students. A couple of superintendents talked about working with other agencies as a way to relieve the financial strain of confronting students' nonacademic needs. Others discussed how working with community agencies might assist the school in achieving its own academic mission, particularly in dealing with "unruly" students.

One superintendent noted:

If a kid is hungry or sick, we are not going to educate him. We are going to feed him. If he needs clothes or any other thing, we should be able to get those for him. We can never hope to get him to learn if all that other stuff is in the way. The only problem is we only have so much money. You know we have a lot of social service organizations as well as community agencies, and I truly think they want to help. I think if we had a clearinghouse in a community area which was centralized, we could send them to that one area and from there they could be taken care of. I just don't think it needs to happen in the schools. It is not our job (Superintendent 1, p. 9).

By contrast, another superintendent who described his district as one with "many needy children" called school-linkages "a necessary evil." He explained that there are those in his district who resent having a school's resources used for anything other than instruction. He reasoned, however, that "after test-score shock and emotion wears off, you go back to the humane side that tells us that if you don't do this (provide assistance to needy children), these children are not going to make it" (Superintendent 2, p. 9). He gave this point of view:

A school district that is not involved [in school-linked service integration] is clearly, clearly serving a totally different population. I am not aware of a school district that is serving a lot of low income families across the way that is not going to get involved in some kind of a linkage program that is going to get services [to those families].

A school district that is not involved more than likely has middle income and upper students or students who are academically better off. They can

spend most of their budgets on academics as opposed to having to divert some of those resources to take care of the physical and emotional needs of children. Those districts, unlike us, are able to get services for the few individuals that need them. They can afford to go through a specialist because they are able to get the service on an individual basis rather than on an ongoing day-to-day activity which also consumes some of your day-to-day resources.

In our case we try to bring the various entities together. We share the benefit from those services and we cannot do this ourselves so we have to have those partnerships. We want the schools to be at the center because school is a safe place. It is a known place. It's a place where even families will come as compared to a doctor's office or an agency office.

You know, none of us has enough money to do all that needs to be done and if we don't collaborate, then we are not able to provide the services that need to be delivered to children. People are looking for ideas and ways to broker services, meet the mandate for welfare reform, and still provide the services that are needed. So we do need to collaborate to help these children survive (Superintendent 2, pp. 7-8).

The superintendents also talked about the challenges of working with "chronically disruptive students." They indicated that working with juvenile justice can lend assistance and support to the school and perhaps help it to accomplish its academic mission. Four superintendents told stories to illustrate this point. The first one described his district as "a small town with some big city problems," and said:
Last year in our alternative school, we had three kids returned to the regular school. They were as close as you can get to being expelled. The folks in the alternative school were able to work with them and their parents and the social workers and their probation officer to get them back in the main stream. So I looked at that as a success, a small success but still a success (Superintendent 5, p. 27).
He returned to this story in a later part of the interview and commented:
One of the atrocious things that happened here is we are able to discipline kids in school fairly, you know, regularly, but when they go into the court system, they are treated differently. You know they have here what is called youthful offenders. They go down to the courthouse and get a slap on the hands and think [to themselves] I can get by. So they don't get the right message and they come back to school and they think they can get by here. Well, we enforce the rules. We are not going to let these unruly kids or anybody else keep others from doing or learning what they are supposed to learn. They are not the only ones who have rights. Other kids have a right to get an education too. They get mixed messages at best.

I think our judges here are beginning to understand that and to support us within the law which I sometimes think is totally dysfunctional

in many ways. These kids are not forced to live with some of the decisions they make. A lot of times we are the ones who end up paying. We need help. We have kids who are just into everything you can imagine - drugs, thieving, assaults - you name it, we've got it. I think working more closely with the police and with the courts would go a long way to making these kids see the light if you know what I mean, and I see that as one big advantage to linking up with them (Superintendent 5, p. 31).

Another superintendent appeared to concur with this point of view. He described a program in his suburban district which utilizes probation officers in the high school. He said:

We have a working relationship with our, I am sorry to say, our probation department. We have a person assigned to the high school which is great. You have a kid that is on probation. You can call into the office and there is nothing like a probation officer having to talk to the student. To tell the probation officer why you are tardy, well, that is marvelous. Great control. No cost other than an office. No bother. If you can set it up like that, well, then that is great (Superintendent 1, p. 10).

A third superintendent who also works in a suburban district talked about working with officers from juvenile justice. He indicated that he thought a working relationship with them was essential but that it was not enough. He said:

You know, we also just had a meeting with the county government officials, the police, and the health department around medical screenings of students that are going into our programs for chronically disruptive students, trying to see if those kids have any medical issues that might be at the root of the problem. No matter what we do in a school setting we are never going to get too far if there is some medical issue that has been unattended. Let's face it. We have no idea why some kids act the way they do or why so many of them appear to be out of control. It's probably a good idea to try to find out, or it may be too late to do anything about it (Superintendent 7, p. 7).

The fourth superintendent noted the contribution that the police department and the county prosecutor's office had made to her suburban school system. She claimed:

One of the most valuable linkages we have is the police department. The chiefs of police have worked very closely with us with partnerships. For example, the principals tie in with the juvenile officers very closely. They know which kids are in trouble and help us keep a "heads up" about them, although they can't give us specifics.

The strong links we have worked with them and have made for stronger school programs, especially with things like drug and alcohol intervention as well as prevention. We actually have a counselor in each of our schools. In the high school, it's a couple of days a week; in the middle

school, it is one day a week; and in the elementary, it is one day a week. That started as an outgrowth of our work with the police to help us with the on-campus drug problems we were beginning to see (Superintendent 6, p. 5).

Prevention

The second benefit that was addressed involved the preventive aspects of school-linked efforts. Two superintendents expressed a distaste for crises-driven delivery of services. As one superintendent on the West Coast said, "We kind of know that we are going to have problems with some kids just because of who they are and where they come from and still we react the same way. That is what a lot of people call insanity: doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result" (Superintendent 3, p. 27)

He continued:

We spend too much of everyone's time picking up the pieces. We talk a lot about the essential elements that kids must have in order to be successful in school. These are things like health, nutrition, good parenting. We know that these things need to be in place if students are to come to school ready to learn. What I see clearly is that if we don't address some of the factors that affect children before they come to school, what we can do with them after they show up at our doorstep is very minimal. Kids of poverty in particular when they show up on our doorsteps, most of the pattern we find is set and we spend the next twelve years trying to change. So, I would suggest that if we could somehow link everything together more along the lines of birth to kindergarten we would have a much better chance from kindergarten to twelfth grade (Superintendent 3, p. 27).

This position was seconded by a superintendent from a small urban district who admitted to being "driven crazy by the special programs that do too little too late" (Superintendent 5, p. 11). This superintendent stated:

We do have parenting programs that are sponsored by different agencies. We donate the space and pay the utilities. I think these show some promise. They're getting to them before the problems start.

Sometimes I think we almost make it easy for parents to fail as parents. In our school system we have adopted the partnership attitude that we are not going to make decisions for you and your kid. Parents no matter who or what they are have got to be able to meet and talk about their kids and what they are learning in school and get them involved as best we can in the learning cycle.

I think for thirty years we have tried to keep parents out of schools and we have paid the price. In fact in all of my career that is what I have seen. Now we have changed our minds and think they need to be partners. And some parents have gotten comfortable with not making these decisions

about kids, and it is not just the parents of welfare kids or at-risk kids. There are a lot of middle class and above parents who find it difficult to make decisions about their kids. We are working in that area with the other agencies. It is growing and I think that is the kind of thing that will pay off (Superintendent 5, p. 21).

Another superintendent from a large urban district remarked that she believed the benefits were "virtually innumerable and far-reaching." She said:

I think you see the benefits everywhere. I mean look at the numbers of kids who are graduating from high school and I am talking about the ones who don't have their own support systems at home. Many of those students would not graduate without the collaboration of some of the many organizations and agencies that work to set those kids up for success (Superintendent 4, p. 13).

Funding as a Benefit

Acquiring funding to improve the efficiency of service delivery was a third benefit noted by superintendents. Comments were made in regard to the sharing of resources, services, and data. Better use of funding was emphasized. Some of the superintendents indicated that at times access to or protection of funding tends to prompt collaboration.

Several of the superintendents talked about gaining access to funding and also about improving the delivery of services to families. One superintendent in a small urban district said, " It was a real boon to the district,being able to get money that we never were able to get and get services for kids that they've never been able to get" (Superintendent 8, p. 6). Another superintendent in a large suburban district indicated that even wealthier districts are beginning to recognize a financial benefit to school-linkages. Implying that there is a break-even point at which it becomes advantageous for school districts to engage in linkages, he said:

I think the biggest thing is that we don't work at cross purposes. We can compliment each other and not step on each others' toes or duplicate services. The families can get better services to the extent that we are coordinated.

For instance, we are doing one on Medicaid billing now where we are going to start seeking Medicaid reimbursement on OTPT [Occupational Therapy/Physical Therapy] services in our schools. We are going to get the information on Medicaid eligible students so that we know then when to bill the federal government. So the benefit to us is money. I mean this is money that we have not previously collected [and] that we can add to better provide services in the school system. It isn't usually the case; but, in that case there is a cooperative arrangement that provides money.

Another example is that if a county social worker and a school social worker are in better coordination about what is going on, someone

can sort of oversight the whole thing and see if there needs to be court involvement, and if there needs to be food stamp assistance, and if there needs to be medical assistance. If we don't work this way, we are working in isolation and the family isn't better served, resources aren't well spent. So, I think money is one and I think efficiency is another one. I think the bottom line is better services to kids and their families (Superintendent 7, p. 14).

