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The question that this study seeks to answer is, Does site-based management increase student achievement? Researchers believe that when a school can function more like a closed system, involved in site-based decision making, the culture of the organization may be more conducive to higher student achievement. This study has attempted to determine if there is a basis for this belief.

Supporting the study are three organization theories, Bureaucracy Theory, Systems Theory, and Human Resource Development Theory. These three theories run like threads in a tapestry throughout the research and legislation upon which this research is developed.

Researchers, up to this point, had not focused on the components of site-based management and their implementation, or lack thereof, and the effects it has on student achievement; nor had any research defined site-based management. The first step in the study was to set a standard by which schools could be held to determine if site-based management exists within the building. An expert panel of educational reformers chose 57 of 75 characteristics that had been disaggregated from the literature review as the set of standards.
This study gathered SBM implementation data from 19 schools in Michigan who began a planning year in 1994-95 to implement site-based management as outlined in the Improving America's Schools Act, Title I. The data determined whether SBM was in place as measured by the Expert Panel's standard. Then, when possible, the change in student achievement within those schools was determined from the baseline year, 1994-95, to the study year, 1997-98. Student achievement was measured by Michigan's Assessment of Education Program (MEAP).

None of the schools in the study met the standards declaring it site-base managed. The schools were rank ordered by their degree of implementation and then the MEAP student achievement data was rank ordered. From the data gathered, there appears to be no impact of site-based management on student achievement. A future study could revise the standards or perhaps weight some of the characteristics.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Schoolwide Title I legislation requires the decentralization of decision making. The question addressed by this dissertation is whether decentralization makes a difference in the academic success of students. Nearly one-third of today’s K-12 population are educationally disadvantaged due to poverty, cultural obstacles, or linguistic barriers and are, therefore, eligible for Title I intervention (Stitt-Gohdes, 1996). Title I, and decentralization, will be successful only if they make a positive difference in educating this vulnerable population.

There are two formats for delivering Title I services to students, a Targeted Assistance program or a Schoolwide program. In a Targeted Assistance format, students are identified as failing in one or more academic areas and needing assistance. Support activities are aimed specifically at only those identified students. Schools with less than 35% poverty levels must use this format for Title I assistance to identified students.

A Schoolwide program, on the other hand, allows schools who choose, with above 35% poverty, to co-mingle Federal categorical funds to improve the educational...
program for all of the students in the building (Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994, October 20, 1994).

Students determined to be “at risk” according to Michigan law must be achieving below grade level or receiving an average of 1.5 out of a possible 4.0 in any subject. In addition, the following criteria places students in an “at risk” category and, thus, generate additional State funds to give academic support to these students: (a) low achievement on MEAP tests; (b) victim of child abuse or neglect; (c) pregnant teen or teen parent; (d) poor attendance patterns or behavior; and/or (e) a family history of school failure, incarceration or substance abuse (Michigan State Aid Act, 1999-2000, Section 31a.(15)).

If intervention is not available or, if available, unsuccessful, the “at risk” population can translate into some staggering statistics. Thirty percent of today’s students will drop out of high school (Stitt-Gohdes, 1996). These persons will find it extremely difficult in today’s economy to have even minimal financial stability. The cost to America’s society cannot be calculated. We have only begun to experience the increasing levels of violence expressed by this disenfranchised population. Research clearly allows schools to identify this population by the end of second grade (Slaven, et.al., Dec. 1992/Jan. 1993). Can decentralized decision-making, as outlined in Title I legislation, intervene on their behalf?

If decentralization of decision-making can improve teaching and learning, as manifested in improved student achievement, fewer students will fail, lose motivation, drop out of school, and will ultimately become contributing citizens to America’s
economy. We cannot afford to fail. We cannot stop searching for the key to learning for all. We must answer the question, what will it take?

Researchers, up to this point, have not focused on the components of site-based management and their implementation, or lack thereof, and the effects it has on student achievement. Title I legislation requires individual schools to spend a year of planning to implement a Schoolwide format through site-based decision making. My study focused on the 51 schools who began their planning year in 1994-95, their implementation of site-based management, and student achievement within those schools, as measured by Michigan’s statewide student assessment program, Michigan Assessment of Education Program (MEAP).

The MEAP State testing program within Michigan is a criterion referenced testing program based on a Model Core Academic Curriculum with Standards and Benchmarks for each of the four academic areas: math, social studies, English language arts, and science. Students are tested in reading and mathematics in 4th, 7th, and 11th grades and in science, writing, and social studies in the 5th, 8th, and 11th grades. These tests show academic achievement of Michigan’s students by individual school and district. In addition, these tests are used to show adequate yearly progress (AYP) for Title I schools. Schools who do not show AYP for two years in a row in any tested area must develop a plan for program improvement that will assure more students achieving at higher levels.

My hypothesis is that site-based management (SBM) increases student achievement. Within SBM schools, critical decisions should be made by those who
daily interact with students allowing for “just in time” intervention strategies. The study sought to discover if SBM is sanctioned, rewarded, and a part of standard operating procedure policy within the study population of schools.

Often two terms are used interchangeably, governance and management. These terms are not used interchangeably in this dissertation. For purposes of this study, “governance” refers to the institutional process of setting policies used to guide, provide incentives, and supply resources to enable schools to operate. “Management,” on the other hand, is the process by which various levels of the bureaucracy operationalize those policies and resource allocations to be used in their schools. Through their influence on management decisions and teacher and student behaviors, the policies created by governance, can have a profound effect on what happens in the classroom and student achievement.

The purpose of this study was to connect governance, management, and student achievement. Figure 1 depicts how I proceeded in several steps. Step one was to define “site-based management.” The literature review did not provide a clear definition. In order to develop a definition for the study, I assembled an Expert Panel from those who have done research in the area of site-based management and/or school reform. The panel was selected from authors identified by the literature review, and through recommendations by Dr. Lawrence Lezotte, an internationally known school reform expert.

Six key concepts and defining characteristics of those concepts became evident from the literature review, as well. Seventy-five defining characteristics were
identified. The panel was asked to rate the importance of each of the defining site-based management characteristics identified in current research. Their ratings were then synthesized to create a set of standards by which a school could be measured concerning implementation of site-based management.

Figure 1. Creation of School Participation Survey.

From the Expert Panel data, a School Participant Survey was developed to be used with school personnel at each of the buildings. Research has shown that each school building is a learning community and that each person who interacts with a
student positively or negatively influences that student’s achievement. Michigan P.A. 25 legislation recognized this phenomenon and, therefore, required that school improvement teams be inclusive of support personnel within schools (Public Act 25, Section 1277, 1991). Therefore, for purposes of this study, when the term “school personnel” or “staff” is used it means every person employed in that building, regardless of their position within the organization.

The principals at the 51 schools within the population were contacted and invited to participate in the study. Nineteen principals agreed to have their staff surveyed. Each principal was then sent a packet of surveys for each member of the school personnel. School personnel were then asked to return the surveys in the provided stamped, self-addressed envelope. The data collected was compiled by school and analyzed to determine each school’s compliance with the standards set by the Expert Panel data.

The results of each schools MEAP data was then accessed. At this juncture, five schools were eliminated. The five schools did not have MEAP data that could be used for purposes of this study. Four schools had less than 25% return rate and were eliminated. The remaining 12 data sets were then analyzed to determine the relationship, if any, between the MEAP data and implementation of SBM as measured by the study’s standards. Figure 2 shows the beginning 51 schools that made up the 1994-95 cohort, why various schools were eliminated from the study population and the final 12 that had MEAP scores available.
Figure 2. Determining Study Cohort.

This study defined site-based management, identified the Title I Schoolwide schools in Michigan's 1994-95 cohort who have implemented SBM, and determined if decentralized, site-based decision making within those programs affected student achievement, as measured by the MEAP.
Theories

Owens (1991) suggests that “schools are far more organizationally complex than has been traditionally understood” (p. 54). It is important to understand this concept and some organization theories since the bedrock of my research is based on the organizational structure of the schools and its impact on student achievement. At this time I want to introduce three organizational theories upon which I believe educational governance, management, and legislation are based. The discussion will continue as it becomes applicable throughout the dissertation. You’ll discover, as I discuss the legislation in the next chapter, how these Organizational Theories have impacted the legislation as it has evolved over the 35 years since its inception. I want to begin here, however, to introduce you to the theories I use and explain how I have seen them played out in an educational setting.

Supporting this study are three organization theories, Bureaucracy Theory, Systems Theory, and Human Resource Development Theory. These three theories run like threads in a tapestry throughout the research and legislation upon which this research is developed. The theories are separate and distinct at times. Other times, they are blurred and convergent. There are even times when they blend to create what may be construed as an entirely different theory. However, once again, they diverge distinct, yet perhaps with a formal structure that seems to have been refined to fit the needs of the social organization.

“Formal structures are not only creatures of their relational networks in the social organization. In modern societies the elements of rationalized formal structure are deeply
organization. In modern societies the elements of rationalized formal structure are deeply ingrained in, and reflect, widespread understandings of social reality” (Meyer & Richard, 1992, p. 24). Social reality takes comfort in knowing how to define school based on these theories.

Bureaucratic Theory

Taylor's Scientific Management and the industrialization of our society set the stage for Weber's model of Bureaucracy Theory. Taylor, at the dawn of the 20th century realized that work could be separated into distinct parts. Those parts, then, assigned to an individual. With the dawning of this new paradigm, came the system of management. Managers were needed to oversee those on the production lines (Meyer, 1978; Drucker, 1977b; Scott, 1983).

As industrialization expanded businesses, Weber's model of Bureaucracy Theory became widely accepted. The 5 main tenets of this theory are: (1) maintenance of a strong hierarchical control and authority that supervises those in the lower ranks, (2) establish and maintain vertical communication, (3) develop clear written rules and procedures to guide conduct, (4) develop clear strategic plans for participants to follow, and (5) add supervisors where necessary to maintain the hierarchy and address problems that may arise (Owens, 1991).

What society accepted as wise practice for growing American businesses, soon became thrust upon education as well. Questions of economy and price per unit which had been applied to business, surely could be applied to education, too. It only meant that
doing their jobs appropriately. “By 1907 there were indications that aspects of the business ideology had been accepted and were being applied by educators themselves” (Callahan, 1962, p. 6).

The bureaucratic theory continues to manifest itself in education today. The community, in fact, expects it. A leader makes decisions and sets policy; usually the Superintendent or School Board. Supervisors (Principals) assure that those policies are adhered to by those working within individual buildings. Subordinates follow the rules and carry out the decisions of the leader(s). Those subordinates are the teachers and students.

Systems Theory

“By and large they [Weber and Taylor] were concerned with management in industrial settings” (Meyer, 1977, p. 10). Today, in the Information Age, many successful organizations are implementing a systems organizational structure. This is based on systems theory developed at about the midpoint of the 20th century. Peter Drucker (1977b) wrote of the systems approach to management,

Each component of the system has to work in its own way, be effective according to its own logic, and according to its own standards. Or else it will not be effective at all. Yet all components have to work toward a common goal. Each has to accept, understand, and carry out its own role. This can be achieved only by direct, flexible, and tailor-made relationships among people or groups of people in which personal bond and mutual trust bridge wide differences in point of view, and in what is considered “proper” and “appropriate” (p. 517).

In 1932 Mary Parker Follett had come to realize that the rigid structure of bureaucratic theory needed rethinking. She identified coordination of processes or
systems that reacted with, between, and among other processes or systems, a Systems Theory (Owens, 1991). Deming (1993) states, “A system is a network of interdependent components that work together to try to accomplish the aim of the system...The aim of the system must be clear to everyone in the system” (pp. 50-51).

After World War II, Deming applied systems theory and gained success in Japan with companies. Deming (1993) made the Systems Theory popular with U. S. business and industry in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Peter Drucker (1993) discussed the idea of each component in the system being a vital part of the system and the necessity for a clear understanding of the mission of the system or organization.

An organization utilizing systems theory operates under a certain set of constructs:

1. An organization is made up of a set of systems that affect one another.
2. Environments are created and maintained where human interactions occur with some regularity and predictability.
3. Systems are permeable and function within a context.
4. Every participant has a role influenced by interactions within the system.

Systems theory is evident in schools. Districts are made up of individual schools that influence what the other schools do. School cultures determine interactions among participants. Participants move between and among various contexts, and influence and are influenced by them. Participants play various roles depending on the context and expectations of self and others. As Peter Drucker (1993) and Mary Follett (Owens, 1991) would agree, the best way for teachers to
function at a high degree is to have a clear understanding of the mission for the school and district, and for districts to abandon a rigid hierarchical organizational structure.

Human Resource Theory

In 1928 in Hawthorne, Illinois at a Western Electric Company, Elton Mayo conducted studies that spawned the Human Resource Theory. His studies showed that social and psychological factors have more to do with productivity than had been previously believed. People respond intrinsically to their work (Drucker, 1977a).