A superintendent working in a suburban district that has been growing by approximately 1,000 students per year emphasized that collaboration is sometimes viewed as a means of safeguarding resources. She discussed how this "fact of life" can promote collaboration among schools and community agencies. She said:

I think linkages are a benefit to the community at large. It definitely has implications financially not only for school districts, but it is a benefit because when you look at the political implications of lowering tax rates because of non duplication of services, that definitely comes back to schools in services provided to the clients. We are one of the only if not the only compulsory institution left in this country. Therefore every kid or family will come to his place called public education unless they choose the private sector. But assuming that everybody touches us, therefore, we have an opportunity to divert services if necessary or to give at least families and kids services needed. So it just makes sense to have a single point of contact (Superintendent 9, p. 7).

This superintendent pointed out later in her interview how funding formulas in her state led to collaboration. She reported:

We work with the juvenile justice system in an alternative education plant which was mandated in the state in counties with populations at certain levels. We also work with other school districts in a consortium of sorts. That is partly due to the funding situation in the state. You know you can hang on to some of your money if you collaborated with school districts within your county and that money stays in the county versus going to the state. It's the Robin Hood formula. The wealthy districts with so much money have to give it back to the state to be distributed to less wealthy districts. If you form a consortium of sorts for certain arenas like alternative programming, then that money can stay within that region. The juvenile justice system is one we have to work collaboratively with. There has to be a sign-off base on what we do with those kids.

In another state I worked in, money was offered for districts that collaborated with their social service agencies. So there was money available for districts and service agencies to jointly offer services. So I have been involved in varying levels of mandates. I'm more, you know, conducive to it because money was tied to it (Superintendent 7, p. 14).

An urban superintendent offered a somewhat different outlook:

If we pool our resources, we might not all be able to solve the problem; but, we could provide that resource to a larger pool of students. I think all of us are going to have to be much more accountable. We are going to have to share data so we don't have kids who as individuals are slipping through the cracks. If you are supposed to be in school, then we need to share that data. If you are supposed to be in a training program, we need to be sharing that data about your attendance and performance. If we don't do more of that, then we are playing games and ultimately the money will be spent and nothing will have happened that is good for kids (Superintendent 2, p. 36).

If there is a consensus among these superintendents, it is that there are several possible benefits to the use of school-linked service integration. Some are more willing than others to promote connections between schools and other institutions. Their motivation to participate in school linkages is one which springs from self-interest. Perhaps this is justifiable because the self-interest appears to be guided by the needs of the community in which the superintendents serve.

Barriers to School-linked Service Integration

Commenting specifically on barriers to school-linked service integration, the superintendents referred to the logistical problems of negotiating, managing, and sustaining school-linkages. They discussed how involvement in school-linked collaboration requires not only a different approach to service delivery but also a willingness to circumvent the usual channels of authority. Moving away from the status quo was seen as a major challenge. They often are faced with choruses of "but we've always done it this way!" Moreover, the amount of time and work required to "hammer out agreements" between the various agencies about the management of school-linked service integration was distinguished as perhaps the most significant barrier of all.

Professional turf

Superintendents were concerned about who has control of the operational procedures governing the sharing of information and resources. These matters were most often portrayed as turf issues. A superintendent whose district has an enrollment of almost 45,000 students talked about these issues in the following way:

Probably the most common problem is turf. We always end up fussing about who pays for who and who pays for what, and who should provide the space and who should provide the staff, and whether or not the school district should rent, lease, or give space to everybody who wants it or just some of the people. And who is entitled to what information about what group of people. I mean there are all kinds of issues (Superintendent 3, p. 16).

Confidentiality

Confidentiality was one issue that was often mentioned. Statements were made about the clients' right to privacy and the difficulties inherent to promoting interagency communication. A few of the superintendents pointed out that school and agency personnel often have different ideas about the kinds of information that can be exchanged. They stressed the importance of building trust among the various service providers.

Recognizing that clients at times wish to guard the nature and extent of the services they are receiving, a superintendent from an urban school district of approximately 65,000 students talked about the sensitive nature of student information and the school's responsibility in protecting that information. He explored the role schools might play in assisting people in need without stigmatizing them:

We have a number of homeless people. We don't make an issue of the fact that you are homeless. You show up to the school and still we provide you services. And once you are involved you get the full service that we can either provide or that we bring to you and that includes your family. There is a need for that kind of thing whether social workers or others get involved. You go to some of the other agencies and they start wanting all this data. I think there [are] some people that are somewhat leery as to whether or not some other super agency is going to get involved and that there may become some negative consequences [for them]. A lot of folks see that as an invasion of privacy. They feel those people [from welfare or judicial agencies] already know too much about them. The school has a different feeling about it. They [those receiving services] don't feel like someone is peeping into their life. We don't want to betray that confidence. We have to be sensitive to that, to the way they see the schools. It is one way the school system can serve these people (Superintendent 2, p. 7).

This superintendent also referred to the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of student information as well as the difficulty of school personnel's being able to access from other agencies information about students. He provided the following illustration:

In many instances the data is not being shared from a practical standpoint. It goes back to an earlier time when we say that is the way we have always done it. You still have some people who feel that we need to protect our kids from having others know what their true circumstances are. We don't share our data. We all tend to operate under the same assumption. If we share our data, there is always the risk that somebody might be able to use it and get our kids and provide a service that we are supposed to provide.

The other thing is many agencies don't have compatible software so that makes it hard to share data even if you want to. It becomes labor intensive. It is a situation in which we have a lot of things to think about

like, for instance, whose budget finances this so-called sharing (Superintendent 2, p. 36).

The issue of confidentiality also was examined from a "need-to-know basis" as well as from a practical standpoint. Other superintendents discussed confidentiality in regard to how difficult it is to build a sense of trust that professional confidences will not be violated.

A superintendent from a district with over a 100,000 students brought up similar issues about exchanging information with other community agencies. He pointed out the pitfalls of agreeing in advance with child protective services for the method of reporting suspected child abuse. He spoke about the confidentiality issue in this way:

You know confidentiality was terribly important to social services. They only wanted to tell, like, the minimal number of people and we were saying we had to forge through and ask some hard questions. Would the classroom teacher know about it [the suspected abuse]? Would the principal know about it? If the principal wasn't there, would the assistant principal know about it? They kept pushing in the direction of the school social worker, but many school social workers aren't in our buildings but one or two days a week. So we were concerned that that wasn't a good enough linchpin. So we were going back and forth. Them struggling with confidentiality; us trying to get the information to people who truly need to know without violating confidentiality. There are some dangers. In going back and forth, what were we signing up for when we agreed to do this? What liability were we taking on? We were in unchartered waters, but we believed our people needed to know what was going on with these kids (Superintendent 7, p. 9-10).

Still another superintendent in a much smaller suburban district with approximately 5,000 students wondered whether or not the issues of confidentiality could ever be managed successfully. She indicated that "it is a big problem." She described the difficulties she had encountered in attempting to establish formal parameters for sharing information about students in her district with other community agency personnel. In doing so, she described what she referred to as "trust issues." She said:

There is a lot that mitigates against collaboration. For one thing, I believe confidentiality is a big issue because of privacy acts or laws. I am currently working with the county government on a memo of understanding so that information can be shared on students and in a way that best serves the interest of the students, not the agencies. Part of the problem is that when you work in an area, sometimes you don't have that small town, neighborhood feeling where everybody knows everybody and you have to build trust on a different level. For us that may come through this agreement. I am reserving judgment. It is one thing to have formal

agreements and another to actually know that you can depend on the people that you are exchanging information with (Superintendent 6, p. 37).

Funding as a Barrier

Issues involving financial matters were also cited as barriers to school-linked service integration. As one superintendent said, "Money, as you know, is a major concern in any district" (Superintendent 3, p. 5).

A superintendent from a small suburban district on the East Coast advised caution when working out the financial negotiations of integrated services. She appeared suspicious of the motives of those who would use educational funds for other purposes. She pointed out that about half of her county's budget was allocated for education. She said:

Public services of any kind get beaten up. No matter who we are or who we work for we get a lot of blame. Some of this is due to our work loads. You cannot do everything; but the public's expectation level is high. Society in general doesn't want to pay any more, but they want more services. Now some people, especially those I think who work in the agencies, view this collaboration as a way to get more for less.

When superintendents start hearing about collaboration, they should ask themselves: Where is this coming from? Is there real community support for it, or is it coming from some special interest, you know, an agency who has budget problems or a group that wants more service?

It all comes back to strong community support and consensus. We have to ask: Whose interest does this collaboration serve? Is it to make life easier for the adults or does it really help kids? And as educators we have to also determine does this help kids succeed in school. That is our job (Superintendent 6, p. 38).

A superintendent in the Midwest confirmed the importance of gaining consensus within the community. She talked about "mixed" reactions that some health care and drug abuse counseling programs had received from members of her local community. She said that, on the one hand, there were families who appreciated gaining access to programs which perhaps were previously unknown to them. On the other hand, there were groups in the community who opposed those same programs, believing instead that schools should spend their funds only on educational programs and "forget about those other things." She said she spent a great deal of her time trying to figure out how to deal with the second group. She described her approach to funding issues in this way:

I think that all we can do is continue to focus on the fact that we're a community service agency ourselves, and the tax dollars that people spend are designed to foster educational improvement and success for all children, and that we can justify the expense of those dollars that do that, directly or indirectly.

One of the ways we've been able to avoid having a confrontation that would prevent us from moving forward is that we haven't used any local money to support these programs. We've made sure that the programs and whatever we were doing were supported by special grant funding or federal reimbursement or other types of state or federal dollars that we could secure.

We try to make sure that all the financial sources are clean. Everytime you get a grant, it's got certain requirements that go with it, and you're allowed to spend the money for certain kinds of things and not for others. So you have to make sure that you set up a system to help you make sure that you comply with all the different requirements of all the different funding sources that you've got. Mostly that is a matter of careful bookkeeping and just making sure that you take the time to set up a system from the get-go that will support those things (Superintendent 8, p. 7).

Conversely, four superintendents reasoned that money issues were "self-imposed" and reinforce the status quo. The first one said, "You often hear people reply to a request to share expenses with 'I don't think our budget office will let us work that way.' " She called these kinds of statements: "Nothing more than excuses. Sometimes you have to work the system" (Superintendent 4, p. 16). She argued that such excuses are self-imposed and "have more to do with fear of loss of power."

The second superintendent remarked, "I think the financial thing goes along with the 'that's the way we have always done it' mentality in trying to get money for an organization to add people or to supply materials" (Superintendent 2, p. 28). He stated his belief that this was one of the most difficult barriers to overcome because the different service providers have a tendency to see their organization's role in terms of their own institution's regulations. He suggested that "it is more than just the schools and the agencies. It is the culture and environment in which we work and that we also have to overcome" (Superintendent 2, p. 29).

This view was shared by a third superintendent. She said she believed that all turf issues are grounded in what she referred to as "fixed attitudes." She said:
I think the only real issue becomes the turf battle. Things get so ingrained. We tend to specialize and say, "I can do it better than you." What we need to look at is a single point of entry. If you are the only game in town, turf becomes a non-issue (Superintendent 9, p.8).

All this, however, was not seen as realistic by one superintendent. He summed up the issue in this way: "You know everybody wants to see the services, but nobody wants to pay either in money or in work" (Superintendent 1, p. 14).

<u>Negotiations</u>

This point of view was supported through examples given by two superintendents. Both commented that working out the financial arrangements was a difficult and time-consuming task. They provided examples to illustrate their points. One superintendent spoke about the challenges of maintaining services which are not usually delivered in schools. The other superintendent gave an example having to do with staffing problems. Both examples involved negotiation issues.

The first example involved a district's effort to get reimbursements from the state or from Medicaid for health checks. The superintendent pointed to the following problem:

In our area now, for example, the ruling is we won't be reimbursed for health screens unless the child is actually going to a doctor in the area. Well, we have known traditionally the kids are not going to go to a doctor at the clinic so we do the screens ourselves with our nurses. Our biggest concern is that the kid is not going to get served and that concern really stems from a money issue. We know they need the service. It would probably better be offered with us, but the funding is with someone else. I think the financial thing goes along with the "that's the way we have always done it" in trying to get money for organizations to add people or to supply materials and such.

Both agencies and schools, I find, have difficulty in giving up the dollar. They want to take your dollar, but they don't want to give up a dollar to you. I think for those relationships to work, we both have to be willing to give. In some situations, the school has the best service so I should be providing it. In some cases I should be giving the money I get that I would be getting for a service and give it to an agency and make them provide the full service.

It would relieve some of our duties, but that is difficult because once you give up a resource, some people have the tendency to say you did not need the resources in the first place, you could afford to give something away, and it makes them suspect about giving you what you need to fulfill other areas. In some cases I should be giving the money I get that I would be getting for a service and give it to an agency and make them provide the full service.

It is more than just the schools and the agencies. It is the culture and environment which we work in that we also have to overcome. You see such an action could cause you to lose staffing because if I was providing a service and I now give it to an outside agency to do, I would have no need to pay the person inside. Plus I wouldn't have that need, so one of the issues would be whether the agency would be prepared to pick up those individuals and let them work for them.

In some cases, the schools pay more and that is not just us. I think across the country salaries for service providers are probably better through the school systems. School districts tend to pay more than outside agencies do for the same service. Therefore you run into the problem of the agency not wanting to pick up your staff because they can't afford to pay them the salary that you have been paying them. And yet the agency may be able to provide better service at a lower cost (Superintendent 2, pp. 26-28).

A second superintendent talked about the difficulties of staffing with what he called "county personnel." Employing people from other agencies, he said, can create unforeseen problems. He described such a situation in this way:

We have programs which employ county personnel. For instance, we have police officers who work for us and public health people who help out in our clinics from time to time. Well, who will pay for police officers? We had a thing going where the county was willing to provide them, but we would have to pay overtime. And in the clinic the county cut back on clinic aids. Our secretaries then feel that they have to take the brunt of it and raise it as a labor issue. So we are lobbing it back. In some cases we are advocating against the county board or against the health department for making these cuts in those kinds of places. So that creates tensions, but I think on the whole they are manageable tensions. I think it is normal if you start a process like that (Superintendent 7, p. 10).

Time

These examples suggest another barrier: the time and effort required to manage school-linked service integration. This is a barrier that was addressed directly by other superintendents. One of the superintendents remarked that she thought the greatest barrier to school-linked service integration was the lack of a realistic understanding of the time required to create and solidify relationships among the various agencies. She said:

A lot of people think you can set your demands that everybody get to the table and that will be adequate. I haven't found that to be the case.   It requires lots and lots of time. You just can't say, 'Ollie, Ollie in free.' Building trust, formalizing agreements sometimes take longer than people think they should take. They require more meetings than you wish you had. I think one of the liabilities that people under recognize is the time it takes not only for those agencies and persons to come together but for them to learn to trust one another and not fear who is in whose territory or who is trying to get whose job or who would be eliminated or who would be downsized and who will look good and who will get credit. It just takes an incredible amount of time to bring people together and along with you (Superintendent 4. p. 12)

Time and work requirements were also mentioned by another superintendent. She commented specifically on the amount of time she devotes to addressing a state mandate for school-linkages. Although she said she believes that school sites are a natural setting for providing services, she also stated her belief that lawmakers have no idea about the amount of time or work required to administer the linked services. She said the people who make the laws live in ivory towers and are not realistic about the time required to implement instructional programs. According to her, administering school-linkages encroaches on instructional time. She said:

> I really am allergic to state-mandated linkages because I don't think they know what they are talking about or what they are doing. When they make these huge mandates without knowing the reality of the schools, it just gives you more work to do without any real relief. Do I think that social services and schools need to link? Absolutely I think it has to be done, especially in poor communities where people don't know where to go for services. I mean I want to spend time in my schools with my kids and my teachers and parents improving instruction and improving learning. That's what we're about, and instead I spend a lot of time on these other issues that I think are diversionary for focusing on instruction of learning. (Superintendent 6, p. 28).

This view was shared by a third superintendent whose state does not mandate linkages. He too was concerned about the amount of time and work required of principals who have integrated services sites in their schools. He described one such program that had been initiated by one of the elementary school's principals, saying he doubted that the program would continue. He believed it required too much of the principal's time to manage. He indicated that he would prefer seeing her devote more of her time to instructional leadership. Further discussing the situation, he said:
In this case this principal came to me and she said, "Hey I want to try this. It fits the district mission of improving achievement figures and a positive school climate, and I want to do it."

I said, "Bless you my daughter. Go forth." Laughter.
And she did.

> Well, in my judgment right now, well, she is neutral on it. She did a lot of work on it. To the extent that she is jumping out of a tree and saying this is wonderful, well, no she isn't. Too much work. She is running a school of over one thousand kids with one assistant principal, and it is a year-round school. It is perpetual motion over there. She has all she can do to keep the school running on a daily basis, and her scores have not improved. I think she is

having second thoughts. It is too much work, too much going on. It takes up too much of her time (Superintendent 1, p. 8).

The superintendents identified barriers to school-linked service integration. The time and effort required to manage issues of confidentiality, funding, and staffing pose a significant obstacle to providing coordinated services and require a substantial change in operational procedures. Further complications arise when representatives of the various agencies are reluctant to challenge the status quo or negotiate new working relationships among the various agencies. As a result, the superintendents seem to agree that while school-linked service integration may be worthwhile, it is rarely easy.

Superintendents' View of Their Role in School-linked Service Integration
When questioned about what the superintendent's role in school-linked service integration should be, most of the superintendents gave a relatively traditional response. They saw their role for the most part as being an implementor of public policy, or as one superintendent put it, "making sure the values and the beliefs of the board are operationalized through the superintendent" (Superintendent 4, p. 9). They differed only in how they might approach the task. Some believed this assignment might be accomplished through improved communication with other community agencies about the management of resources and personnel, and they cast themselves in the role of facilitator. Others thought that their role was to develop new roles and responsibilities for district personnel so that they might more effectively facilitate instruction as well as improved delivery of services. Only one superintendent spoke about expanding the superintendent's role beyond the school culture to take a dynamic leadership role in the community.

Facilitators
A few of the superintendents viewed effective communication as critical to the implementation of school-linked service integration. They emphasized the importance of sorting out the various administrative details and roles through negotiation with the other agency leaders. Because they believed they were often viewed by the community as a "spokesperson for the board" (Superintendent 1, p. 1), they assumed they should be the ones to foster this type of communication. As one superintendent said, "I see my role as an enabler. I may have to open the discussions and give on some of the turf issues first" (Superintendent 9, p. 10). Another said: What I do is try to avoid problems. For example, in the policy that came up from the county about family counseling, a problem had to do with roles, whose role was what. In reviewing the agreement, I had to be very careful. I mean I wanted it clear what was the school's responsibility and what was social services' responsibility. I had to help everybody to

understand and clarify the roles before we got into a problem situation. I had to get everybody together and get it spelled out correctly to avoid any problems (Superintendent 8, p. 7).

These superintendents also believed that it was their role to communicate the progress of ongoing programs to policy makers. As one superintendent said:

> Making sure all the roles are sorted out is like a marriage. It takes constant work and it's complicated because of all the people involved. They have their own issues, egos, certain problems that they work on. My job is to make sure that the county commissioners know what's going on, make sure the mayor knows what is going on, make sure that the city council knows what is going on; so that when we have those small site-level problems, at least the policy makers can solve them at that level" (Superintendent 3, p.16).