Human resource development theory, sometimes referred to as management theory, emphasizes using the conscious thinking of individuals about involving their commitment, abilities, and energies toward achieving the goals of the organization (Owens, 1991). McGregor’s Theory Y expects that people want to contribute effectively and are capable of initiative, responsibility, and creativity.

This theory sets forth four tenets on which it claims credibility: (1) the front line worker is foremost in creating change, (2) the front line worker should be included in decision making when it concerns their work, (3) coordination of the system is accomplished through socialization of the participants, and (4) identification with the culture provides motivation.

This theory plays out in schools through site based management where: (a) stakeholders to decisions develop a vision/culture and goals; (b) new stakeholders to the organization are given professional development in the vision/culture and goals; (c) teacher efficacy is developed; and (d) a strong sense of commitment, on the part of all,
to the vision/culture and goals exists. In this environment, the administrator allows and encourages teachers to participate in important and routine decisions. The more important a decision, the greater are the administrator’s efforts to include the faculty as resources. McGregor’s theory asserts that teachers will exercise responsible self-direction and self-control in the accomplishment of worthwhile objectives that they understand and have helped to establish. Peter Senge (1990) calls it a “learning organization.”

The literature review identified the management style within this type of organizational as critical to the success of students. Therefore, the management style of the educational leader within each building, the principal, will be assessed as a part of the research. In the survey instrument for the Expert Panel participants, one question is based entirely on the management style which, in their opinion, best exemplifies a leadership style necessary within a site-base managed school.

As you will see, Title I Schoolwide legislation requires implementation of site-based decision making and management which would be supported by human resource theory. This legislation mandate, however, recognizes that each local school is a part of a larger system (district) and, therefore, expects collaboration with other entities in the system, supporting systems theory. Under this legislation, teachers are expected to perform unfamiliar tasks for which they need to be trained, presumably through the support of a hierarchy which supports bureaucratic theory. In fact, bureaucratic theory is alive and well in education today, as evidenced by legislation which includes
enabling funds to support the professional development for teachers within the larger Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) bill.

Creation of a learning organization that diminishes a hierarchical structure may be the intent of this legislation. All three theories, however, have a part to play in implementation. There has been a great deal of research on the implementation of the Title I Schoolwide legislation. None, however, has looked specifically at the governance structure, which I believe is the intent of this legislation, as the one overarching variable that affects student achievement.
CHAPTER II

TITLE I LEGISLATION

On April 11, 1965, Lyndon Baines Johnson signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) near the LBJ Ranch in Texas. This legislation was part of his "War on Poverty." The ESEA is the largest source of federal monetary support for K-12 educational programs. The purpose of this legislation was to give supplemental funds to school districts with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged children.

Expectations, under the 1965 ESEA were very different than they are today. It was assumed that poor children were not capable of learning more than rudimentary skills and, therefore, were pulled out of classroom instruction to receive a lower level of instruction in small groups. Catching up to their peers was difficult, if not impossible.

Funding for the ESEA was reauthorized every five years for 30 years with very little changes or revisions made to the initial legislation.

There was one exception in 1978. A schoolwide provision was added to aid in the flexibility in use of funds in high poverty schools. The ESEA Act amendments of 1978 were intended to enable schools with high proportions of economically
disadvantaged students to implement a Schoolwide format. A Schoolwide program, it was theorized, could eliminate disruptive instructional practices, simplify the complexity of scheduling requirements and the school’s organizational structure, and utilize staff and other resources more effectively. To be eligible for Schoolwide program funding a district had to have at least one school with at least 75% of the students eligible for Title I funds (Goor & Farris, 1980). That eligibility being low socio-economic status.

Goor & Farris (1980) looked at Title I Schoolwide statistics in the 1979-80 school year and found that of the schools applying for Title I funding, only 5% were eligible for a Title I Schoolwide format. Six states had no districts eligible. Three percent of the total number of schools in 49 states were eligible. And only 4 percent of the eligible districts had, or expected to have, Title I schoolwide projects during the 1979-80 school year.

Although the legislative amendments were aimed at facilitating schools with a high percentage of socially disadvantaged students operating in a Schoolwide format, this legislation had a provision that discouraged schools from initiating a Schoolwide program. Matching state and local funds were demanded for those students not eligible for Title I remediation. In other words, if a student did not qualify as economically disadvantaged, the school would have to match the amount of federal dollars coming into the school for those students. This matching requirement could be as high as 25 percent of the student population within a school with an economically disadvantaged population of 75 percent. This could account for the low percentage of
school participating in Title I Schoolwide programs under this earlier legislation.

Except for rare exceptions, the spirit and intent of the amended law could not
pragmatically be implemented.

In February 1990, the nation's governors met at the winter meeting of the
National Governors' Association (NGA) to give final approval to "a set of national
education goals shaped through negotiations with the Bush Administration" (Walker,
Feb. 28, 1990). Then Governors Bill Clinton of Arkansas and Carroll A. Campbell of
South Carolina worked on a document to further clarify and give substance to the
goals. The flexibility mantra was once again set forth. This time, however,
accountability was added.

A portion of the text of the document set forth by the NGA states what
ultimately became the backbone of the changes made to the E.S.E.A.

... our public education system must be fundamentally restructured in order
to ensure that all students can meet higher standards. This means: reorienting
schools so they focus on results, not on procedures; giving each school's
principal and teachers the discretion to make more decisions and the flexibility
to use federal, state, and local resources in more productive, innovative ways
that improve learning; ...Most important, restructuring requires creating
powerful incentives for performance and improvement, and real consequences
for persistent failure. It is only by maintaining this balance of flexibility and
accountability that we can truly improve our schools.

The consensus reached by the White House and the National
Governors' Association was hailed by many as a historic occasion—the first
time that all 50 governors and the President have set a joint agenda to improve

When it became apparent that there was support nationwide for sweeping
changes, other organizations began to line up behind the reform efforts and voice their
support or concerns.
At a press conference in Washington on July 26 [1990], the Council of Chief State School Officers unveiled its own, eight-point strategy for achieving the national education goals, based on its concern that there was, as yet, no “game plan” for providing national or federal leadership (Olson, August 1, 1990, p. 1).

In August 1990 at the National Conference of State Legislatures’ annual meeting, they made clear that they did not want to be left out of the discourse on implementation of any new educational reform legislation initiatives. At this early date, few of those at the conference believed that the goals were attainable, however they were willing to declare that the goals had “provided a sense of urgency and direction for the public schools at the federal, state, and local levels” (Harp, September 5, 1990).

By January of 1991, half way through President Bush’s term of office people began complaining that he had not done enough to push the NGA goals or legislation to support them. Roger B. Porter, White House domestic-policy advisor came to his defense by stating,

Is the country more interested and engaged in education than it was two years ago? Yes. Are people more convinced that we’re going to have higher standards and a major restructuring is going to achieve those higher standards? The answer is yes. Is it clear that we have a President who is interested in the subject? Clearly, yes. Are all these things moving us in the right direction? Yes. (Olson and Miller, January 9, 1991, p. 1)

Given the support and discourse, I believe it was safe for him to say that education had moved to the nation’s agenda. By the time Governor Clinton was elected President Clinton in 1992, the snowball of school reform was gaining
momentum and support from all areas of the country and, especially essential to the process, the educational community.

By December of 1992 a consortium of 25 education groups led by the Chief State School Officers submitted their support and wish list to Capital Hill. Among those were the American Federal of Teachers, The National School Boards Association, the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, the Association of School Business Officials, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the National Alliance of Black School Educators, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Pupil Services Administrations. (Miller and Pitsch, December 9, 1992) The list goes on. It was clear that there was a groundswell of support from grassroots educators' associations for the changes set forth, such as accountability for student achievement, consolidation of federal categorical funds to support schoolwide school improvement planning, and decision making at the building level. The educational community was willing to accept site-based management with the accompanying accountability if they could be assured of more flexibility in the use of federal, state, and local funds.

Late in 1993 the preliminary report of the National Assessment of Chapter 1 being conducted by the U.S. Department of Education proclaimed that the Chapter 1 program “has had little success in improving the achievement of the educationally deprived children it is intended to serve” (Pitsch, November 24, 1993, p. 1). This information was old news for educators. They were willing to abandon efforts that
were not working to try something new, especially if they could blame it on

"Washington," just in case the new approach did not work either.

Pitsch (Nov. 3, 1993, p. 1) reported that the education media was proclaiming.

State and local education officials generally praise the course the Clinton Administration has charted in its plan to revamp Chapter 1 . . . In its proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Clinton Administration called for what would be the most substantial reworking of Chapter 1 since the law was first enacted in 1965.

Clinton's plan had two sticking points that the various stakeholder groups could not come to a consensus on. He wanted a new formula for allocating the Title I funds which would send the money only to high poverty counties. Many schools would be eliminated under this new formula.

A compromise bill came out of a House Panel in February 9, 1994 with forty-one of 43 members voting in favor of the compromise formula allowing districts to continue to receive their present allocations under the 1990 reauthorization, but any new money would be distributed as concentration grants to counties with the highest concentration of poor. (Pitsch, February 16, 1994) This compromise language was readily accepted and ultimately included in the final legislation.

Another sticking point was a requirement for a setting of national standards, among them "opportunity to learn" standards. Opportunity to learn standards would address the processes and procedures schools use to deliver teaching and learning in classrooms. No one wanted to give up local autonomy. The compromise that ultimately was included in the legislation mandated states setting high standards in support of the Goals 2000 legislation and an assessment program for districts' students.
under this change, initiating the accountability requirements. (Pitsch, February 9, 1994).

With these two compromise issues taken care of, the legislations other major change was that of allowing more schools to participate in the schoolwide orientation. Miller (August, 4, 1993, p. 1) reported,

Despite the overwhelming support of Chapter 1 experts, however, the idea of greatly increasing the number of schoolwide projects is based more on reform theory than on solid evidence that they lead to improvements in student learning. There's just not a lot of solid evidence, and the evidence that does exists suggests that schoolwide projects are not a panacea,” said Larry F. Guthrie Director of the students-at-risk program at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. “Nevertheless, research showing that Chapter 1 students still lag behind their peers has convinced many that a new approach must be tried.

Site-based management would be the hallmark of the push to Schoolwide implementation.

On Sept. 30, 1994 the House approved the reauthorization of ESEA by a bipartisan vote of 262 to 132 with 30 Republicans voting in favor and five Democrats voting against. Two days later the Senate passed the measure by a vote of 77 to 20, again with a bipartisan vote. On October 21, 1994, President Clinton signed the reauthorized ESEA into law. (Pitsch, October 12, 1994).

With that signature to the revamped Title I legislation, a new era of educational reform efforts began. This new legislation not only maintained the original intent of the E.S.E.A., to give supplemental support to schools with high concentrations of poverty, in addition it put in place an agenda of site-based decision
making with accountability for continuous improvement for these schools and
sanctions if improvement did not occur.

Flexibility and Accountability Under the 1994 Reauthorization

In 1994, when the reauthorization bill was signed, some sweeping changes
were set forth. The new bill was part of a package of school reform legislation, Goals
2000: Educate America Act, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and School-
to-Work Opportunities Act.

These three bills together make up what is referred to as the Improving
America’s Schools Act (IASA). The Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (P.L.
103-382) reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA).
The purpose of this legislation is to improve teaching and learning for all children to
enable them to meet challenging academic content and State student performance
standards through . The reauthorized ESEA complements the Goals 2000: Educate
America Act and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act by supporting state and local
education reform efforts and promoting coordination of resources to improve
education for all students.

Under the new legislation funds from various programs may be combined to
develop and implement comprehensive efforts by schools to reach the National
Education Goals, raise the academic standards for all students, put in place site-based
decision making, and become accountable for students’ achievement. When the ESEA
was reauthorized in 1994, several changes were made that dramatically altered how schools could work with this at risk population.

Title I, the largest program funded by ESEA, is designed to help support children living in poverty so they can meet challenging content and student performance standards set by the individual states. Title I programs are to be but one element in a school's comprehensive, continuous improvement effort.

Part A of Title I provides financial assistance through State educational agencies (SEAs), such as the Michigan Department of Education in Michigan, to local educational agencies (LEAs) to meet the educational needs of children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet a state's student performance standards in school attendance areas and schools with high concentrations of children from low-income families. What that means for Michigan is that Title I Schoolwide programs should have teachers, through site-based decision making, decide how to best help students, through supplemental instruction and materials to pass the State's MEAP test.

The ESEA of 1994 eliminated the need for a local match and lowered the poverty threshold to 50 percent. In Michigan, under a waiver from the United States Department of Education (USDoE), we only require a school have 35% poverty to operate a Schoolwide program. This further increases the number of schools eligible for a Schoolwide format.

Not only has there been a relaxation of the Title I rules, but also enabling legislation (Section 108 of Public Law 103-448) authorizes the release of aggregate and individual student information to determine the socioeconomic status of students
within a school's population. This enabling legislation is an important piece of the overall for it allows schools to identify at risk students for funding purposes.