Developers

Other superintendents described their role as one of developer. They believed it was their function to establish training programs so district personnel would be prepared to assume new roles and responsibilities. One of the superintendents in this group said, "The chief executive sets the tone under which everyone else operates" (Superintendent 7, p. 18). He suggested using staff development programs as a vehicle to communicate the school district's goals in building school-linkages and to educate staff to work with people from other agencies. Another superintendent also proposed this approach and said:

I believe the premier role of the superintendency is to be a developer of others. You accomplish that in a lot of different ways, depending on the constituency that you are working with. In developing others, probably the most important thing I do is being sure that the right people are in the right place to do the right things for kids. It is a role where you are constantly helping people find and look for information to empower this organization. The role does not change. What I do is in providing leadership to bring out the best in people (Superintendent 4, p. 9).

Two additional superintendents also talked about their role in terms of developing skills necessary for school personnel to work with agency personnel. Their strategy was to tie the coordination of services to improved academic achievement for all children through the development of a "local school vision." Both endorsed staff development initiatives as a way to assist people in assuming their new duties. One superintendent described his view of his role in establishing such an initiative:

The agency head whether school or other has the responsibility for carrying out the mission and goals for that particular area. I play the role I can play now, but I am also planning a new role. I want to do more with site-decision making. I guess from the standpoint of facilitator I would

always be facilitating, but the role of facilitator would even be less because I would be sharing the vision and the creating of it and also the implementation of it. I am training my people as we speak: what we are going to do, who is going to do it, and what it is they will need for their training. What I hope to achieve is a local school vision of what is needed for kids in that school to move on and learn and achieve (Superintendent 2, p. 33).

Another superintendent who was already immersed in such a process said that he was beginning to see results with this type of approach. He admitted that because of his state's mandates it was impossible for him to arbitrarily set goals by himself. He said that his method for integrating services had been to involve his principals and the local site-councils in the implementation plans for each school and to train them in shared-decision making techniques. He said their focus was always about improving student achievement. He said:

Our job is to help the kids, and if we can get everyone to cooperate, we can do it. But someone is going to have to insist that things happen, and we have got to have, you know, other responsible adults participating because we can't do it all. Schools have been asked to do too much. Things just sort of get dropped on us because other people - How can I say this? - don't want to get their hands dirty. So I guess it is part of the schools' function to get their hands dirty.

[Our state mandate] is on the right trail, I think, by combining all these efforts toward a school setting. We are able to zero in on school learning as an important issue. We publish our test scores. We put out accountability reports, which, by the way, I don't see other agencies doing.

I think the reports are helping people get a picture of what we need to do and that we do have the will to take the hard knock. Educators want to achieve and they want to succeed. They just need to know what success means wherever they are working.

I try to provide a sense that I believe in them and that I am willing to commit my future to their success. I insist on their being able to explain to me how whatever they do is going to help student achievement. It all comes back to that.

They are beginning to talk in their site-councils and to try to get the agenda mostly about how to improve student achievement. Traditionally those agenda items on the site-councils center on finance and trying to get more money out of the central office and trying to get more people; but, of course, that is not what we want to talk about. We want to talk about using what we have to help students get to a higher level of achievement (Superintendent 5, pp. 29-30).

Community leader

One superintendent, however, viewed the role differently than the other superintendents did. She maintained that her involvement in school-linked service integration had caused her to take on the role of community leader. She spoke at length about how she viewed that role. She said:

I spend a lot of time being more or less a community leader. People will come to me and ask me to solve problems in the community. Now that is not part of my job, but you do it because it will get you the support you need to do things for your students. Let's face it. We are in the business of trading resources. Some people might say we are competing. I prefer to think of it as a trade.

I try to use the stature of the superintendency. This is something I did not take advantage of in my first superintendency. I don't think I even realized that the office has a certain stature or that you can make it have one. I believe the public wants superintendents to take a much more dynamic role. I think in my first superintendency I believed that it was not my role to be a politician. I was naive. Any CEO of a school system has to navigate the political waters. We are constantly negotiating to protect students. It hits me constantly that we don't understand the power or the stature of the superintendency. We don't use it to our advantage or use it for good. You can have an impact in the community.

My strength in this community is that I am someone from the outside. I carried no baggage. I had no allegiance. People got the idea that they got what they expected. I was able to settle strife because I was seen as impartial (Superintendent 6, p. 36).

 She argued that one could not be a shrinking violet and be a superintendent.

Eight of the nine superintendents framed their role in school-linked service integration as it related to the implementation of school board policy. They appeared to view their role as that of asset managers, protecting the school's resources and being responsible for the inner workings of the educational institution. Only one superintendent veered from this point of view, claiming that the role was to "get out there and inspire confidence and solve problems." This superintendent viewed the role as extending well beyond the school system in seeking to take a more vital role in the leadership of the community. Nevertheless, most of the functions that she described were similar to those outlined by the superintendents who saw the role as one of facilitation.

Chapter Summary

Chapter Four described the findings of the data analyses of this study investigating superintendents' views about administrative issues involved in school-linked service integration. An examination of the themes which emerged from the interviews with the nine superintendents who participated in the study was included as well as their comments concerning the role of the superintendent in school-linked service integration. Descriptions of the participants and of the setting for the data collection were also presented.

CHAPTER V
Conclusions and Implications

Introduction
Chapter V contains an overview of the study, conclusions on the findings as related to the research questions, followed by the relationship of the findings to the literature. Elements that are connected with the superintendents' views about school-linked service integration are the focus of the discussion of the findings. Recommendations for future research study are suggested.

Overview of the Study
Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, school districts across the United States have been promoting ever-higher standards of student achievement while at the same time confronting the non-educational needs of increasing numbers of at-risk students. This challenge has been a daunting one for school district personnel, and consequently, the professional literature about education has focused on the changes required for schools to meet this challenge (Goodman, 1995; Jackson, 1995; Murphy, 1996; Ottinger & Root,; 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). One of the most ambitious proposals aimed at school reform has been school-linked service integration (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Crowson & Boyd, 1996; Jehl & Kirst, 1992) which promotes a new ecology of schooling that does not distinguish between education and care (Kagan, 1989). As a result, a number of approaches for coordinating a variety of educational, health, judicial, and social services have emerged in such states as California, New Jersey, Florida, Kentucky, Illinois, and Louisiana (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Dryfoos, 1994; Edwards & Biocchi, 1996; First, Curcio, & Young, 1994; Miron, 1995; Smrekar, 1994; Sullivan & Sugarman, 1996; U. S. Department of Education, 1996).

Recent studies examining these school and community linkages have focused on the growing needs of children, the fragmentation of the children's services system, and the need for school and human service agency collaboration. Various phases of collaboration have been discussed and described in terms of the following three steps: problem identification, goal setting, and implementation (Gray, 1995). Not enough attention has been given to the problems of managing school-linked service integration nor to the leadership issues that surround them (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Gardner, 1993; Herrington, 1996; Hord, 1990; Smylie & Crowson, 1996; Smylie et al., 1996). Furthermore, surprisingly little has been written about how superintendents regard school-linked service integration or the conditions required to negotiate, manage, and sustain a successful implementation. To date, relatively little research, qualitative or

quantitative, has been conducted on the role superintendents play in the administration of school-linked service integration (Herrington, 1996; Hord, 1990: Jackson, 1995; Kowalski, 1995; Leithwood, 1995; Murphy, 1995). The purpose of this study, then, was to explore through qualitative inquiry the views of selected superintendents about administrative issues involving school-linked service integration.

<u>Applications of the Findings to the Research Questions</u>

<u>Research Question 1</u>

What views emerge when superintendents discuss school-linked service integration?

In general, the superintendents who participated in this study understood the concept of school-linked service integration as schools and community agencies working in "partnerships" to provide a variety of services for the community and its children, particularly to those children who are "needy," "unusual," or "unruly." The superintendents' notion of school-linkages included "not having redundant services" and "blurring the boundaries between agencies" to create "special projects" with "easy access and a kind of seamless continuum of services for children and families." They viewed the coordination of services as providing "more focus on the child in the case of the school issue and more focus on the family and how to support the family in the case of community groups."

In describing "how we link those services together," the superintendents provided examples which involved the coordination of efforts with judicial, social, and health-care agencies. Among those examples were medical screenings for disadvantaged children, child-care facilities for teen-aged parents, and assistance from local judicial authorities for dealing with disruptive students. The superintendents did not, however, limit their image of creating school-linkages to those agencies alone. They also cited, as a way of illustrating their school districts' participation in school-linked service integration, associations with those who administer other such community programs as public libraries, recreational facilities, charitable campaigns, and senior citizen activities . The superintendents' impression seemed to be that school-linked service integration "can mean whatever you want it to mean," and that "the idea is to use what you've got the best way you can." In their view, the partnerships were local ones and were most often referred to as "our relationship" with the county or city government rather than with any particular community agency. One thing that they found distasteful was the mandating of school-linkages by state or federal authorities without regard to local community need or consensus because they saw the mandates as providing more work "without any real relief."

72

The superintendents disagreed about the extent to which schools should be involved in coordinated service efforts. Using the school as a "point of contact" was viewed by some as logical because "schools are out there and basically available," and it is "the one place where, in fact, service providers can get to all or the majority of the population that needs to be served." Moreover, according to these superintendents, the schools in many communities are regarded as safe havens and perceived as "a known place." Therefore, those in need are less likely "to slip through the cracks" and more likely to access the services available to them if those services are located in or near schools. Furthermore, using the school as a "single point of contact" for service delivery was seen as a way to "strengthen the schools" because without having an opportunity "to give at least families and kids services needed" some students "are not going to make it" or "graduate." Tying school-linked initiatives to a "local school vision" of improved student outcomes was deemed as essential to the success of school-linked service integration; otherwise, "their agenda becomes your agenda."

Other superintendents, however, viewed school-linked arrangements as "inappropriate," stating that "schools are overburdened." "This is not our job," they said; "our job is to educate." They were concerned that involvement in school-linkages might interfere with the school's mission, superimposing other agencies' agendas over their own and requiring them to attend to "other issues" which would be "diversionary for focusing on instruction of learning." If, on the other hand, community agencies were willing to realign their own goals toward one which "coalesced around keeping kids in school" or "fit the district mission of improving achievement figures and a positive school climate," these superintendents appeared then to be more accepting of school-linked "partnerships" as a "necessary evil."