The Secretary of Education, Richard W. Riley, (September 1995) offered an overview of the new legislation. Each school's comprehensive education effort should include, "... 1) high standards for all students; 2) teachers better trained for teaching to high standards; 3) flexibility to stimulate local reform, coupled with accountability for results; and 4) close partnerships among families, communities, and schools" (p. 1).

The new Title I legislation mandates site based decision making, specifically moving program decisions down to the school level and engaging teachers in the decision-making process; and at the same time, holding schools and teachers accountable for students' academic success. As Mary Jean LeTendre, Director of the Compensatory Education Program for the U.S. Department of Education stated in Title I Times (April 1995), "Teachers, administrators, parents, and other staff will decide who will be served and what form the program will take in order to help students meet high State standards" (p. 2). By law, individual schools, in consultation with their districts, are to determine how to use their funds in ways that best meets the needs of the students in each individual building. With this comes new accountability for student achievement at the building level and accountability for individual students at the classroom level.

Moving decisions to the school level can help change a Title I program from a centrally-directed "one-size-fits-all" program to a significant resource for individual schools to use to meet the needs of their failing students. However, consultation with
the LEA regarding these decisions is extremely important because the LEA has the ultimate responsibility for the education of its students and proper administration of Title I, Part A legislative mandates. The management of individual schools then becomes a balancing act allowing for SBM while at the same time maintaining a level of accountability at the district level.

Under Section 1114(b)(1) of the new legislation, a Schoolwide program must include eight components. The first component is a comprehensive needs assessment of the performance of the school’s students in relation to the State content and student performance standards. A school must, secondly, have in place Schoolwide reform strategies that provide opportunities for all children to meet the State’s student performance standards, based on effective means, using effective instructional strategies. There should be an increase in the amount and quality of learning time for students identified as failing or most at risk of failing. An enriched and accelerated curriculum must be provided for the failing students. And the educational needs of historically under served populations, including girls and women must be addressed.

The third necessary component includes a site-based management plan to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of curriculum and assessments. In addition to putting in place effective instructional strategies, an assessment program must be implemented at each grade level to determine students’ continuous achievement or lack thereof. The teaching, learning, and assessment plans must be consistent with and an integral part of, the school’s School Improvement Plan under

A fourth component consists of instruction by highly qualified professional staff. The fifth component is professional development of the professional staff, aides, and where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, principals, and other staff to enable all children in the Schoolwide program to meet the State’s student performance standards. The professional development is to be of high quality, sustained and continuous so that the training affects teaching and learning in the individual classroom and is supported and reinforced within the home.

Most reform efforts include some form of parental involvement. The Title I legislation says that the sixth component of a Title I program must include strategies to increase parental involvement, such as family literacy services. The IASA of 1994, also known as Goals 2000: Educate America Act, includes eight National Education Goals. Goal eight of the National Education Goals states, “Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children” (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, March 31, 1994).

When schools work together with families to support learning, children are inclined to succeed not just in school, but throughout life. Three decades of research have shown that parental participation in schooling improves student learning (Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies, Policy Guidance for Title I, Part A, April 1996). Such participation of parents and families is critical.
not only in the very beginning of the educational process, but throughout a child’s entire academic career. To accomplish this objective, the Act promotes the formation of new partnerships, particularly home-school partnerships, to help address more completely the full range of student needs that impact on their learning. Both pieces of legislation recognize the important roles that school, family, and community members play in helping our children to succeed in school, and both provide greater opportunity for these entities to participate directly in school governance and in the design and implementation of State school reform plans. Title I Part A acknowledges the full range of roles that parents can play in their children’s education.

Component number seven states that the Title I plan must include strategies for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start and Even Start, to local elementary school programs.

The final component ensures that students who experience difficulty mastering any of the State’s standards during the school year will be provided with effective, timely additional assistance.

Title I legislation is an attempt on the part of the Federal government to address the issue of unsuccessful students and their inability to compete in today’s economy. Directing districts to apply a systems theory approach to planning, implementation, evaluation, and accountability, the fervent hope is that student achievement will improve, especially for this disadvantaged population.
CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nearly one-third of today's K-12 population are educationally disadvantaged due to poverty, cultural obstacles, or linguistic barriers (Stitt-Gohdes, 1996). These barriers make these students eligible for Title I funding. Title I funding is provided through an allocation from the Federal government to each State. Financial assistance flows through State educational agencies (SEAs), such as the Michigan Department of Education, to local educational agencies (LEAs) to meet the educational needs of children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet a state's student performance standards in school attendance areas and schools with high concentrations of children from low-income families (Improving America's Schools Act of 1994).

In Michigan, schools receive Title I funds based on free and reduced lunch counts. Nearly 32 percent of Michigan's students receive free or reduced lunch. Any student in a family of four is eligible for a reduced price for lunch if the income is $28,860 and a free lunch if the family income is at or below $20,280 (Robotham, September 1997).

Any classroom teacher can tell you that the at risk student population is growing (Fiske, 1991; Kozol, 1992; Schorr & Wilson, 1989; Stitt-Gohdes, 1996; Hewlett, 1991). Kids Count in Michigan has stark statistics in the 1996 Data Book.
Since 1988 the percentage of students on free and reduced lunch has increased by nearly 33 percent. Nearly 85 percent of this population today are eligible for a completely subsidized lunch. This is the population that the Title I legislation targets as at risk of failure.

In 1997 high school students in Michigan took the high stakes MEAP test. Forty-seven percent were not proficient in math. Fifty-eight percent were not proficient in reading. Sixty-one percent were not proficient in science. And nearly 70 percent were not proficient in writing. The test scores at the fourth and fifth grade levels were similarly startling. Research clearly allows schools to identify this underachieving population by the end of second grade (Slaven, Dec. 1992/Jan. 1993). Theory says that intervention should be easily implemented in plenty of time to assure academic success (Slaven, 1996; Glasser, 1969; Fisk, 1991).

Thirty percent of today's students who are unsuccessful in high school will drop out (Stitt-Gohdes, 1996). These persons will find it extremely difficult, in today's economy, to have even minimal financial stability. The cost to America's society is incalculable. Ask the business community the cost, or perhaps a better term would be value, of a well educated employee. James Burke, Chairman of Johnson & Johnson said, "Our people can't be properly trained unless they are first adequately educated . . . We are running out of time and no less than the future of the nation is at stake" (Gerstner, 1993, pg. 251). Intervention strategies can be put in place early in a child's academic career.

The skills of our workforce and their ability to adapt to a knowledge-based economy seem certain to be critical factors in our ability to compete. . . much of the decline in productivity in American society can be linked to the decline in education and to the resulting gap between the requirements of the economy and the reality of the workforce.

It is critical to give every student an education so that not only they, as individuals, can compete in today’s job market, but so that we, as a country, can successfully compete in today’s global market.

Many schools today remain entrenched in the hierarchy of the industrial model, still functioning using the Bureaucratic Theory, where decisions that affect what and how instruction is given emanates from the central office (Sarason, 1990; Bauer, 1996). Teachers, who work directly with students, have very little latitude in their day to day work. Decentralization, as outlined in the Schoolwide Title I legislation, would move decision making and, likewise, accountability to the school building level (Improving Basic Programs, April 1996; Schoolwide Program Planning, April 1995; U.S. Department of Education, 1994; Johnson, May 1997; Swanson & Finnan, April 1996).

Researchers, up to this point, have focused on the components of pedagogy, school climate, or specific programs in their quest for an answer to why some Title I Schoolwide programs move student achievement ahead (Carlson, Dec. 1996; Curry, June 1996; Lein & Johnson, Feb. 1997; Schlechty, 1990; Wong, 1996). After futile
attempts at pinpointing what influences student achievement, many researchers have come to believe that there can be no significant progress in educational reform that raises student achievement for all students until the governance system changes the way schools are organized and managed (Bauer, 1996; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Gerstner, 1994; *Putting Learning First*, 1994; Ceresin, 1990; Bimber, 1993; Berman, Spring 1978).

In 1981 Secretary of Education, T. H. Bell created the National Commission on Excellence in Education. The Commission was to examine, and report on, the quality of education in the United States. The Commission's report entitled *A Nation at Risk* quickly became one of the seminal documents in American educational history. Throughout the report, emphasis was placed on the importance of what happens to individual students in individual classrooms. Recommendations for classroom changes were made based on the Commission's findings (*A Nation at Risk*, 1984). Researchers and policy makers concluded that before changes can be implemented in the classrooms of America, power for decision making must be given to those involved with classroom behaviors, teachers, students and their parents (*Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies. Policy Guidance for Title I. Part A.*, April 1996; Curry, June 1996; Holt, January 1993).

The Committee for Economic Development (CED), a research and policy recommending organization, has done extensive research and literature review on the topic of school governance and site-based management. The CED is comprised of 250 business leaders and educators, and is a self-proclaimed "nonprofit, nonpartisan,
and nonpolitical" organization. Their findings are set forth in a small book entitled *Putting Learning First: Governing and Managing the Schools for High Achievement* (1994). This organization, and other researchers, hypothesize that the hierarchical, centralized governance system in place in most schools today is a major barrier to improving our schools and ultimately student achievement (Hill & Bonan, 1991; Holt, January 1993; McLaughlin, March 1995; Ceresin, 1991; Wells, 1993; Senge, 1990; Martz, 1992; Swanson & Finnan, April 1996).

When legislators set forth site-based management as a legal requirement in the Title I legislation and used increased student achievement as an evaluatory measure, it appears they were trying to tie the two together. There is, however, at this point, little more than belief to support this supposition.

**Defining Site-Based Management**

**Lack of a Common Definition**

While researchers believe that decentralized decision making is the best model to improve student achievement, there has not been any research to establish a causal relationship. No one has established that gains in achievement followed the implementation of SBM (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990).

My study will address two areas where research has been silent or, at best, sparse. One clear problem exists that makes any research in this area difficult. There has not been any definition, nor standards for identifying a school as a site-based
management school. Secondly, no study has attempted to use student achievement as the measure of site-based management's implementation.

Researchers use the term, site-based management, but no one has offered any consistent definition nor criteria by which to measure or determine if SBM has actually been implemented. Hill and Bonan in their 1991 research, Decentralization and Accountability in Public Education (p.v), have come the closest to actually offering a definition.

Site-based management . . . involves shifting the initiatives in public education from school boards, superintendents, and central administrative offices to individual schools. The purpose . . . is to improve performance by making those closest to the delivery of services . . . more independent and therefore more responsible for the results of their school's operations.

The focus of their study was to make building administrators and teachers accountable for student achievement. Hill and Bonan, like other researchers, did not make any link, however, between implementation of SBM and student achievement.

Key Factors of SBM

A school, as with any organization, is made up of a community of individuals with their own culture, norms, and history. To move from the status quo, the entire community must become a community of learners, researching best practices, applying those practices, assessing effectiveness, and adjusting for future learning. Sarason (1990) asserts that the basis of power and control must be reallocated to make school relevant for all the learners within the community.
Sarason’s vision of a school community as a learning organization was first created by William R. Torbert in 1972 and outlined by Joiner (1986). Peter Senge’s (1990) model is best known today. Senge’s model suggests that actions or changes should always be based on research, either other’s or one’s own. It is essential that the educational leader within the school community encourage this process and instill a vision of a continually evolving future where the goal is continual school improvement and student achievement.

This study will determine the transfer of authority from the central office to the individual schools. The goal for education, whether site-based or some other form of governance, is empowered, growing, learning organizations involved in determining their own actions, research, and new actions culminating in higher achievement for their students, including those at risk. From my review of the literature, I have identified six key components which researchers believe need to be in place to facilitate a “learning organization” format, identified by many as site-based management.

1. Leadership

Today’s educational leaders find themselves in a chaotic environment in which everything is in a constant state of flux. Assumptions and theories designed months or years ago may no longer be valid. Berman (Spring 1978) found that the impact of school reform hinges on the local administrator’s ability to enhance and change leadership style to fit the ever changing landscape within school reform. Curry (1996)
found that strong leadership and a team-like approach were among the most important factors for school success in such an eb and flow culture. The Schoolwide Program Planning Guide 1995-96: A Catalyst for Reform (April 1995) states that administrative leadership and support “... ensures initial and continuing plan operation” (p. 17).

When collaborative groups of school personnel and community members become involved in site-based decision making, the leadership style best suited to this new governance format is participative. A participative leader encourages individuals to be highly involved in their work, take personal responsibility for quality, and exercise initiative (House, 1995).

To the extent the administrator within local buildings can change or enhance their leadership style, and to the extent central administration will allow change, and to the extent the unions will allow change, dictates the impact of the Title I Schoolwide legislative intent (Berman, Spring 1978; Sarason, 1990).

“The principal’s leadership is critical. To lead a school effectively, the principal must be both an expert manager of resources and an inspiring educator who sets the tone and direction of the school” (Putting Learning First, 1994, p. 14). Swanson and Finnan (April 1996) also found that a strong dynamic leader who was willing to share power made a marked difference in the students academic success.

Through personal experience Joseph A. Fernandez (1993) writes of site-based management, “... when such a strategy is adopted, it had better have a leader who is willing to fight for it. To be there for it. To be willing to help create the right climate and then keep everything moving” (p. 170).
2. Vision

A shared sense of vision, goals, and strategies for implementation is repeatedly mentioned throughout the literature as a means for accelerating student achievement (Swanson & Finnan, April 1996; Schoolwide Program Planning Guide 1995-96. A catalyst for reform, April 1995; Curry, June 1996; Kirst, 1989).

The shared vision may be developed by an SBM committee or may begin with the school administrator. House (1995) states, “Outstanding leaders articulate a vision or serves as a catalyst to facilitate the development of a vision that expresses cherished end values shared by leaders and followers” (p. 416). In fact, Janice Curry (June 1996, p. 31) has found that,

The most important factor common to these Best Practices Schools appears to be a unified philosophy and goals that are shared throughout the school. Staff and administration at these schools work together as a community to increase the achievement of their students.

While studying the literature on effective schools, Kirst (1989) points out that SBM creates a consensual rather than hierarchical governance system with a great deal of personal involvement and investment by those involved. Furthermore, Kirst (1989) found that this degree of involvement tends to create a sense of mutual goals and belief system which teachers working within an SBM context attend to almost religiously.

3. Support

Administrative Support. The overarching stumbling block of any policy is that it requires change. Change is not comfortable for anyone, but especially for teachers
who may or may not have administrative support for taking risks and changing the standard operating procedures. In fact, many administrators work at maintenance of the status quo (Berman, Spring 1978; Sarason, 1990). Curry (June 1996) found that factors such as strong administrative support contributed to improved student achievement and Holt (January 1993) claims support of teachers is a prerequisite for any reform initiatives.

Support by school leaders during stressful times of change can be "... a source of self-confidence and social satisfaction and a means for stress reduction and alleviation of frustration" (House, 1995, p. 432). Stress reduction permits those involved in the change activities to use their intellects effectively, thus further allowing for evaluation of new initiatives and revisions so necessary during a change process.

Levin (1996) cites two advantages for SBM which focus on teachers and their need for support: (1) teachers more readily accept responsibility for student outcomes that they were instrumental in developing, and (2) teachers' talents are often underutilized because of a lack of decision making power.

Support for action research is critical. Teachers need to be able to have time to analyze results of changes by individual student, classroom, grade, or by school. It is important for both innovative teaching strategies and professional development activities to be valued and supported by administrators (Curry, June 1996; Holt, January 1993; Fernandez, 1993; McLaughlin, March 1995).
Community Support. In Austin, Texas, Curry (June 1996) found that it was clear that administration, staff, students, parents, and community were all an integral part of the SBM process. Community support is a very valuable asset to the schools and is not only recognized as such by the Title I legislation, but parent involvement activities initiated by the school is one of the mandates of the legislation. Community involvement provides financial assistance, volunteer support, and reinforcement of teaching within the home setting. Parents contribute an understanding of the community and needs and strengths of their children. In turn this understanding not only supports, but aids in the development of a comprehensive school improvement plan for improved student achievement (Putting Learning First, 1995; Comer, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1997).

Parental Support. The Title I legislation supports the National Education Goals. Goal number 8 is, “Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.”

Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies. Policy Guidance for Title I, Part A (April 1996, p. 136) states:

When schools work together with families to support learning, children are inclined to succeed not just in school, but throughout life. Three decades of research have shown that parental participation in schooling improves student learning . . . To accomplish this objective, the Act promotes the formation of new partnerships, particularly home-school partnerships, to help address more completely the full range of student needs that impact on their learning . . . the legislation recognize the important roles that school, family, and community members play in helping our children to succeed in school, and provides
greater opportunity for these entities to participate directly in school
governance and in the design and implementation of State school reform plans.
Title I, Part A acknowledges the full range of roles that parents can play in
their children’s education.

**Legislative Support.** The reauthorized ESEA complements the Goals 2000:
Educate America Act and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act by supporting state
and local education reform efforts and promoting coordination of resources to
improve education for all students. In addition, a mandate for parental involvement
made it clear that the legislators understood and supported the integral role parents
play in any school reform initiatives under SBM (Improving Basic Programs Operated

Not only has there been a relaxation of the Title I rules, but also enabling,
supportive legislation (Section 108 of Public Law 103-448) authorizes the release of
aggregate and individual student information to determine the socioeconomic status of
students within a school’s population. This enabling legislation is an important piece
of the overall puzzle that must come together to support Title I Schoolwide program
implementation (Improving basic programs operated by local education agencies.

**Peer Support.** Peer evaluations or review have been cited by several
researchers as an important component both to improved classroom behavior but also
to improved collegiality in an environment where work is interdependent (Kirst, 1989;
SBM as a call for "greater collective authority coupled with greater professional accountability" (p. 165).

**Resources.** Gaining autonomy over resources is probably one of the last areas where local districts relinquish their authority (Kirst, 1989; Odden, 1999; Sarason, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1997). Odden (1999) states however, "The next necessary fiscal step in designing a new school finance system is to budget the dollars to the school site and provide sites with the authority to use those dollars in ways that support revised instructional and related organizational strategies" (p. 149).

Miles and Darling-Hammond (1997) have done research in resource reallocation. Schools who were given budgetary oversight almost immediately used finances very differently to support improved student performance. Without any additional funds Odden (1999) cites the following six accomplishments: (1) reduced class sizes, (2) lower class sizes for reading instruction, (3) reduction of the high school student teacher contact number from around 150 to below 100, (4) personalize the learning environment, (5) provide for common planning time for teachers, and (6) expand professional development for the staff.

Fernandez (1993, p. 169) states that when he was the Superintendent of Miami Public Schools and major budgetary cuts had to be made, that the strength of SBM came to the forefront.

*Wholesale money problems virtually create the stimulus to find solutions through the redirection of funds and offer windows of opportunity to invent better ways to make do with what you’ve got.* Despite the cuts, with strategic
planning we were able to initiate a string of new programs through SBM, as varied as the schools are varied.

The reauthorized ESEA complements the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the School-too-Work Opportunities Act by supporting state and local education reform efforts and promoting coordination of resources to improve education for all students (Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies. Policy Guidance for Title I, Part A. April 1996). The coordination of several formula-based Federal categorical funding is a very new phenomenon. Under the ESEA umbrella, if a school implements a Title I Schoolwide program, Title I, Migrant, Bilingual, Special Education, Gifted and Talented, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Title VI Innovative Program funds may all be utilized together to support site-based decisions that impact student performance. As long as the Schoolwide program SBM committee can substantiate that the intent of these legislative allocations are being met, they may be used in concert to implement programs that reach all students and raise student achievement for all students within the building. In any other context these funds must be kept separate and carefully monitored to meet the compliance guidelines of the legislation.

4. Information

It is important to have a broad knowledge base when asked to make decisions. Change will never happen unless teachers have enough confidence and information to feel comfortable trying something new (Kriegel and Brandt, 1996).
Teachers can be isolated. However, their efficacy can be enlarged when they work together (Lezotte, 1992; Shulman, 1989).

Darling-Hammond (1997) found in her research that there were five features important in the sharing of knowledge for teachers in schools involved in SBM: (1) team planning and teaching; (2) continual horizontal communication throughout the school; (3) peer evaluation and support; (4) continually sharing information about students, their families and their work; and (5) high visibility of students' exhibition of work. Darling-Hammond states, "Shared information about how students are achieving can motivate greater accountability" (p. 168).

Curry (Spring 1996) found that a shared common knowledge was important to student achievement. A time for common reflection on data and shared insight into strategies that are working or not working can be very motivational. As Sarason (1990, p. 147-148) describes it,

The problem inheres in your unreflective acceptance of assumptions and axioms that seem so obviously right, natural, and proper that to question them is to question your reality. Therefore, faced with failure after failure, having tried this, that, and almost everything else, you don't examine your bedrock assumptions. Instead, you come up with variations on past themes—now with more desperation and anger, but less hope. Instead of stimulating discussion in which no assumption is sacred, no alternative automatically off limits, and arguments for practicality and the status quo are no inhibitors of envisioning alternatives, intractability has reinforced the repetition compulsion.

Swanson & Finnan (April 1996) found that changes occurred that raised student achievement when teachers were mutually involved in reflection and research.

Title I Schoolwide schools work primarily with poor, low-achieving students. Swanson and Finnan (April 1996) state, "... that schools cannot change until
teachers beliefs and expectations for low-achieving minority students changes. Changing school structure is easier than changing expectations” (p. 7).

5. Communication

Professional Development. In accordance with sections 111(a)(5) and 1119, the Title I legislation mandates “professional development for teachers and aides, and where appropriate, pupil service personnel, parents, principals, and other staff to enable all children in the Schoolwide program to meet the State’s student performance standards” (Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies: Policy Guidance for Title I, Part A, April 1996).

Swanson & Finnan (April 1996) found that it was, indeed, important for teachers to make decisions about their own staff development activities and the materials and equipment needed to enhance their instructional efforts. There is a distinction between what Title I legislation calls professional development and a “sit and get” that many schools call professional development. The legislation says the professional development must be “high quality, sustainable professional development that effects student achievement” (Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994, October 20, 1994).

Lack of sufficient training in decision making, consensus building, and conflict resolution is one of the reasons site-based decision making does not work. School personnel should not be asked to undertake SBM without technical training. This training for both teachers and principals should be an integral part of any plan to
decentralize management to the school level (Putting Learning First, 1994; Fiske, 1991).

**Student Information.** Not only has there been a relaxation of the Title I rules, but also enabling legislation (Section 108 of Public Law 103-448) authorizes the release of aggregate and individual student information to determine the socioeconomic status of students within a school's population. This is the first step in identifying students at risk.

However, identifying those at risk does not necessarily identify those who are failing. Often they are one in the same student, however, failing students may come from families of higher socioeconomic status. It is, therefore, important to conduct ongoing student assessment to be able to administer timely intervention. Timely intervention can mean the difference between a student's success or failure in school (Schorr, 1989; Bernhardt, 1999).

Measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance. It is only as the organization and individuals within the organization mutually adapt to changes, collect data on what is and is not working, revise the plans, and move on to improve continually can any program be effective (Berman, Spring 1978).
6. Power

Swanson and Finnan (April 1996) found that a strong dynamic leader who was willing to share power made a marked difference in the students' academic success. The whole concept of SBM is moving the decision-making authority to the site where the decision needs to be made to allow for a quick more flexible response to students' needs. As Schlechty (1990) so aptly puts it, "... much of the effort expended in bureaucracies has to do with getting around the system, around the rules, and around the procedures so that work can get done" (p. 79).

When school administrators delegate power in an effort to help teachers accomplish the shared vision of the school teachers experience a sense of competence. Sergiovanni (1989, p. 221) states,

Empowerment and efficacy are closely connected ideas. When teachers and principals are empowered, their sense of control increases, as does the belief that they can make a difference. Teacher efficacy has been convincingly linked to more effective teaching and to gains in student learning, as measured by achievement test scores and other indicators of school effectiveness.

Implementing Site-Based Management

While there is no research clearly linking site-based management to student achievement, it may be that this is due more to a failure to adopt genuine SBM than to flaws in the concept (Ceresin, 1990; Fiske, 1991; Putting Learning First, 1994; Bimber, 1993; Berman, Spring 1978; Wohlstetter, September, 1995; Wong, 1996; Bauer, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1997). Most SBM experiments have focused on
relationships among the adults in the school and between the school and the central office (Putting Learning First, 1994). Educators and educational researchers are seeking ways to improve student achievement. None of the studies of SBM have used improved student achievement as a criterion for successful implementation of SBM. Teachers and principals have little incentive to implement strategies to improve academic performance if achievement is neither established as a goal nor used as a basis for evaluating their effectiveness.

**Macro vs. Micro Implementation**

Berman (Spring, 1978) discusses the implications caused when macro-implementation (federal government) tries to dictate micro-implementation (local level) policies and procedures. Berman’s essay goes to the heart of the decentralization issue. The spirit of the law may not, and often does not, get transferred to the context within which it must be implemented. In other words, the intent of Title I legislation dictates site-based decision making, however, the local context within which SBM may or may not be utilized, will ultimately affect how the policy plays out in reality. "...micro-implementation may be the most pivotal step because a social policy’s outcome depends on local delivery" (Berman, Spring 1978, p. 172).

The legislation affecting K-12 education moves from Congress to the U.S. Department of Education, who in turn sends it to the 50 State Departments of Education, who in turn moves it to the hierarchy within the 692 local districts, in the
case of Michigan, who in turn moves it to the 3,662 individual district's schools. One can begin to understand the enormity of the problems to implement the policy of site-based management. At each level the possibility of cooptation is ever present. Administrators of policy may have bias, a personal agenda, or for pragmatic reasons coopt the process.