Research Question 2

What aspects of school-linked service integration do superintendents identify as most beneficial?

The nine superintendents who participated in this study identified several benefits to school-linked service integration. Although they recognized that "there is a lot that mitigates against collaboration between schools and community agencies," they also pointed out that such collaboration might in the long term "better serve the public interest" and more immediately the interests of their own individual school districts. Superintendents implied that there is a break-even point at which the benefits of school-linked service integration outweigh its drawbacks. According to the superintendents, the balance is most likely to be tipped in favor of school-linkages when they lend support to the school's academic

mission and enhance the district's financial capacities to meet the needs of its students.

The superintendents acknowledged that at times schools and community agencies "work at cross purposes," duplicating or creating "redundancy" in service delivery. Services are targeted to those children in crises and "too much of everyone's time [is spent] in picking up the pieces." As far as the superintendents were concerned, not enough attention has been given to "the factors that affect children before they come to school," such as, "health, nutrition, and good parenting." The superintendents believed that offering a "more integrated, better coordinated" approach to address children's needs might improve the efficiency of service delivery to a "larger pool of students." The families then might acquire "convenient access" or obtain "services for kids that they've never been able to get." As a result, those who provided the services might "accomplish more for children" by helping the community to avoid problems in the future, problems which the superintendents believed they are presently confronting.

The superintendents talked about the challenges of dealing with increasing numbers of "problem kids" and "needy kids" who come from "dysfunctional homes" with "no support system." Admitting that "we need help," the superintendents seemed more disposed to working with other community agencies if those agencies could assist school personnel in managing the issues that these "unusual" and sometimes "unruly" students create. This attitude was particularly apparent as superintendents cited the benefits of various programs which link schools with judicial and social services agencies and place probation and police officers or social workers on school campuses. These programs appeared to have a two-fold purpose. First they assisted school personnel in "keeping a heads up" about "violence issues and disruptive issues and rumor issues and gang issues and those kinds of things." In other words, they provided "great control" at little cost. Second, these school-linkages helped "disruptive" students to return to the "mainstream" through programs which teach students how to cope with such problems as substance abuse or teen-aged parenting. These kinds of school-linkages were seen as ones which furthered the schools' academic agenda because they addressed the needs of those who might "not make it" or who might "keep others from learning."

Foremost on the minds of most of the superintendents was the "financial strain" of meeting the "other needs" of children in a way which supported the schools' mission of improved student achievement. Several of the superintendents emphasized that "we only have so much money." Perhaps, as a result, the superintendents tended to view the instructional needs of children as being at odds with their non-instructional needs. The implication was that a competition for resources existed not only between

schools and community agencies but also among school system programs as well. Competition in all its forms was seen as a "fact of life" because "none of us has enough money to do all that needs to be done."

Thus, having "a single point of contact" was viewed as a matter of expediency, particularly in the areas of health care and human services. When "money was made available for districts and service agencies to jointly offer services," the superintendents appeared to be "more ... conducive to it" and experienced less conflict about using district funds "to take care of the physical and emotional needs of children." For example, obtaining medical reimbursements was considered "a real boon" because school districts were "able to get money that [they] were never able to get before." In addition, this money was regarded as "clean" because it was not "diverted" from local budgets.

Although superintendents alluded to the benefits of school-linked service integration for children and families, their prime motivation for participation in such efforts was based on how those efforts might promote their own organizational agendas. Consequently their slant on school-linkages appeared to be dependent upon whether or not other agencies might assist them by providing increased manpower or funding to secure improved student outcomes.

Research Question 3

What aspect of school-linked service integration do superintendents identify as most challenging?

The superintendents agreed that bringing about a successful implementation of school-linked service integration is no easy matter. This kind of collaboration was viewed as challenging because it requires a substantial change in the way that the various agencies conduct business with one another. These changes often affect operational procedures, asset management, and working relationships. Consequently "turf" issues are likely to emerge, "straining" efforts toward collaboration. Although these "tensions" were thought by the superintendents to be "normal" and "manageable," there was concern about the amount of time and effort that might be required to ease them. Therefore, according to the superintendents, the most challenging aspect of administering school-linked service integration was its "labor-intensive" nature.

First, the superintendents pointed out that different service providers have a tendency to see their organization's role in terms of their own institution's regulations. A pervasive attitude seems to exist among the various agencies that "they have their functions and we have ours, and we don't see eye-to-eye." For example, several of the superintendents in this study viewed the function of schools as an exclusively educational one, indicating a propensity toward "specialization" that was thought to be

typical of all agencies. Thus, changes in roles, responsibilities, or procedures usually foster a "self-imposed" hesitancy to retreat from a status-quo way of thinking that argues "That's the way we have always done it." Transforming "the culture and environment in which we work and that we also have to overcome" was viewed as a long and difficult process. According to the superintendents, a substantial amount of retraining might have to occur in order for agency members to realign effectively the ways in which they do business with one another.

Second, working out the arrangements for sharing resources was also viewed as labor-intensive. The superintendents admitted that a great deal of time is spent "fussing" about who has control of and responsibility for the management of such assets as money, staff, space, and information. Many of these arguments emanate from a "fear of loss of power" and the insecurity that sometimes results from having "to give something away." The superintendents saw themselves in "unchartered waters" and felt that they had "to be very careful" in "reviewing" agreements with other agencies in order to avoid problems in these areas. In their opinion, this process took a "great deal of time."

Third, the superintendents noted that "building trust" was essential to the success of any "formalized agreement." They believed that the "incredible amount of time" required to create this kind of "linchpin" was "under recognized" and sometimes "took longer" than expected. This aspect was seen as being additionally labor-intensive because it required "attending more meetings than you wish you had" in order "to bring people together and along with you."

Working out the details of school-linked service integration appeared to be a logistical nightmare for the superintendents. They believed, however, that everything could be negotiated except for the amount of time required to accomplish this. The prospect of carving out "lots and lots of time" from an already overcrowded schedule was a demanding one which they viewed as the most challenging aspect of school-linked service integration.

Research Question 4

What aspects of background, experience, or educational philosophy emerge when superintendents describe their views about administrative issues of school-linked service integration?

The superintendents were pleased to relate their varied experiences about "coming up through the ranks." They believed these experiences had enabled them to acquire executive-type skills about how to "make decisions," "structure options," and "handle mistakes," and had provided, as well, insight into the managerial and the political functions of the superintendency. Attaining the superintendency was regarded as an

arduous task which required one "to work in the trenches" and "to sit in a lot of chairs" before being chosen for "the big one." Furthermore, a certain amount of luck was seen as essential in order to be "at the right place" to take advantage of "career bends" and "one-time only opportunities."

They were, however, somewhat guarded in talking about whether or not these experiences had influenced their educational philosophies or their thinking about school-linked service integration. Being adept at skirting this line of investigation, they tended to reframe the researcher's follow-up questions and to speak about promoting "higher standards" and "raising the bar" and about the school's mission being "always primarily about academics."

The "silent assumption" (McCracken, 1988) seemed to be that a superintendents' philosophy and thinking about any issue would naturally incorporate enhanced student achievement and that the "bottom line" would always "come back to that." Implicit in this assumption was the notion that support or lack of support for school-linked service integration might hinge upon its potential to bring about improved student outcomes so that "the school can move on and learn and achieve" and therefore improve the standardized test scores. Further implied was the idea that a focus on student achievement demands that everything else fall by the wayside because "schools have been asked to do too much" and "you can't do everything."

Other Findings and Their Applications

The superintendents in this study talked easily and at length about their view of the role of the superintendency in school-linked service integration. Because they believed the primary responsibility of the superintendency is to provide leadership "for carrying out the mission and goals" of the school district, they tended to see the superintendent's role in school-linked service integration as that of a facilitator or developer.

They described a facilitator as one who "as a spokesperson for the board" communicates with other institutions and with policy makers about the management of resources and personnel. The purpose of the role was "to avoid problems" by acting on behalf of the school district to review agreements, clarify roles, and help others understand the nature of the various agencies' responsibilities. If problems arose, it was the facilitator's job to provide information so that policy makers might make an informed decision about how "to solve them at that level."

Developers, on the other hand, were described as those who "make sure that the right people are in the right place to do the right things for kids." It was viewed as a role "where you are constantly helping people find and look for information to empower the organization." The purpose

of the developer was to build capacity within the organization to meet the demands of collaboration, while at the same time pursuing a "local school vision" focused on improved student achievement.

The superintendents appeared to be very results-oriented in pursuing their role as superintendents. They believed they were "much more accountable" to the community than were other community agency heads possibly because public schools represent the "only compulsory institution left in this country." They also pointed out that in some instances the public school system receives a larger portion of local revenues than do other agencies and may be one of the larger employers of the local work force. In addition, from their point of view, they were under a great deal of pressure to comply with state and local instructional mandates about raising "standards and achievement" because that is "the issue" now, and it is their job as superintendents to determine what "helps kids succeed in schools." Perhaps as a result of that pressure, they seemed to prefer a supporting role rather than having the lead, which might make them similarly accountable for the success or failure of school-linked service integration.

<div align="center">Relationship of Findings to the Literature</div>

The results of this study are related to previous literature in two areas: school-linked service integration and the superintendency. The primary area of interest concerns superintendents' views about the administrative issues of school-linked service integration.