Add to this dilemma the vague construct of “decentralization,” and you have, to understate the situation, a hodge podge of various local implementations, none of which may actually look or act as the legislature intended when the legislation was originally written. This would explain why so many of the research studies conclude that Title I Schoolwide implementation looks very different from one locale to the next. Researchers studying Title I implementation have found multiple forms, or programs, being used to implement the Title I legislation at the local level (Tyak and Cuban, 1995; Lezotte, 1992; Swanson & Finnan, April 1996; Stitt-Gohdes, 1996; Schoolwide Program Planning Guide 1995-96: A catalyst for reform, April 1995; Sarason, 1990).

Some of the formats being used to implement Schoolwide programs are discussed below. Their use varies based on: (a) a school’s financial status, as in the use of technology; (b) comfort in making change that may not be welcomed by some parents, such as multi-age classrooms or project-based learning; and (c) the trust among teachers necessary to implement team teaching strategies.
**Multi-Age Classrooms.** For example, elementary schools have always been set up into classrooms of students who are nearly homogeneous as to age. However, in an effort to eliminate social promotion without attainment of content some schools have chosen to move to multi-age classrooms (Tyak and Cuban, 1995). In a multi-age classroom students work on skills they have not yet attained regardless of their chronological age.

**Teams.** Teachers are working in teams with groups of students rather than individual classrooms. Teacher teams allow for a sharing of expertise, support for new teachers, immediate intersession for student needs. Teachers discover that problems that they thought belonged to them alone, are shared by others, possible solutions can be discussed in this collaborative climate, and solutions put in place (Lezotte, 1992; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Fiske, 1991). I was recently in a middle school that had begun teaming. They enthusiastically stated that far fewer students were getting lost because more people were responsible for them and noticed when a problem arose. In fact, they said their absenteeism and discipline referrals had dropped dramatically because problems were met with immediacy rather than allowed to fester and grow into full-blown proportions.

**Technology.** Computer labs are being used in some schools to meet the needs of at risk students. Computers are non-biased pieces of equipment. It does not have any preconceived ideas about whether the person sitting in front of the computer is a gifted or special education student. As Larry Lezotte is known to say, "It is important
not to replace a 3-cent pencil and a 2-cent piece of paper with a $3,000 computer.” Teachers no longer have to teach to the middle when a computer is used. Students receive immediate feedback from the computer, data are collected and analyzed. When a student is having difficulty and a concept is not understood, they are not pushed ahead, nor left behind. The computer waits until the student has mastered the concept before it allows the student to access more complicated material. As Fiske (1997, p. 158) so adequately states it,

> Computers are powerful tools for working the curriculums of schools away from rote learning and toward the problem-solving skills that students will need in the workplace of the future . . . Computers promote the value of respect for diversity. Whereas teacher talk appeals to the minority of students who learn best by hearing abstract ideas, computers offer a dazzling array of visual images.

I was recently in a computer lab observing 30 students. All were totally engaged in their own work. No two computer screens were alike. The teacher and instructional aid were free to work with the identified Title I students in this classroom to accelerate their learning without having to be concerned with behavior problems or making any other student have to wait while the students having difficulty caught up.

**Connections to Life.** Problem-based schools where students are given a problem to which they must collectively find a solution are creating groups of students who work together to draw on strengths of each participant. “Teaching the process of inquiry, we must show that questions are just as important as answers. Factual answers, the counterfeit currency of the educational system, are worthless unless they are integrated into ideas and thinking” (Glasser, 1969, p. 77).
These represent a few of the tools and pedagogical changes being made in classrooms to implement the Title I Schoolwide programs. All forms must, however, have in place site-based decision making to comply with the law. This study looks at this one unifying requirement of the legislation, SBM, and its possible impact on the academic success of the students, who are ultimately impacted by this legislation. But until there is a standard definition and consistent application we cannot determine that SBM has or has not been implemented nor if it is having a direct impact on the academic success of the students who are ultimately impacted by this legislation.

Many school systems seem intractable and bent on maintaining the status quo (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Sarason, 1990; Hill and Bonan, 1991). I have been in numerous schools, however, where both teachers and administrators are consciously seeking continual school improvement. However, a lack of knowledge concerning implementation and uncertainty about problems that may arise may serve as barriers to change. When the organization realizes that decisions may need to be made that depart from the routine behavior or, when there is a need to explain new operating procedures, it is easier to revert to the time honored way of doing things (Sarason, 1990; Lezotte, 1992; Berman, Spring 1978; Postman, 1995).

The Principal's Role

Researchers agree that the principal's leadership in implementing SBM is critical. The extent to which the administrator within local buildings can change or enhance their leadership style, and to the extent central administration will allow
change, and to the extent the unions will allow change, dictates the impact of the Title I Schoolwide SBM implementation. Ideally, the principal must be both an expert manager of resources and an educational leader who nurtures a safe climate for risk taking within the teaching and learning process and sustains the shared vision of the school. Sharing power within this context is essential (Carlson, December 1996; Hill and Bonan, 1991; Holt, January 1993; Johnson, May 1997; Leighton, 1996; Mehlinger, 1995; Swanson & Finnan, April 1996).

An authoritarian principal who demands total authority is repeating the command-and-control of traditional school bureaucracies. The principal must act as a liaison between the school and the larger community so that collaborations with business and other human service providers can be developed and sustained. The Title I legislation makes it clear that these collaborative efforts are to be an integral art of the site-based management model.

The Teacher’s Role

Teachers who work together with site-based authority, work with the community, and make decisions that are research based should make decisions that will lead to higher student achievement for the at risk population (Johnson, May 1997; Lein & Johnson, February 1997; Swanson & Finnan, April 1996; Sarason, 1990). Sarason (1990), Berman (Spring 1978), Lezotte (1992), and Holt (January 1993) each argues for the necessity to shift power to the lowest level of the hierarchy, classroom reachers, parents, and other community members. Researchers contend that there will
be no sustainable school reform until individual classroom teachers are afforded the power necessary to become lifelong learners involved in, and encouraged to, take risks and meet the needs of students, not merely cover content within a curriculum. Berman (Spring 1978) reinforces Peter Senge’s theory of a learning organization; the basis of power and control must be reallocated to make school relevant for all the learners within the community, including teachers.

Organizational Culture

Berman’s description sounds a great deal like Peter Senge’s (1990) “learning organization” model. Educators and business alike are coming to understand that the old command and compliance model must be replaced by more flexible management; management for educators that gives more authority and accountability for student achievement to teachers, individual school administrators, parents, and students. In other words, to the front line workers (Lein & Johnson, February 1997; Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies. Policy Guidance for Title I Part A, April 1996; Holt, January 1993; Bauer, 1996; and Gerstner, 1994).

Meyer and Scott (1992, p. 14) argue that organizations have “rational myths.” Widely held beliefs within the organization or community which are ...

...rational in the sense that they identify specific social purposes and then specify in a rule-like manner what activities are to be carried out...to achieve them. However, these beliefs are myths in the sense that they depend for their efficacy, for their reality, on the fact that they are widely shared, or are promulgated by individuals or groups that have been granted the right to determine such matters. We argue that the elaboration of these rules provides a normative climate within which formal organizations are expected to flourish.
Without a consistent definition of site-based management, many initiatives may call themselves site-based management without actually transferring management decision making activities to the individual school. The organizational climate may continue under rational myths or organization comfortable to those within the organization and proclaim the school a SBM school.

"The culture of an organization makes clear what the organization stands for—its values, its beliefs, its goals—and provides tangible ways in which individuals in the organization may personally identify with that culture" (Owens, 1991, p. 167). This is a concise statement of what the Title I legislation was seeking when it mandated site-based management. Each school, through school personnel and community input, was to identify a learning culture to improve student achievement based on shared values, beliefs, and goals set forth by the collective community and legislation. Implementation of SBM would then allow the personnel within the school authority to make decisions, on site, that would theoretically increase student achievement.

Conclusion

Slaven, Karweit, and Wasik (December 1992/January 1993, p. 17) state,

The good news in research on prevention and early intervention is that early school failure is fundamentally preventable. The implications of this should be revolutionary. At the policy level, it means we can choose to eradicate school failure, or we can allow it to continue. What we cannot do is pretend that we do not have a choice.

Is the lack of implementation of site-based management standing in the way of making the choices Slaven and his colleagues say are so essential? Congress thought
SBM would make a difference or they would not have included it in the legislative mandates. Researchers believe, albeit without any research to support their belief, that SBM will make a difference. The barrier to knowing the answer is a lack of a definition for site-based management and criteria by which a school can be measured to have implemented site-based management.

This study will supply both a definition and a set of standards for determining if a school has implemented site-based management. Then I will examine the correlation between site-based management implementation and student achievement as measured by the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) results in each school building.
Defining Site-Based Management

Sorting Defining Characteristics

It became apparent from the literature review that no consensus had been
drawn around a definition nor had standards of site-based management been set. This
gap left two strategic questions unanswered. What is site-based management? And
what standards can be applied to an organization that would deem that organization
site-base managed? The success of this study was contingent on a consistent
delineation upon which to base a decision as to whether a school could actually be
considered a site-base managed school.

The research cited many defining characteristics that were evidence that site-
based management was taking place. The same characteristics were recurring
throughout the literature. Some characteristics were cited more than others, but there
were no characteristics that were unique to any one study. The characteristics tended
to group into six broad components: (1) information, (2) vision, (3) support, (4)
communication, (5) leadership, and (6) power.
The first step, then, became sorting the site-based defining characteristics identified in the research into these six broad component. The six groups of characteristics combined to define the component. I called these individual characteristics "defining characteristics."

When the defining characteristics were grouped, I created a table type of survey to use with an Expert Panel of researchers. The INFORMATION component included nine defining characteristics. The VISION and CORE VALUES component included nine defining characteristics. The SUPPORT component included twelve defining characteristics. COMMUNICATION included nine defining characteristics. LEADERSHIP included eight defining characteristics. The degree to which, over what, and who at what time, questions concerning power, dictated the necessity to have a much larger group of defining characteristics for the POWER component. Twenty-eight were identified from the literature and included.

The Expert Panel

The review of the literature made it clear that there were people who had completed a great deal of research in the area of site-based management in schools. In addition, there are internationally recognized school reform experts whose opinions concerning site-based management as a school reform tool would be valued by the broader educational community. Ten people from across the United States and Canada were invited to participate in an Expert Panel. The Expert Panel was asked to identify the site-based activities that must be in place (essential) for a school to be
identified as a site-base managed school. These then became the standards by which the schools in the study cohort were judged.

Two invitees declined to participate in the Expert Panel. Those who agreed to offer feedback on this project were:

1. Dr. Janice Curry of the Austin Independent School District, Department of Performance, Audit and Evaluation, Austin, Texas.


3. Dr. Michael Fullen, Dean, School of Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

4. Dr. Carl Glickman, Director, Program for School Improvement, School of Teacher Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

5. Dr. Paul T. Hill, RAND Institute for Education and Training, Santa Monica, California.

6. Dr. Maurice Holt, School of Education, University of Colorado, Denver, Colorado.

7. Dr. Sandra Kessler-Hamburg, Vice President and Director of Education Studies, Committee for Economic Development, Putting Learning First, Project Director, New York, New York.

The survey consisting of the six overarching components and 75 defining characteristics was sent to the ten people identified as potential Expert Panel participants. Feedback data was received from eight panelists identified above. The panelists were asked to indicate how important, in their opinion, each statement was in defining the component of site-based management. In addition, they were encouraged to add defining characteristics they believed to be "critical, influential, or important" in defining the component.

The panelists were allowed to determine one of four degrees to which they felt the defining characteristic was necessary to define the component. The degrees and their definitions used in the Expert Panel's survey were:

1. Critical: Without this statement the component definition would not be complete.
2. Influential: Without this statement the definition changes in such a way that I would no longer agree with the definition.
3. Important: This statement adds clarity to the definition.
4. Not Relevant: This statement can be left out without affecting the definition of the component.
Setting the Standards: The Expert Panel’s Opinion

The classification of CRITICAL on the survey was given a value of four, INFLUENTIAL, a value of three, IMPORTANT a value of two, and NOT RELEVANT a value of one. The individual scores from the Expert Panel for each defining characteristic were averaged to give a composite score for each characteristic. Fifty-seven of the defining characteristics received a composite score above 3.0. These 57 defining characteristics became the survey used with the individual school building personnel.

In the interest of keeping the school survey as short as possible, but keep the defining characteristics which the expert panel saw as most important, I determined that a defining characteristic must receive at least a composite score of three, or valued by the Expert Panel as INFLUENTIAL or CRITICAL to be maintained and included as a standard for determining the existence of site-based management. While a defining characteristic that received a composite score above two and below three was identified as adding clarity to the definition of the component, I felt there needed to be a cutoff point.

Table 1 shows the scores garnered from the Expert Panel on each defining characteristic. Those shaded were eliminated from inclusion in the School Survey based on the Expert Panel’s composite scores. A copy of the Expert Panel’s survey in its original format is included in Appendix A.
### Table 1

**Expert Panel Survey Tally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>TALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff is given information on the school improvement process.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many kinds of data are collected to determine impact of new initiatives.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions regarding change are research based.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear codes of conduct which all stakeholders (including students) understand.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A needs assessment, including students’ achievement, has been administered to determine school goals.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building staff can articulate the goals of the school’s improvement initiative(s).</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>TALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The existence of a school norm of continuous improvement.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building principal articulates a clear vision for the school.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s vision incorporates standard school behaviors expected of all staff.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s normal (usual) behaviors have been changed to implement the school’s vision.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A shared vision is supported by a majority of the staff.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s improvement goals and strategies were developed in such a way that there is support by a majority of the staff.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School personnel have a well-defined vision regarding student outcomes that guides curriculum decision making.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff holds high expectations of all students.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders feel a sense of responsibility and accountability for all students’ achievement.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>TALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused professional development supports the vision.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development is provided for all who interact with students (i.e., support staff, custodians, bus drivers, parents, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are actively sought to implement new initiatives.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building level administrator(s) support a culture of risk taking.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office administrator(s) support a culture of risk taking.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide celebrations of success occur.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers trust their building administrator(s).</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The union allows waivers teachers see as necessary to implement new innovation.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school board allows waivers teachers see as necessary to implement new innovation.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sufficient resources to implement changes teachers see as necessary.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a high level of parent involvement.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers model continuous learning for students</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>TALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>DEFINING STATEMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>TALLY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members of the community have a vehicle for input into decision making that would result in changes at the school.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>DEFINING STATEMENT</td>
<td>TALLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator(s) is viewed as a facilitator of change.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator(s) recognizes accomplishments publicly.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator focuses on systemic requirements that support successful implementation of building level initiatives.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator is seen as the instructional leader by the staff.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator uses a participative leadership style (decision making procedures allow others some input to the leader's decisions).</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator uses a transformational leadership style (the leader is admired and respected, followers make decisions &quot;for the greater good&quot;).</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator uses a directive leadership style (the leader makes the plan and delivers expectations to followers).</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator uses an instrumental leadership style (the leader empowers followers who are seen as well qualified).</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>TALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are areas that are “non negotiable,” standard operating procedures that cannot be changed.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development needs are identified by the teachers.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development for the professional staff includes leadership skills (i.e., running meetings, budgeting, and interviewing).</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has a decision making group representative of all stakeholder groups (i.e., building staff members, parents, students, community members, business people, etc.).</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision making group (identified above) has control over:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiring (including the principal)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire school budget</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supply budget</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content delivery system</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building staff has control over:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiring (including the principal)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire school budget</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supply budget</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content delivery system</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school involves a variety of stakeholders in the school’s governance.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the decision making group have identified responsibilities to the group.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>TALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The building administrator fosters shared leadership to aid staff in a feeling of</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>empowerment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The staff believes the building administrator empowers them to make schoolwide</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The staff believes the building administrator empowers them to make classroom</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The staff believes the building administrator empowers them to make decisions</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concerning curriculum delivery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Categorical program budgets are integrated to serve all students.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are involved in self-evaluation.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are involved in peer evaluation.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration evaluates teachers based on a teacher developed instrument.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no difference in teacher evaluations between a site-based management</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school and one that it was so designated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no &quot;sacred cows.&quot; If something isn't working anyone in the school has</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the responsibility of bringing the issue or practice to the attention of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision making group to consider change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher make presentations to the school board.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codes of conduct for the school are administered consistently and equitably.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Three defining characteristics received a perfect 4.0 composite score: (1) Professional staff is given information on the school improvement process, (2) A shared vision is supported by a majority of the staff, and (3) All stakeholders feel a sense of responsibility and accountability for all students' achievement.

The Expert Panel had identified 57 defining characteristics that, in their collective opinion were either “Critical: Without this statement the component would not be complete.” or “Influential: Without this statement the definition changes in such a way that I would no longer agree with the definition.” These defining characteristics then became the standard by which the individual school would be judged as having site-based management in place.

Survey of Cohort Population

A School Survey was developed based on the 57 defining characteristics that the Expert Panel identified as critical or influential for classification as a SBM school. Each defining characteristic on the survey used the same wording as the Expert Panel's survey and was given a scoring option of a five-point Likert Scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree. The defining characteristics included in the School Survey are noted above and a copy of the survey is included in Appendix B.
The Pilot

A pilot school was chosen from the 1995-96 cohort of Title I Schoolwide implementers. I had been the MDE facilitator for this school during their year of planning and was, therefore, familiar with the principal and staff. This school was chosen because it demographically closely resembled the 1994-95 cohort and also for its convenience due to our relationship. Figure 3 shows the Pilot School’s composite score for each defining characteristic on the School Survey.

The pilot school scored above four (agree) on two of the defining characteristics the Expert Panel had given a perfect (4.0) score: “Professional staff is given information on the school improvement process.” and “Building level administrator(s) support a culture of risk taking.” The pilot, on the other hand, had a score below undecided (2.8) on number 15, “All stakeholders feel a sense of responsibility and accountability for all students’ achievement.” In addition, the defining characteristics concerning the decision making group’s power in several areas scored as a disagree (2.0). However, they scored agree on “The staff believes the building administrator empowers them to make schoolwide decisions.” This defining characteristic the Expert Panel again gave a perfect score of critical (4.0). It is possible that the staff feels they have responsibility and accountability for all students achievement, but that others, such as the decision making group, does not feel that sense of responsibility and accountability.
Figure 3. Pilot School’s Composite Answers to Defining Characteristics.

Pilot School Survey Results

Given the responses and the high degree of return rate (58%), I saw no reason to change any of the defining characteristics. However, the one change that was apparent from the Pilot School that must be changed when conducting the study was in mailing protocol. I mailed the package of materials to the principal of the pilot school in a plain mailer. When after three weeks the materials still had not arrived, a search entailed at the building. The materials were found in a supply storage closet. They had been identified as supplies and thus stored. The Cohort Schools received
their materials in U.S. Postal supplied red, white, and blue mailing boxes clearly marked Priority Mail.

Identification and Description of the Target Population

1994-95 Title I Schoolwide Cohort

In 1994-95 when the ESEA was revised, Michigan encouraged schools with a population of 35% or more of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch to move from a Title I Targeted Assistance school to a Schoolwide school model. Thirteen districts in Michigan identified schools who met the criteria and were willing to take on the responsibility of a site-based management model. Fifty-one schools signed up for a year of training and planning. Five of the schools were rural schools. The remaining forty-six were urban schools. Five of the schools were junior high or middle schools. The remaining forty-six were elementary schools. All schools were located in the lower peninsula of Michigan. These schools were then identified as the 1994-95 Title I Schoolwide cohort. These schools will be referred to in this study as the 1994-95 cohort.

Poverty in these buildings is based on the percent of students on a free and reduced lunch count. The average percentage of poverty population in the 1994-95 cohort schools was 77.4 percent, with a range of 53.9% to 100% free and reduced lunch.
Identifying the Study Population

Each of the schools from the original cohort was identified as a potential participant in the study. The principal in each building was contacted by telephone and invited to have their staff included in the study.

One district chose not to allow any of their six schools to participate, leaving 11 districts with schools as possible participants in the study cohort. Five schools had returned to a Targeted Assistance format. Two schools had closed. In addition, 17 schools chose not to participate in the study.

The measure used to determine student achievement in each building is the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP). The MEAP test is administered at the 4th, 5th, 7th, 8th, 10th, and 11th grades. Therefore, two of the schools in the 1994-95 cohort were eliminated, because they were K-3 buildings. Both of the eliminated schools were in the same district, thus narrowing the district population to 10.

An interesting sidebar occurred during the conversation with each principal. I explained that the study was to test the implementation of site-based management in their building since becoming a Title I schoolwide school and the correlation with student achievement. Of the 19 who agreed to take part in the study, only two said they wanted to gain consensus for the activity from their staff prior to agreeing to take part. While I mentally noted this fact, I failed to note which buildings they were, so I was unable to identify those schools' data when it arrived.
To determine if the participating schools were representative of the original 1994-95 cohort, I conducted a series of two-tailed t tests on five available variables. The variables included were: (1) percent of poverty, (2) enrollment, (3) student to teacher ratio, (4) enrollment of district, and (5) whether the school was in a rural or urban setting. There was no statistically significant difference between the study cohort and the 1994-95 cohort. Figure 4 shows the results of the tests.

This elimination of schools from the original 1994-95 Title I Schoolwide cohort made the Study Cohort from which to gather data consist of 19 schools from 10 districts located in the lower peninsula of Michigan.

The Study Cohort principals were assured that there would be no way to identify their schools from the study. Therefore the schools are referred to throughout this study by number, 1-19.

Collection of Data

Those 19 principals who agreed and had a building that qualified were asked to identify the number of school personnel employed by the district in the building. Since researchers (Slaven, et. al., 1996, Glasser, 1969) have identified the importance of all school personnel who interact with students, that definition included anyone who worked in the building regardless of their position. The survey was to be given to all school personnel. The requested number of packets were mailed in a bundle of large self-addressed, stamped manilla envelopes. Each envelope contained a survey, consent form, and information for returning the survey. Table 2 shows the participating
schools, the number requested, returned, and the percentage returned. There was a
44% overall return rate of surveys.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances} \\
\begin{array}{l|cc}
\hline
& 69.4 & 84.4 \\
\hline
\text{Mean} & 80.72727 & 77.42143 \\
\text{Variance} & 155.2642 & 199.7466 \\
\text{Observations} & 11 & 42 \\
\text{Hypothesized Mean Difference} & 0 & 0 \\
\text{df} & 17 & 17 \\
\text{t Stat} & 0.761005 & 0.761005 \\
\text{P} (T <= t) & 0.228541 & 0.228541 \\
\text{t Critical (one-tail)} & 1.739606 & 1.739606 \\
\text{P} (T <= t) & 0.457081 & 0.457081 \\
\text{t Critical (two-tail)} & 2.109819 & 2.109819 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 4. T-Test of Variables.
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### t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>360.5833</td>
<td>403.1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>10185.9</td>
<td>27494.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-1.10906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (T ≤ t)</td>
<td>0.138258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical</td>
<td>1.699127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (T ≤ t)</td>
<td>0.276515</td>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical</td>
<td>2.045231</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>27.11667</td>
<td>27.68674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>7.20697</td>
<td>22.69646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-0.53666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (T ≤ t)</td>
<td>0.297606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical</td>
<td>1.693888</td>
<td>STUDENT TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (T ≤ t)</td>
<td>0.595212</td>
<td>TEACHER RATIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical</td>
<td>2.036932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8817.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>74212165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-1.37807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (T ≤ t)</td>
<td>0.091345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical</td>
<td>1.720744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two-tail</td>
<td>2.079614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.204545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-0.97934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (T ≤ t)</td>
<td>0.172017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical</td>
<td>1.761309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-tail</td>
<td>2.144789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**1994-95 Cohort Study Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>No. of Surveys Requested</th>
<th>No. Returned</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recording the Data

The return envelopes that were provided had the school's name and address on them. As the surveys returned they were divided by school. Each school was given a number and entered into a database. Each defining characteristic was given a score of 1-5 based on the participant's score. By averaging the scores each school received, each defining characteristic was given a composite score of 1-5. As the data were collected, it became clear that none of the schools had all of the defining characteristics identified by the Expert Panel as Critical or Influential. To avoid any bias of non-respondents, I eliminated the four schools with a return rate below 25%. Perhaps if their colleagues had responded to the survey the results for those buildings would have been different.

Findings

SBM Schools

A check to determine if the remaining 15 schools had valid MEAP scores identified three buildings that did not have satisfactory MEAP information. Two schools had changed the grade level format since 1994-95 leaving their MEAP data unavailable for comparison purposes. One school was an alternative school with a population taking the MEAP too small to draw significant conclusions.