School-linked Service Integration

Nine superintendents from across the United States were interviewed for this study. Like Adler (1994), they agreed that there are a variety of definitions about what constitutes school-linked service integration, but they generally regarded the concept as one in which schools and community agencies work in partnerships to provide a variety of services for the community and its children. Although they agreed that involvement in school-linkages should be shaped by the needs of the local community (Gardner, 1993), the superintendents were divided about the extent and form that school-linked service integration should take. Some of the superintendents believed that using the school as a single point of contact (Dryfoos, 1994; First et al., 1994; Lawson, 1995; Rigsby et al., 1995) is logical because children are less likely to fall through the cracks if services are offered in a centralized location such as the safe haven that a school setting can provide (Koppich, 1994). Because the delivery of services might be less fragmented (Bruininks, Frenzel, & Kelly, 1994; Garvin & Young, 1994; Hertert, 1996; Kirst, 1991; Koppich, 1994; Melaville et al., 1993; Rist, 1992; Wang et al., 1995), children and their

families might acquire a variety of educational, health, judicial, and social services in a family-friendly setting and be better served (Adler & Gardner, 1994; Cibulka & Kritek, 1996; Dryfoos, 1994; Gray, 1995; Kirst, 1994; Melaville et al., 1995; White & Wehlage, 1995). Other superintendents in this study saw this use of schools as inappropriate because the schools are overburdened and can ill afford to take on additional responsibilities (Crowson & Boyd, 1993). Their hesitation to collaborate with other agencies seemed predicated upon whether or not school-linkages could lend support to the school's academic mission (Sarason, 1990; Tyack, 1992), thus helping the superintendents to cope with disadvantaged or disruptive children through increased funding and manpower.

Bringing about collaboration was viewed as time-consuming and labor-intensive because of the number of issues that require resolution. Researchers previously indicated that if such issues as professional turf, resources, accountability, or risk management are left unresolved, they are apt to create barriers to school-linked service integration (Cunningham, 1990; Gray, 1995; Hannaway, 1989; Kirst, 1991; Syracuse University Research Corporation, 1971; Wood & Gray, 1991). Such barriers have most commonly been characterized as the "nuts and bolts issues" of governance and staffing (Gardner, 1993), as technical or administrative problems (Herrington, 1996), or as "deep structure problems" (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Smylie et al., 1996). Koppich and Kirst (1993) concluded that funding, space, confidentiality, staff training, and governance are also potential barriers to school-linked service integration.

Many of these issues were viewed similarly by the superintendents as presenting barriers to school-linked service integration. They cited specific issues that included the negotiation of operational procedures, asset management, and working relationships with other agencies. Gray (1995) as well as Sullivan and Sugarman (1996) also classified these issues as obstacles to school-linked service integration but portrayed them as issues of governance, resources, and accountability.

The superintendents were likewise cognizant of the difficulty in transforming the work culture, depicted by Smylie and Crowson (1996) as "the New Institutionalism" in which individual members demonstrate loyalty to their own organizations, which in turn creates a kind of organizational persistence, tending to reinforce the status-quo. White and Wehlage (1995) pointed out as well that many professionals, whether from schools or community agencies, get their professional identities and tend to give their loyalties to the organizations they represent rather than to the children they serve. Sullivan and Sugarman (1996) also saw this barrier as one involving staff who have not yet been trained, coached, inspired, and managed to assume new roles and responsibilities. Viewing this issue as a

particularly labor-intensive one, the superintendents anticipated a long, difficult, and extensive retraining of all the various agencies' membership. Consequently, the time required to manage these issues basic to the transformation of any organizational culture (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Handy, 1989; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992; Wheatley, 1994) was regarded as perhaps the most significant administrative issue of school-linked service integration.

The Superintendency

A number of researchers have commented on the need for synergistic leadership which is capable of managing the kind of change that school-linked service integration requires of organizations (Garner, 1994; Garvin & Young, 1994; Payzant, 1992; Zetlin, 1995). Some have stated that administrative roles and behaviors must shift from control to facilitation (First et al., 1994; Carter & Cunningham, 1997). This approach would guide administrative decision-making that is likely to proceed from a bottom-up approach rather than a top-down one. Others writing more generally about leadership and, often, from a corporate point of view have stressed the need for leaders who develop learning organizations in which people constantly expand their capacity to understand complexity and develop shared mental models (Handy, 1989; Senge, 1990; Wheatley, 1994).

The superintendents in this study tended to view the role of the superintendent in school-linked services as being similar to that which was described in the educational and corporate literature on leadership. They characterized it as being one of a facilitator or a developer. In both roles, the superintendents saw themselves acting on behalf of the school board to implement policy (Herrington, 1996; Hord, 1990; Jackson, 1996; Konnert & Augenstein, 1995).

The superintendents who described the role as one of facilitation emphasized its communicative aspects (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). Its function would be to "avoid problems" (Hannaway, 1989) rather than to promote a personal agenda (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). They saw the role of facilitator as one of information provider to policy makers (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

The superintendents who discussed the role in terms of building capacity within the organization (Handy, 1989; Senge, 1990; Wheatley, 1994) referred to themselves as developers who enabled others to act in the best interests of children. They saw themselves as working inside the organization to direct and strengthen the schools' commitment to a local vision focused on improved student achievement.

Their collective view of the superintendent's role in school-linkages appeared to be one borrowed from the literature about leadership,

particularly corporate leadership. In reform movements, like school-linked service integration, if the superintendency is mentioned in any way, it is generally described as being comparable to the role of a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Eaton, 1990; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). The superintendent, like the CEO, is recognized as a leader, a manager, and a politician who must deal with problems associated with finance, personnel, and curriculum (Glass, 1992). Hannaway (1989) pointed out that managers are expected to oversee an organization and ensure its efficiency [like the developer]; negative outcomes are unexpected and result in "lopsided" performance feedback (p.57). Jackson (1995) suggested, however, that unlike the CEO in business, the superintendent has numerous constituencies to please [like the facilitator] - the most important of which is the school board. Moreover, Norton et al. (1996) stated that reform initiatives have the potential to strain relationships between the school board and the superintendent. Therefore, it is understandable for superintendents to be wary of innovations like school-linked service integration which engender risk (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Kowalski, 1995). Although both groups of superintendents acknowledged that more and more students come to them with multiple and complex needs, (Hodgkinson, 1989; Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990; Koppich, 1994; Kowalski, 1995), they viewed their primary responsibility as one of accountability in regard to state and local mandates directed toward improved student achievement (Gardner, 1992; Goodman, 1995; Hertert, 1996; Hogan, 1985; Jackson, 1995; Kritek, 1996; Leslie, 1992; Tyack, 1992; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). The superintendents generally agreed that they were chiefly responsible for carrying out the mission and goals of the school district by operationalizing the values and beliefs of the school board.

<div align="center">Discussion of the Findings</div>

In this study, elements related to superintendents' views about the administrative issues of school-linked service integration were explored holistically. The research findings from this study are predicated upon the results from data collection and data analyses conducted through the use of open-ended interviews and qualitative methodology. The nine superintendents who participated in this study discussed their views about the complex issues, the complicated relationships, and the slowly evolving events (McCracken, 1988; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Seidman, 1991) that sometimes emerge in response to a school-reform initiative such as school-linked service integration.

Sarason (1990) argued that educators can no longer "accept full responsibility for dealing with educational problems, most of which by their very nature are exacerbated by forces beyond the school" (p. 39). The superintendents in this study, however, appeared to view themselves as

being held unremittingly accountable for the academic achievement of their students, regardless of the students' circumstances. Consequently many of their views appeared to follow from that consideration. In their discussions about school-linked service integration, the superintendents tended to describe the students in their districts as falling into two groups, those who had obtained academic proficiency and those who had not. Their willingness to facilitate or develop their school district's involvement in school-linkages seemed grounded upon how this involvement might affect student outcomes or further the local school vision of improving student achievement.

Konnert and Augenstein (1995) insisted that "much is left to the discretion of the board" (p. 7) and superintendents must obtain school board approval of many administrative recommendations (Johnson, 1996; Konnert & Augenstein; 1995). It is not surprising, then, that the superintendents regarded the issues about operational procedures, asset management, and working relationships as being labor-intensive. In order to bring about a successful implementation, the superintendents anticipated a long and difficult reorganization of program administration for school and community agency partnerships. Moreover, the superintendents believed that a successful implementation would necessitate a transformation of the organizational culture, which they also regarded as labor-intensive. The superintendents appeared to measure the time required for these administrative tasks against their school board's indulgence of such a time commitment. The implication was that the time to deal with these issues would be found if the board deemed these organizational changes necessary.

Carter and Cunningham wrote that "everything depends on good relationships" (p. 93). They noted that confusion about roles, poor communication, and personal agendas can "destabilize the superintendent's relationship with the board" (p. 98). The superintendents in this study described their primary role as one which would operationalize the values and beliefs of the school board. Their descriptions of the roles they might play in school-linked service integration were further extensions of their primary role. Whether they described themselves as facilitators or developers, they viewed the role as a political and managerial one. They emphasized the need for good communication with policy makers and appeared to see as themselves as asset managers whose primary function was to avoid problems and to enable others to perform their jobs well.

Hannaway (1989) reasoned that managers are expected to oversee an organization and ensure its efficiency; negative outcomes are unexpected and result in lopsided performance feedback (p. 57). According to Hannaway, a tendency toward caution is a consequence of this management function and that as a result "self-protective or risk-reducing behavior is

quite reasonable" (p. 57). She argued that managers often seek to distribute the risk by involving as many others as possible so as not to be held accountable if problems materialize.

The superintendents in this study appeared to be well-aware of Hannaway's principle involving risk. The lack of support for school-linked service integration on the part of some superintendents could be attributed to the risk potential that any innovation brings to managers. On the other hand, those who supported school-linkages seemed to recognize that others might finally share in the responsibility for the educational outcomes of all children.

<center>Recommendations for Future Study</center>

The findings in this study may have implications for other research in the area of school-linked service integration and the superintendency. The following recommendations are being made:

1. Submit the findings of this study for further study with a larger and more representative sample of superintendents.

2. Conduct a case study of several superintendents to determine differences in being disposed or not to school-linked service integration.

3. Study the processes used by superintendents to establish successful implementation and evaluation of school-linked service integration.