To determine if the MEAP scores of the study cohort were representative of the original 1994-95 cohort, I ran two-tailed t tests on both the Reading and Math
percentage of change between 1994, the planning year for Title I Schoolwide implementation, and 1998, four years into implementation. Figure 5 shows that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>46.25833</td>
<td>48.08718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>261.8117</td>
<td>525.3369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-0.30787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (T &lt;= t)</td>
<td>0.380318</td>
<td>COMPARING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparing Math Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>46.25833</td>
<td>48.08718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>261.8117</td>
<td>525.3369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-0.30787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (T &lt;= t)</td>
<td>0.380318</td>
<td>COMPARING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. T-Test of MEAP Score Changes for 1994-95 Cohort and Study Cohort.
Figure 5—Continued

\[ \text{t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31.83333</td>
<td>34.37692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>371.1097</td>
<td>516.2497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-0.38275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P (T &lt; t) ) one-tail</td>
<td>0.352875</td>
<td>( t ) Critical one-tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P (T &lt; t) ) two-tail</td>
<td>0.70575</td>
<td>( t ) Critical two-tail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPARING READING SCORES

Schools in Michigan are tested in Reading, Writing, Math, Science and Social Studies. However, the MEAP scores that were used for this study are for math and reading only because these tests have not changed over the four years since the schools Title I Schoolwide implementation. The baseline data used is the school’s MEAP score for each area during the year of planning, 1994. The difference between the 1998 percent of students passing and the 1994 baseline year was used to determine change in student achievement, if any. Figure 6 shows the rank order of the schools and the percentage point change in MEAP scores for each building. If there is a relationship between implementation of SBM and student achievement, as measured by the MEAP, one would expect the two graphs’ trend lines to be similar. They are not.
Figure 6. Rank Order of Schools and MEAP Changes Between 1994 and 1998.
All of the remaining 12 schools received a score on at least one of the defining characteristics of less than 3.0 meaning none met a 100% standard set by the Expert Panel. The composite scores for all 57 defining characteristics were, therefore, averaged to rank the schools in order of degree of implementation. The schools all fell between 3.842 and 3.369. In other words, the schools' personnel reported 67-77% implementation of the standard set by the Expert Panel.

While many schools were lacking in the same areas, there does not appear to be any correlation between the number of defining characteristics below 3.0 and their overall ranking by composite score. This indicates that those defining characteristics which are in place received high scores raising the overall composite score.

Question 58 on the School Survey asked the participant to indicate their position in the school. Not everyone answered this question, including the administrators. However, the lowest achieving schools, 9 (LA1) and 10 (LA2), and the highest achieving school, 12 (HA) did provide this information. I was able, therefore, to compare answers on the part of the staff to those of the administrator in the buildings. These three schools are all rural schools.

Up to this point none of the data has supported the hypothesis that site-based management increases student achievement. I decided to compare these three schools by component and see if perhaps I could find a focal point that would give a clue as to why school number 12 had such remarkable increases in student achievement, while their sister school in the same district, LA2, had such remarkable decreases in student achievement. I almost hesitate to relay what I found because the findings fly in the
face of accepted beliefs about the trust and respect of staff toward their administrator. I would recommend a case study of these two schools as a future dissertation study.

The administrators in both LAI and HA consistently rated the school with agree or strongly agree on all but 7 of the defining characteristics. (The seven were not the same between the two schools.) While the administrator in school LAI consistently rated the school as undecided in 20, more than one-third, of the defining characteristics, how the staff differed from what the administrators said, provided an interesting contrast and some areas of agreement.

Component 1 - Information

Everyone agreed as to the importance of the first defining characteristic in this component area, Expert Panel and school personnel, that the “Professional staff is given information on the school improvement process.” In addition to the three schools that I’m focusing on, this defining characteristic received the highest score in all 12 schools. The school improvement process has been legislated in Michigan for 10 years and, as an employee of the Michigan Department of Education, I was glad to see that this was in place in the study cohort.

As reported by school personnel in all three buildings (LAI, LA2, and HA), “Data are being collected to determine impact of new initiatives”, but the administrator in school HA is undecided as to whether or not this is happening. In addition, while buildings LAI and HA have building staff who can “articulate the goals
of the school's improvement initiative(s)," both the staff and administrator in school
HA are undecided on this point.

Component 2 - Vision and Core Values

All three buildings, staff and administration, agree that there exists "a school
norm of continuous improvement" and a "building principal that articulates a clear
vision for the school." For all other defining characteristics of this component, the
administrator in building LA2 is undecided, while his staff agrees that they are in place.
Schools LA1 and HA have agreement between the staff and administrator that these
components are in place.

Component 3 - Support

This component is very interesting in the light of site-based management. The
staff in the school with the highest student achievement of any school in the study
cohort does not "trust their building administrator(s)." Yet, he believes that they do.
In the two schools, LA1 and LA2, with the lowest student achievement there is
agreement between the administrators and staff that the "teachers trust their building
administrator(s)." All agree that "building level administrator(s) support a culture of
risk taking. At the same time, school HA reports a lack of trust.

All disagree with the statement that "The union allows waivers teachers see as
necessary to implement new innovation." And while the school personnel are
undecided about "The school board allows waivers teachers see as necessary to
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implement new innovation., the administrators agree that the school board is willing to allow waivers. The school personnel in all three buildings and administrators in schools LA1 and HA believe “There is a high level of parent involvement.” The administrator in building LA2 once again is undecided.

Component 4 - Communication

“The principal in the building communicates effectively.” is one of the defining characteristics the Expert Panel agreed was critical for SBM to be in place. In the school with the highest student achievement the administrator believes he communicates effectively, however his staff is undecided. Yet in the two buildings with the lowest achievement there is agreement from everyone in each building that their principals communicate effectively.

Another defining characteristic in this component that the Expert Panel rated high (3.8 out of 4), is “Formative assessments are provided to students for self-evaluation.” The administrator in school HA strongly agreed, but his staff were undecided.

Component 5 - Leadership

In this component, the administrator in building LA2 showed he did strongly agree with some defining characteristics: (a) “The building administrator is seen as the instructional leader by the staff.” and (b) “The building administrator uses a participative leadership style”. His staff agrees with him. The staff in building HA,
undecided while he agrees strongly in two important defining characteristics: (a) "The building administrator(s) is viewed as a facilitator of change." and (b) "The building administrator focuses on systemic requirements that support successful implementation of building level initiatives." He and his staff do agree that he is seen as the instructional leader in the building.

Component 6 - Power

The final component, Power, is seen as the one area that stands as a barrier to SBM. Here is how the three buildings we have been examining see themselves.

Does the school have "a decision making group representative of all stakeholder groups (i.e., building staff members, parents, students, community members, business people, etc.)?" School LA1 was undecided. School LA2's principal agreed that there was, but his staff was undecided. School HA's principal strongly agreed. His staff was undecided.

While school LA1 was undecided as to whether there was a decision making group in place, the principal agreed that that group had control over curriculum. His staff disagreed with him. Both principals and staff from schools LA2 and HA agreed that this group did not have control over the curriculum.

The principal from building LA2, who was undecided about one-third of the defining characteristics agrees that the decision making group, "identified above", has control over the entire school budget and the content delivery system. His staff, on the other hand is undecided. His colleague from the same district, principal of building
HA strongly agrees that this group has decision making power in these same two areas. His staff, too, is undecided. Building LA1 consistently does not believe they have this group and that they have no control over these areas. However, building LA1 has a principal who believes his building staff has control over curriculum and content delivery system. His staff is undecided.

In response to the defining characteristic, "The building administrator fosters shared leadership to aid staff in a feeling of empowerment," the administrators from buildings LA1 and HA strongly agree. Their staff is undecided. The principal from building LA2, once again, is undecided. His staff agrees.

While the staff in the building HA, the one with the highest student achievement, believes that "the building administrator empowers them to make schoolwide decisions" earlier they reported not trusting him. The principals of the other buildings, LA1 and LA2, each have a staff who believes their administrator empowers them, yet they have low achieving students. In addition, they trust him, see him as an educational leader, and a facilitator for change.

It would appear that LA1 has an administrator that is undecided in most areas, has a staff that respects, trusts, and feels empowered by him, yet their students are not achieving. School LA2, where students also are not achieving, has an administrator who reports agreement on the defining characteristics much more in line with his staff. On the other hand, where the students are achieving in an outstanding fashion, the principal is not trusted, does not empower his staff, and reports a much higher degree of agreement on most defining characteristics than his staff.
Why?

Meyer and Scott (1992) have a theory that myths accepted by the staff affects the degree to which, "...they are able to speak with a unified and persuasive voice on matters affecting their work" (p. 15). The defining characteristics identified by the schools as being in place should indicate a high degree of efficacy on the part of the staff. Leithwood and Menzies (1997) who summarized and analyzed 75 research studies on SBM implementation state the the model used for Title I Schoolwide implementation, the Professional Control model, "...appears to have more positive effect on the practices of teachers than either of the other two forms, and no more negative effects. Professional Control SBM appears to hold the greatest promise for contributing to student growth" (p. 235).

In their Conclusion, Leithwood and Menzies (1997) state, "From the perspective of high-involvement theory, SBM begins to supply some of the conditions for increasing the productivity of schools" (p. 278). I restate, the data collected by this researcher does not support these beliefs. While I still would like to believe that SBM is the "silver bullet" to increase student achievement, future studies will have to be conducted to prove this belief.

I may have made some erroneous assumptions going into this study. I assumed a bureaucratic hierarchical form of governance was in place when the schools chose to implement Title I Schoolwide planning. I, also, assumed that changes should have occurred after that year of planning.
While the highest achieving school and one of the lowest achieving schools in my study cohort both came from the same district, all years of Title I Schoolwide planning are not equal. Each building in the study cohort had the same professional development provider. Each building had a facilitator provided by the Michigan Department of Education. Those facilitators were not the same person, however. They may have had an influence that was not identified by this study.

The MEAP is the only common student achievement measure used in Michigan's schools and was, therefore, chosen as the measure of student achievement. However, the data collected did not take into account the transient population of students at each school. Some buildings have reported as much as 80 percent turnover in their student population to this educational consultant. Even a 10 percent change can affect the MEAP scores dramatically, depending on the number of students taking the test.

In some schools there is a high degree of skepticism over MEAP scores and their ability to accurately test student achievement. The data collected for this study did not take that into consideration. Schools that believe MEAP is a valid reliable test, work to align their curriculum, instruction, and assessment to the State Model Core Curriculum to which the MEAP is aligned. Their scores are usually considerably higher than schools who do not take these steps.

A tragedy in a school can cause a skewing of MEAP results. One school saw a beloved teacher die shortly before the 4th grade MEAP and a peer killed in a hit-and-
run accident shortly before the 5th grade MEAP. These two events affected the scores of that cohort.

Another question left unanswered by this study is, how long does it take to implement site-based management. These buildings scored from 67-77% on the standard set by the Expert Panel. Two schools showed a decrease in student achievement, however all others showed an increase. One building had an increase in math achievement and a decrease in reading achievement. This could be explained by a new reading series implementation or a concentration on math with a lack of attention to reading. The data from this study doesn’t answer any of these questions.

Another consideration is the remaining 39 schools from the 1994-95 cohort that were not included. While the variables I used showed the study cohort was representative, there may have been other intervening variables that made this cohort considerably different.

Or is intractability, as Sarson (1990) asserts destined to be the downfall of public education in America? A study looking at the degree of change using schools with high student achievement may be able to link in some manner SBM with higher student achievement. If I had begun with high achieving schools and applied the Expert Panel’s standard, it would be interesting to compare the results to this study.

Site-based management may be the beginning. However, it alone cannot assure higher student achievement as indicated by the data collected in this study. As Kriegel and Brandt (1996, p. 147-148) state,
The problem inheres in your unreflective acceptance of assumptions and axioms that seem so obviously right, natural, and proper that to question them is to question your reality. Therefore, faced with failure after failure, having tried this, that, and almost everything else, you don’t examine your bedrock assumptions. Instead, you come up with variations on past themes—now with more desperation and anger, but less hope. Instead of stimulating discussion in which no assumption is sacred, no alternative automatically off limits, and arguments for practicality and the status quo are no inhibitors of envisioning alternatives, intractability has reinforced the repetition compulsion.

Further studies using the definition of SBM supplied by this study may substantiate or obliterate the findings in this study. Only time and more research of a wider study population will tell.

Questions to consider during future studies may include:

1. Do high achieving schools meet more of the Expert Panel’s criterion for identification as a site-based management school?

2. Does a change in administration at the building level affect site-based management and/or student achievement? If so, how?

3. Are there defining characteristics within components of the Expert Panel’s criterion that should be eliminated or given more weight when identifying a site-based management school?
Appendix A

Expert Panel Survey
The literature review has identified eight components that seem to be present in a site-based decision making school. The components are: INFORMATION, VISION, SUPPORT, COMMUNICATION, LEADERSHIP, and POWER.

Please indicate, with a check, how important, in your opinion, each statement is in defining each component of site-based management. The definitions for each category are given below. In the empty rows, please add any statements you believe are critical, influential, or important in defining the component. If there are other components that you feel should be included, please indicate them on the reverse side of the survey, and include a couple defining statements.

Critical: Without this statement the component definition would not be complete.
Influential: Without this statement the definition changes in such a way that I would no longer agree with the definition.
Important: This statement adds clarity to the definition.
Not Relevant: This statement can be left out without affecting the definition of the component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Influential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff is given information on the school improvement process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff is given information on the school accreditation process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders visit other schools to learn about school improvement strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders attend conferences to learn about school improvement strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many kinds of data are collected to determine impact of new initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions regarding change are research based.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear codes of conduct which all stakeholders (including students) understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A needs assessment, including students’ achievement, has been administered to determine school goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building staff can articulate the goals of the school’s improvement initiative(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Influential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Releva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The existence of a school norm of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building principal articulates a clear vision for the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s vision incorporates standard school behaviors expected of all staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s normal (usual) behaviors have been changed to implement the school’s vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A shared vision is supported by a majority of the staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s improvement goals and strategies were developed in such a way that there is support by a majority of the staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School personnel have a well-defined vision regarding student outcomes that guides curriculum decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff holds high expectations of all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders feel a sense of responsibility and accountability for all students’ achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Influential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused professional development supports the vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development is provided for all who interact with students (i.e., support staff, custodians, bus drivers, parents, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are actively sought to implement new initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building level administrator(s) support a culture of risk taking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office administrator(s) support a culture of risk taking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide celebrations of success occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers trust their building administrator(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The union allows waivers teachers see as necessary to implement new innovation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school board allows waivers teachers see as necessary to implement new innovation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sufficient resources to implement changes teachers see as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a high level of parent involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers model continuous learning for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Influential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development for the professional staff includes interpersonal skills (i.e., group decision making, consensus building, conflict management).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members of the community are kept aware of changes being considered at the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members of the community have a vehicle for input into decision making that would result in changes at the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal(s) in the building communicates effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff take a proactive stance when questioned about changes being initiated at the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff has opportunities to collectively reflect and communicate about school improvement issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent compacts are an important part of the school’s parental involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents receive information on a regular basis regarding their student’s success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessments are provided to students for self-evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Influential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator(s) is viewed as a facilitator of change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator(s) recognizes accomplishments publicly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator focuses on systemic requirements that support successful implementation of building level initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator is seen as the instructional leader by the staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator uses a participative leadership style (decision making procedures allow others some input to the leader’s decisions).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator uses a transformational leadership style (the leader is admired and respected, followers make decisions “for the Gipper”).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator uses a directive leadership style (the leader makes the plan and delivers expectations to followers).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator uses an instrumental leadership style (the leader empowers followers who are seen as well qualified).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Power**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Influential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are areas that are &quot;non-negotiable,&quot; standard operating procedures that cannot be changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development needs are identified by the teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development for the professional staff includes leadership skills (i.e., running meetings, budgeting, and interviewing).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has a decision making group representative of all stakeholder groups (i.e., building staff members, parents, students, community members, business people, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The decision making group (identified above) has control over:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiring (including the principal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire school budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supply budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content delivery system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The building staff has control over:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiring (including the principal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire school budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supply budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content delivery system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school involves a variety of stakeholders in the school’s governance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the decision making group have identified responsibilities to the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Power (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING STATEMENT</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Influential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The building administrator fosters shared leadership to aid staff in a feeling of empowerment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff believes the building administrator empowers them to make schoolwide decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff believes the building administrator empowers them to make classroom decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff believes the building administrator empowers them to make decisions concerning curriculum delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical program budgets are integrated to serve all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in self-evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in peer evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators evaluate teachers based on a teacher developed instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no difference in teacher evaluations between a site-based management school and one that is not so designated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no “sacred cows.” If something isn’t working anyone in the school has the responsibility of bringing the issue or practice to the attention of the decision making group to consider change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make presentations to the school board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes of conduct for the school are administered consistently and equitably.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

1994-95 Title I Schoolwide Implementors
School Survey
1994-95 Title I Schoolwide Implementors

This survey is to be completed by personnel presently working in a school that began the year of planning to become a Title I Schoolwide school during the 1994-95 school year and began implementation of their plan during the 1995-96 school year.

When the term "staff" is used, it means all of the building personnel.

The survey is made up of statements meant to indicate the degree to which this school has implemented site-based decision making. Please put a check in the box next to the degree of agreement that most closely aligns with your agreement to each of the statements.

1. The staff is given information on the school improvement process.

   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

2. Many kinds of data (rubrics, standardized tests, portfolios, etc.) are collected to determine the impact of any new initiatives.

   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

3. Any decisions regarding change are research based.

   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

4. There are clear codes of conduct which all stakeholders (including students) understand.

   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree
5. A needs assessment, including students' achievement, has been administered to determine the school goals.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

6. The building staff can articulate the goals of the school's improvement initiative(s).

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

7. A school norm of continuous improvement exists.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

8. The building principal articulates a clear vision for the school.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

9. The school's vision incorporates standard school behaviors expected of all staff.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

10. The school's normal (usual) behaviors have been changed to implement the school's vision.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree
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11. A shared vision is supported by a majority of the staff.
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

12. The school's improvement goals and strategies were developed in such a way that there is support by a majority of the staff.
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

13. School personnel have a well-defined vision regarding student outcomes that guides curriculum decision making.
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

14. The staff holds high expectations for all students.
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

15. All stakeholders feel a sense of responsibility and accountability for all students' achievement.
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

16. Focused professional development supports the school's vision.
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree
17. Resources are actively sought to implement new initiatives.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

18. The building level administrator(s) support a culture of risk taking (trying new teaching strategies, etc.).

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

19. Central office administrator(s) support a culture of risk taking (trying new teaching strategies, etc.).

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

20. Teachers trust their building administrator(s).

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

21. The union allows waivers that teachers see as necessary to implement new innovations.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

22. The school board allows waivers that teachers see as necessary to implement new innovations.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree
23. There are sufficient resources to implement changes teachers see as necessary.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

24. Teachers model continuous learning for students.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

25. All members of the community have a vehicle for input into decision making that would result in changes at the school.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

26. The principal(s) in the building communicates effectively with all stakeholder groups (parents, staff, community, students, etc.).

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

27. School staff take a proactive stance when questioned about changes being initiated at the school.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree
28. School staff has opportunities to collectively reflect and communicate about school improvement issues (shared planning time, staff meetings, professional development days, etc.).

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

29. Parents receive information on a regular basis regarding their student's success.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

30. Formative assessments (weekly quizzes, peer evaluation, rubrics, etc.) are provided to students for self evaluation.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

31. The building administrator(s) is viewed as a facilitator of change.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

32. The building administrator(s) recognizes accomplishments publicly (during staff meetings, in newsletters, etc.).

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

33. The building administrator(s) focuses on systemic requirements that support successful implementation of building level initiatives.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree
34. The building administrator is seen as the instructional leader (a person who understands new instructional strategies and research) by the staff.

   o A. Strongly Agree  
   o B. Agree  
   o C. Undecided  
   o D. Disagree  
   o E. Strongly Disagree

35. The building administrator's decision making procedures allow others some input into the leader's decisions.

   o A. Strongly Agree  
   o B. Agree  
   o C. Undecided  
   o D. Disagree  
   o E. Strongly Disagree

36. The building administrator empowers staff who are seen as well qualified.

   o A. Strongly Agree  
   o B. Agree  
   o C. Undecided  
   o D. Disagree  
   o E. Strongly Disagree

37. There are areas that are "non negotiable," standard operating procedures that cannot be changed.

   o A. Strongly Agree  
   o B. Agree  
   o C. Undecided  
   o D. Disagree  
   o E. Strongly Disagree

38. Professional development needs are identified by the teachers.

   o A. Strongly Agree  
   o B. Agree  
   o C. Undecided  
   o D. Disagree  
   o E. Strongly Disagree
39. The school has a decision making group representative of all stakeholder groups (i.e., building staff members, parents, students, community members, business people, etc.).
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

40. The decision making group (identified above) has control over the curriculum.
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

41. The decision making group (identified above) has control over hiring (including the principal).
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

42. The decision making group (identified above) has control over the entire school budget (salaries, utilities, etc.).
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree

43. The decision making group (identified above) has control over the supply budget (teaching materials, professional development, etc.).
   - A. Strongly Agree
   - B. Agree
   - C. Undecided
   - D. Disagree
   - E. Strongly Disagree
44. The decision making group (identified above) has control over the content delivery system.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

45. The building staff has control over curriculum decisions.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

46. The building staff has control over the content delivery system.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

47. The school involves a variety of stakeholders in the school’s governance (decision-making).

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

48. Members of the decision making group have identified responsibilities to the group.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

49. The building administrator(s) fosters shared leadership to aid staff in a feeling of empowerment.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree
50. The staff believes the building administrator empowers them to make school wide decisions.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

51. The staff believes the building administrator(s) empowers them to make classroom decisions.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

52. The staff believes the building administrator(s) empowers them to make decisions concerning curriculum delivery.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

53. The categorical program budgets (i.e., Title I, Gifted and Talented, Eisenhower, etc.) are integrated to serve all students.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

54. Teachers are involved in self evaluation.

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Undecided
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree
55. Teachers are involved in peer evaluation.

   o A. Strongly Agree
   o B. Agree
   o C. Undecided
   o D. Disagree
   o E. Strongly Disagree

56. There are no "sacred cows." If something isn't working anyone in the school has the responsibility of bringing the issue or practice to the attention of the decision making group to consider a change.

   o A. Strongly Agree
   o B. Agree
   o C. Undecided
   o D. Disagree
   o E. Strongly Disagree

57. Codes of conduct for the school are administered consistently and equitably.

   o A. Strongly Agree
   o B. Agree
   o C. Undecided
   o D. Disagree
   o E. Strongly Disagree

58. Please check your position below.

   o A. Maintenance
   o B. Kitchen crew
   o C. Counselor
   o D. Teacher
   o E. Administrator (please specify)
   o F. Other (please specify)

59. If you're a teacher, what grade level do you teach?

60. Please indicate your gender.

   o A. male
   o B. female
Appendix C

Protocol Clearance From the Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: 28 August 1998

To: Barbara Liggett, Principal Investigator
    Susan Hannah, Principal Investigator
    Roxana Hopkins, Student Investigator

From: Richard Wright, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 98-08-08

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Site-Based Management & Student Achievement" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: 28 August 1999
CONSENT FORM

I am attempting to determine whether site-based school governance is associated with observed changes in student achievement. There are two related problems and the help of a panel of experts is needed to assist in solving them. The problems are, first, site-based management means different things to different people. Second, schools evidence varying degrees of implementation of the concept and, therefore, should be classified differently.

Through a reading of the literature and knowledge of the field you have been identified as a potential participant on the "panel of experts." I understand your participation will take time from your busy schedule, but I would sincerely appreciate it if you could take a few minutes and complete the enclosed questionnaire.

The responses from the "panel of experts" will be synthesized to form a comprehensive definition of site-based management. Using that definition, a survey will be developed and given to the staff of a cohort of schools engaged in Title I Schoolwide Improvement planning and implementation. The data from the surveys will be used to scale the schools in terms of their degree of implementation of site-based governance. Then, using the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) scores, I will attempt to determine to what degree those schools that evidenced the highest degrees of implementation of site-based management also had the greatest amount of improvement in achievement.

There will be no confidentiality maintained in the collection of answers to the questionnaire. A list of researchers invited to participate in the expert panel is enclosed. If you agree to participate, I need the completed questionnaire returned in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope before September 4, if possible. If it would be more convenient for you to fax the completed questionnaire, the fax number is (517) 349-8852. If you cannot participate, will you please drop the enclosed post card in the mail.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or additional treatment will be made available to the subject except as otherwise stated in this consent form.

I would be happy to send you a copy of the study or executive summary of the study upon request. If you have questions, I can be contacted either by e-mail at RoxanaMH@aol.com or by phone during the day at (517) 335-0352 or evenings at (616) 789-1157. If you have questions for the Dissertation Chair, you may contact Dr. Susan Hannah by e-mail at hannah@ipfw.edu or by phone at (219) 481-6116. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (616-387-8293) or the Vice President for Research (616-387-8298) if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

Date: Participant's Signature:

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Subjects should not sign this document if the corner does not show a stamped date and signature.
ANONYMOUS SURVEY CONSENT FORM

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “Site-Based Management and Student Achievement” designed to determine whether site-based school governance is associated with observed changes in student achievement. The study is being conducted by Dr. Susan Hannah (principal investigator) and Roxana M. Hopkins (student investigator) from Western Michigan University, Department of Public Affairs and Administration. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Roxana M. Hopkins.

This survey is comprised of 57 statements to which you have the opportunity to indicate your degree of agreement with the statement from strongly disagree to strongly agree. In addition, there are three demographic questions: (1) position; (2) if a teacher, grade level you teach; and (3) gender. It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose not to answer any question and simply leave it blank. If participate or you choose not to participate in this survey, please return the blank survey in the stamped, self-addressed, envelope provided. Returning the survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

If you have questions, you may contact Dr. Susan Hannah by e-mail at hannah@ipfw.edu or by phone at (219) 481-6116, Roxana M. Hopkins at RoxanaMH@aol.com or by phone (616) 789-1157, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at (616) 387-8293, or the vice president for research (616) 387-8298.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. You should not participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature.
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