4. Examine student achievement specific to the practices and programs of school-linked service integration.

5. Examine the use of superintendents' time as it relates to involvement in school-linked service integration.

References

Adler, L. (1994). Introduction and overview. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), The politics of linking schools and social services. (pp. 1-18). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Adler, L., & Gardner, S. (Eds.). (1994). The politics of linking schools and social services. Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Alexander, K., & Salmon, R. G. (1995). Public school finance. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Amato, C. (1996). Freedom elementary school and its community: An approach to school-linked service integration. Remedial and Special Education.17(5), 303-309.

American Association of School Administrators. (1994). Roles and relationships: School boards and superintendents (Rev. ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.

Bernstein, P. L. (1996). Against the gods: The remarkable story of risk. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Blumberg, A., & Blumberg, P. (1985). The school superintendent: Living with conflict. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bruininks, R. H., Frenzel, M., & Kelly, A. (1994, August). Integrating services: The case for better links to schools. Journal of School Health,64(6), 242-248.

Carter, D. S. G., Glass, T. E., & Hord, S. M. (Eds.). (1993). Selecting, preparing, and developing the school district superintendent. Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Carter, G. R., & Cunningham, W. G. (1997). The American school superintendent: Leading in an age of pressure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chase, S. (1995). Ambiguous empowerment: The work narratives of women school superintendents. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Children's Defense Fund. (1996). The state of America's children: Yearbook, 1996. Washington, DC: Author.

Cibulka, J. G., & Kritek, W. J. (Eds.). (1996). Coordination among schools, families, and communities: Prospects for educational reform. Albany: State University of New York.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1993, February). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. American Journal of Education 101, 140-179.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1995). Integration of services for children: A political economy of institutions perspective. In L. G. Rigsby,

M. C. Reynolds, M. C. Wang (Eds.), <u>School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice</u>. (pp. 121-141). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1996). Achieving coordinated school-linked services: Facilitating utilization of the emerging knowledge base. <u>Education Policy, 10</u>(2), 253-272.

Cuban, L. (1989). <u>The urban superintendency: A century and a half of change</u>. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation.

Cunningham, L. L. (1990). Reconstituting local government for well-being and education. In B. M. Cunningham & L. L. Cunningham (Eds.), <u>Educational Leadership and Changing Contexts of Families, Communities, and Schools. Eighty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 2</u> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cunningham, W. G., & Gresso, D. W. (1993). <u>Cultural leadership: The culture of excellence in education</u>. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Dewey, J. (1900). <u>The school and society</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dey, I. (1993). <u>Qualitative data analysis: A user-friendly guide for social scientists</u>. New York: Routledge.

DeYoung, A. J. (1989). Excellence in education: The opportunity for school superintendents to become ambitious? In J. L. Burden (Ed.), <u>School Leadership: A Contemporary Reader.</u> (pp. 34-55). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Drath, W. H. (1996). Changing our minds about leadership. <u>Issues & Observations, 16</u>(1), 1-4.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1994). <u>Full-service schools: A revolution in health and social services for children, youth, and families.</u> San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Eaton, W. E. (Ed.). (1990). <u>Shaping the superintendency: A reexamination of Callahan and the cult of efficiency</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Edwards, P., & Biocchi, K. (1996). <u>Community schools across America</u>. Flint, MI: National Center for Community Education.

Farrow, F., & Joe, T. (1992, Spring). Financing school-linked, integrated services. <u>The Future of Children, 2</u>(1), 56-67.

First, P. F., Curcio, J. L., & Young, D. L. (1994). State full-service school initiatives: New notions of policy development. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), <u>The politics of linking schools and social services.</u> (pp. 63-73). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Fraenkel. J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1996). <u>How to design and evaluate research in education</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Fullan, M. (1982). <u>The meaning of educational change</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gardner, S. L. (1992, Spring). Key issues in developing school-linked integrated services. The Future of Children, 2(1), 83-94.

Gardner, S. L. (1994). Afterword. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), The politics of linking schools and social services. (pp. 189-199). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Garvin, J. R., & Young, A. H. (1994). Resource issues: a case study from New Orleans. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), The politics of linking schools and social services. (pp. 93-106). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Glass, T. E. (1992). The 1992 study of the American school superintendency. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glass, T. E. (1993). Through the looking glass. In D. S. G. Carter, T. E. Glass, & S. M. Hord (Eds.), Selecting, preparing, and developing the school district superintendent. Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Gomby, D. S., & Larson, C. S. (1992). Evaluation of school-linked services. The Future of Children, 2(1), 68-84.

Goodman, J. (1995, Spring). Change without difference: School restructuring in historical perspective. Harvard Education Review 65,(1) 1-29.

Gray, B. (1989). Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gray, B. (1995). Obstacles to success in educational collaborations. In L. G. Rigsby, M. C. Reynolds, M. C. Wang (Eds.), School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice. (pp. 71-99). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hagen, U., & Tibbitts, F. (1994). The Norwegian case: child-centered policy in action. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), The politics of linking schools and social services. (pp. 19-32). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Handy, C. (1989). The age of unreason. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Hannaway, J. (1989). Managers managing: The workings of an administrative system. London: Oxford University Press.

Herrington, C. (1996). Schools as intergovernmental partners: Administrator perceptions of expanded programming for children. In J. G. Cibulka & W. J. Kritek (Eds.), Coordination among schools, families, and communities: Prospects for educational reform. (pp.197-221). Albany: State University of New York.

Hertert, L. (1996, September). Systemic school reform in the 1990s: A local perspective. Educational Policy, 10(3), 379-398.

Hertz, R. & Imber, J. B. (Eds.). (1995). Studying elites using qualitative methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hodgkinson, H. J. (1989). <u>The same client: The demographics of education and service delivery systems.</u> Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hogan, Thomas P. (1985).   <u>Measurement implications of 'A Nation at Risk'.</u> ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation, ERIC Digest

Hord, S. M. (1990). <u>Images of superintendents' leadership for learning</u>. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Lab. (ERIC Document Reprofduction Service No. ED 355 652)

Jackson, B. L. (1995). <u>Balancing act: The political role of the urban school superintendent</u>. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.

Johnson, S. M. (1996). <u>Leading to change: The challenge of the new superintendency</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kaestle, C. F. (1983). <u>Pillars of the republic: Common schools and American society, 1780-1860.</u> New York: Hill and Wang.

Kagan, S. L. (1989, October). Early care and education: Beyond the schoolhouse doors. <u>Phi Delta Kappan, 7,</u> 107-112.

Kahne, J., & Kelley, C. (1993, February). Assessing the coordination of children's services: Dilemmas facing program administrators, evaluators and policy analysts. <u>Education and Urban Society, 25</u>(2), 187-200.

Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. (1976). <u>Educational administration: An introduction</u>. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Kirst, M. W. (1991, April). Improving children's services: Overcoming barriers, creating new opportunities. <u>Phi Delta Kappan,</u> 615-618.

Kirst, M. W. (1994, December). Equity for children: Linking education and children's services. <u>Educational Policy(8)</u>,4, 583-590.

Kirst, M. W., & Kelley, C. (1995). Collaboration to improve education and children's services: Politics and policy making. In L. G. Rigsby, M. C. Reynolds, M. C. Wang (Eds.), <u>School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice</u>. (pp. 21-43). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kirst, M. W., & McLaughlin, M. (1990). <u>Rethinking children's policy: Implications for educational administration.</u> Bloomington: Indiana University, Consortium on Educational Policy Studies.

Konnert, M. W., & Augenstein, J. J. (1995). <u>The school superintendency: Leading education into the 21st century</u>. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Co., Inc.

Koppich, J. E. (1994). The politics of policy making for children. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), The politics of linking schools and social services. (pp. 51-62). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Koppich, J. E., & Kirst, M. W. (1993, February). Integrating services for children: Prospects and pitfalls. Education and Urban Society, 25(4), 123-127.

Kowalski, T. J. (1995). Keepers of the Flame: Contemporary Urban Superintendents. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Kritek, W. J. (1996). Introduction. In J. G. Cibulka & W. J. Kritek (Eds.), Coordination among schools, families, and communities: Prospects for educational reform. (pp. ix - xxv). Albany: State University of New York.

Langenbach, M., Vaughn, C., & Aagaard, L. (1994). An introduction to educational research. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Lawson, H. A. (1995). Schools and educational communities in a new vision for child welfare. Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 1(1), 5-26.

Leithwood, K. (1995). Effective school leadership: Transforming politics into education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Leslie, M. (1992). The critical role of the superintendent in school reform. Tulsa, OK: University of Tulsa. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 349 658)

Levy, J. E. & Shepardson, W. (1992). Look at current school-linked service efforts. The Future of Children, 2(1), 44-49.

Liontos, L. B., & Lashway, L. (1997). Shared decision making. In P. Piele & S. Smith (Eds.), School leadership: Handbook for excellence. (pp. 226-250). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1988). Analyzing social settings. A guide to qualitative observation and analysis. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lugg, C. A. (1994, October). Schools and achieving integrated services: Facilitating utilization of the knowledge base. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED384997)

Mason, J. (1996). Qualitative researching. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McCracken, G. (1988). The long interview: Qualitative research methods series 13. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McNeill, L. M., & McNeill, M. S. (1994, Autumn). When good theory leads to bad practice: Some considerations in applying shared decision making to school settings. Theory Into Practice, 33(4), 254-264.

Melaville, A. I., Blank, M. J., & Asayesh, G. (1993). Together we can: A guide for crafting a pro family system of education and human services. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education and the U. S.

Department of Health and Human Services, U. S. Government Printing Office.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, E. (1995, November/December). Shared decision-making by itself doesn't make for better decisions. The Havard Education Letter, XI(6), 1-4.

Miron, L. F. (1995). Pushing the boundaries of urban school reform: Linking student outcomes to community development. Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 1(1), 98-114.

Mitchell, D. E. & Scott, L. D. (1994). Professional and institutional perspectives on interagency collaboration. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), The politics of linking schools and social services. (pp. 179-187). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Murphy, J. (1995). Restructuring in Kentucky: The changing role of the superintendent and the district office. In K. Leithwood (Ed.). Effective school district leadership: Transforming politics into education. (pp. 117-133). Albany: State University of New York.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imprerative for educational reform. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Norton, M. S., Webb, L. D., Dlugosh, L. L., & Sybouts, W. (1996). The school superintendency: New responsibilities, new leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ostrander, S. A. (1995). "Surely you're not in this just to be helpful": Access, rapport, and interviews in three studies of elites. In R. Hertz & J. B. Imber (Eds.), Studying elites using qualitative methods (pp. 133- 150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ottinger, C., & Root, M. (1994). Critical eduction trends: A poll of America's urban schools. Washington, DC: Council of Great City Schools.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods, 2d ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Payzant, T. W. (1992, September). Superintendent's view of interagency collaboration. The School Administrator, 10-11.

Payzant, T. W. (1992, October). New beginnings in San Diego: Developing a strategy for interagency collaboration. Phi Delta Kappan, 139-146.

Reich, R. B. (1983). The next American frontier. New York: Times Books.

Reynolds, J. E. (1994). Governance structures of Florida's full service schools: A case study. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1994).

Rigsby, L. G. (1995). Introduction: The need for new strategies. In L. G. Rigsby, M. C. Reynolds, & M. C. Wang (Eds), School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice. (pp. 1-18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rigsby, L. G., Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C. (Eds.). (1995). School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rist, M. C. (1992, April). Putting services in one basket. The Executive Educator, 18-24.

Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (1995). Qualitative Interviewing: The art of hearing data. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Russo, C. J., & Lindle, J. C. (1994). On the cutting edge: Family Resource/ Youth Service Centers in Kentucky. In L. Adler & S. Gardner (Eds.), The politics of linking schools and social services. (pp. 179-187). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Sabatier, P. A. (1986). Top-down and bottom-up aprroaches to implementation research: A critical analysis and suggested synthesis. Journal of Public Policy, 6, 21-48.

Sailor, W., & Skrtic, T. M. (1996, September). School/community partnerships and educational reform: Introduction to the topical issue. Remedial and Special Education. 17(5), 267-270, 283.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the twenty-first century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schorr, L., & Schorr, D. (1988). Within our reach: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage. New York: Anchor Books.

Seidman, I. E. (1991). Interviewing as qualitative research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday Currency.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral Leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Smylie, M. A., & Crowson, R. L. (1996, March). Working with scripts: Building institutional infrastructure for children's service coordination in schools. Education Policy, 10(1), 3-21.

Smrekar, Claire. (1994, Winter). The missing link in school-linked social service programs. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16(4), 422-433.

Smylie, M. A., & Crowson, R. L. (1996, March). Working with scripts: Building institutional infrastructure for children's service coordination in schools. Education Policy, 10(1), 3-21.

Smylie, M. A., Crowson, R. L., Chou, V., & Levin, R. A. (1996). The principal and community-school connections in Chicago's radical reform. In J. G. Cibulka & W. J. Kritek (Eds.), Coordination among schools, families, and communities: Prospects for educational reform. (pp.171- 195). Albany: State University of New York.

Spring, J. (1993). Conflict of interests: The politics of American education. New York: Longman.

Stainback, S. B., & Stainback, W. C. (1988). Understanding and conducting qualitative research. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Stout, R. T. (1989). A review of criticisms of educational administration: The state of the art. In J. L. Burden (Ed.), School Leadership: A Contemporary Reader. (pp. 390-402). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Sullivan, C. J., & Sugarman, J. M. (1996, September). State policies affecting school-linked integrated services. Remedial and Special Education.17(5), 284-292.

Syracuse University Research Corporation. (1971). The potential role of the school as a site for integrating social services. Policy Memorandum SYR 71-5. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Research Corporation, Education Policy Research Center.

Tyack, D. (1974). The one best system: A history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. (1992). Health and social services in public schools: Historical perspectives. The Future of Children, 2(1), 19-31.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Usdan, M. D. (1994, November). Collaboration: A new leadership dimension. Principal, 19-20.

U. S. Department of Education. (1994, September). Strong families, strong schools: Building community partnerships for learning. Washington, DC: Author.

U. S. Department of Education. (1996, May). Putting the pieces together: Comprehensive school-linked strategies for children and families. Washington, DC: Author.

Verstegen, D. A. (1996). Reforming American education policy for the twenty-first century. In J. G. Cibulka & W. J. Kritek (Eds.), Coordination among schools, families, and communities: Prospects for educational reform. (pp. 269-296). Albany: State University of New York.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1995). The effectiveness of collaborative school-linked services. In L. G. Rigsby, M. C. Reynolds, & M. C. Wang (Eds.), School-community connections:

Exploring issues for research and practice. (pp. 283-309). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Warner, C. (1994, June 15). Morial seeks federal windfall, empowerment zone status. Times-Picayune, p. A1.

Wheatley, M. J. (1994). Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

White, J. A., & Wehlage, G. (1995, Spring). Community collaboration: If it is such a good idea, why is it so hard to do? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 17(1), 23-38.

Wills, F., & Peterson, K. (1995). Superintendents' management of state-initiated reform: A matter of interpretation. In K. Leithwood (Ed.). Effective school district leadership: Transforming politics into education. (pp. 85-116). Albany: State University of New York.

Wood, D. J., & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(2), 139-162.

Yow, V. R. (1994). Recording oral history: A practical guide for social scientists. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zetlin, A. (1995). Commentary: Lessons learned about integrating services. In L. G. Rigsby, M. C. Reynolds, & M. C. Wang (Eds.), School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice. (pp. 421-426). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

<u>Interview Guide</u>

An introduction will be given.

      "As you know from our telephone conversation or from the letter I wrote to you, I am interviewing a number of superintendents about school-linked service integration. Because I would like to have everyone address the same issues, I have brought a set of questions with me. I think it will take about 30 to 45 minutes to discuss these questions. I will be taking notes as we talk; however, I would also like your permission to tape record our discussion. Your remarks will be treated confidentially."

1.   What comes to mind when you hear the terms school-linked service integration or school and community agency collaboration?
2.   Do you see any benefits to such collaboration?
3.   Can you think of anything that might stand in the way of school and community agency collaboration?
4.   Are there any elements that have to be in place in order to create a successful school-linked service effort?
5.   Talk to me about the role the superintendent plays in school-linkages.
6.   How did you develop this idea of the superintendent's role in school-linkages?
7.   What do you think was the most important aspect in your own preparation for the superintendency?
8.   Among the superintendents that you know, who is likely to know the most about these issues that we have discussed today?

Appendix B

Letter of Introduction

Date, 1997
<< Name>>
<< Agency>>
<< Address>>
<< City, State, Zip Code>>

Dear <<   >> :

My name is Mary Ann Hardebeck. I am a doctoral candidate in
Educational Administration at Virginia Tech. Dr. Joan L. Curcio is the
chairman of my dissertation committee.

I am investigating the ways different school and community agency
initiatives are managed. Ultimately, my goal is to add to the body of
research that describes the role of the superintendent in school-linked
service integration. The information gained will be used to complete my
dissertation research.

You have been nominated as a superintendent who has some experience or
knowledge about the administration of school-linked initiatives. I would
like to interview you about your perspectives and experiences. The time
required for the interview should take no longer than one hour. I will
store, secure, and maintain the confidentiality of all information that you
provide to me; moreover, the name of your school system will not be used
in the study.

Should you agree to participate, I will contact your secretary to arrange
for a date and time when we talk by telephone. I look forward to hearing
from you.

Yours truly,

Mary Ann Hardebeck

Appendix C

Initial Codes
Academics
Accountability
Achievement
Agendas
Agreements
Background
Barriers
Beliefs
Benefits
Community
Community Leadership
Confidentiality
Control
Culture
Definitions
Facilitation
Funding
Efficiency
Examples
Experience
Developers
Development
Goals
In our district
Kids
Logistics
Loyalty
Luck
Management
Mandates
Mission
Mentors
Money
My job is
Needs
Negotiation
Not my job
Open
Parents
Philosophy

Politics
Prevention
Professional Guidance
Role
Risks
School
School-linked Service Integration
School Reform
Site-based
Size
Special Projects
Status Quo
Stress
Superintendents
Tensions
Time
Training
Trust
Uniqueness
Work
Work experience
Working in the trenches

VITA

Mary Ann Hardebeck was born on May 5, 1948. She attended public schools in Logan County, West Virginia, and graduated from Man High School. She earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Education with a concentration in English from Marshall University in Huntington, West Virginia. She also earned a Masters Degree in Reading Education from Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York, and a Masters Degree in Educational Administration as well as a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. She holds an endorsement in the state of Virginia for the elementary, middle school, and high school principalship.

Mrs. Hardebeck spent nearly twenty years teaching at the elementary, middle and high school levels in Virginia and in New York. She taught fifth and sixth grade at the elementary school level. At the middle school level, she worked as an English teacher, a social studies teacher, and a reading teacher. At the high school level, she taught English, developmental and remedial reading, and gifted education. In addition, she has served as an English department chairman, a staff development coordinator, a gifted education coordinator, and an administrative intern.

Mrs. Hardebeck has presented at both national and state conferences and has published articles in professional journals. A teaching unit she developed was selected as an Exemplary Technology Project in Education by the Virginia Department of Education, and a course that she devised to assist ninth graders with their transition from middle to high school was awarded a Certificate of Recognition for its quality and significant contribution to education in the state of Virginia by Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Currently Mrs. Hardebeck is employed by the Prince William County Public Schools, in Prince William County, Virginia. She serves as an Assistant Principal for Curriculum and Instruction at Woodbridge Senior High School, a site-based managed school with a diverse student population of more than 3,000. There she supervises academic and vocational departments as well as student services personnel.

_____
Mary Ann Hardebeck