1984

A Proposal for the Implementation of a Quality Circle Program at Cumberland High School

Joseph A. Ciaccio

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in Educational Administration at Eastern Illinois University. Find out more about the program.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

_8/2/84_ _____

Date   Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____ _____

_____

_____

_____   _____

Date   Author

m

A PROPOSAL FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A

QUALITY CIRCLE PROGRAM AT CUMBERLAND HIGH SCHOOL

(TITLE)

BY

JOSEPH A. CIACCIO

FIELD EXPERIENCE

X~~THESIS~~X

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1984

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

7-20-84
DATE

ADVISER

7-20-84
DATE

COMMITTEE MEMBER

7-20-84
DATE

COMMITTEE MEMBER

July 20, 1984
DATE

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

A Proposal For The Implementation
Of A Quality Circle Program
At Cumberland High School

By

Joseph A. Ciaccio

B. S. in Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1970

M. S. in Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1974

ABSTRACT OF A FIELD STUDY

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Specialist in Educational Administration in the
Graduate School, Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois
1984

ABSTRACT

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to implement a participative management program at Cumberland High School in Toledo, Illinois. The researcher, who had been principal at the school for five years, believed that participative management may be a solution to what he perceived as problems within the school. These problems included low teacher morale, below average student achievement, and a lack of open communication between individual teachers and teachers and administrators. In addition, teacher gains in effectiveness and productivity, as based on formal teacher evaluation reports, were minimal.

The Quality Circle participative management approach, as reviewed in literature, seemed directed at the core of these problems. Thus, this study was deemed timely and relevant.

Procedure

Participative management in the form of Quality Circles is relatively new to industry and somewhat new to the field of education. Much of the research in Chapters one and two reviews both industrial and educational use of this type of employee relations model as well as giving justification for its implementation.

Chapter three identifies the participants in the program and describes the instrumentation used to judge the effectiveness of the program. Chapter four, after summarizing the research findings, lists six recommendations for the implementation of Quality Circles at Cumberland High School.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Project Goal

Many members of the older generation of workers have been conditioned by the era of the great depression. They are still concerned about their basic needs at the survival level. Such individuals, many of whom occupy positions in management have to learn to cope with a new breed of American worker. Many young people now start at a higher level of expectations. Because they are better educated, they have a broad understanding of what is going on in the world around them. They want to influence their surroundings to a greater extent than did workers in the past. This same group of individuals are characterized through such activities as picketing nuclear plants or staging protest marches in front of the White House. They are skeptical about the pronouncements made by leaders in government, education, and business. As members of the new generation of employees, they insist in maintaining their independence (Patchin, 1981).

The field of education has not escaped this phenomenon, but is one of the last to deal with changing employee relations. Currently, American education is plagued by high staff turnover, chronic absenteeism, discipline problems, lack of commitment, declining pupil competence, teacher burn-out, low self-esteem, frustration and disappointment (Chapee, 1983). In a time when education faces an unending barrage of criticisms, administrators in Illinois, especially middle management, face substantial new challenges in employee relations with the advent of collective bargaining legislation. Nichols (1982) identifies educational

1

management problems further by stating that academe seems either to suffer from very indecisive leaders or, like the business world, to employ chief executives who see themselves as "lone ranger" bosses who are paid to make tough, quick decisions. According to Nichols, these rapid fire commanders tend not to last very long. Their hasty, uninformed decisions often backfire. They may spend months mending shattered morale and back-pedaling in a fashion that eventually destroys their dynamic image. As Nichol's opinion indicates, in order to successfully achieve quality education, superintendents, principals, and teachers must establish an atmosphere conducive to dealing with today's crisis in education.

In the industrial world, many companies have adopted various humanistic models in dealing with their work force, participative management being a part of many of these plans. The most universally known plan of participative management is the Quality Circle plan. The Quality Circle Program is a management tool that allows for participatory decision making. It is a way of capturing the innovatative resources in a work force. It is founded on the belief that people are the most important resource and the key to productivity. This study dealt with the use of the Quality Circle concept as a catalyst in solving educational problems.

Background and Significance of the Field Study

As Nichols indicated, not only are the nation's schools at risk, but probably (and more accurately) the nation's school administrators' jobs are at risk.

Study after study, including a recent one by the State Board of Education (1984) indicate that the administration of a school system is a major factor in

2

determining the quality of a school. To achieve quality in an atmosphere of collective bargaining, Richard Williams notes that the administrator must be willing to share information with the union, must foster open and frank discussion of issues, must allow descent without considering the descentor disloyal and unprofessional, must work with the union and others to improve the quality of the school, and must at the same time be able to be a colleague and the manager (Williams, 1977). A common theme revolving around the words communication, morale, trust, and involvement is emerging as management's key to success. Paul Ford reaffirms this philosophy for the new successful administrator in the following:

A healthy organization is characterized by a sense of purpose, high communication, morale, mutual trust, and problem solving capabilities. It is the administrator's major responsibility to attend to organizational health for this is the basis upon which leadership potential and a productive instructional change process rests (P. 42).

Ford goes on to recommend discussion with influential staff members concerning their ideas in program improvement (Ford, 1980).

Howard Karlitz conducted a survey of administrators at an Akron, Ohio workshop in 1977 trying to identify perceived solutions to administrator/teacher problems. The following recommendations were given by the group:

1. Show genuine interest in the teachers.

2. Keep teachers well informed about the school system.

3. Involve teachers in almost all decisions in policy making.

4. Give more teacher recognition when it is due. Too often there
   is criticism leveled at those who have not performed as they

3

should have or when they have made mistakes, but not enough
do we recognize the efforts of individuals, and, of course, this
goes beyond a dollar and cents value you can place on it.

5. Use staff meetings for problem solving using a seminar approach
(Karlitz, 1977, P. 118).

Keys and Bartunek in their 1979 study on "Organization and Development
in Schools" cite a 1975 Rand Corporation study on "change" projects. The study
notes that such imposed changes on education as mainstreaming, gifted
programs, bilingual education, school district consolidation, and others, are
doomed to failure without internal acceptance. However, projects with a
problem-solving thrust are more likely to result in change since the project
addressed goals are important to teachers, principals, parents, and students
(Keys and Bartunek, 1979). Example after example are witness to management
problems when "grass roots" involvement is neglected in the educational arena.
Fifteen years after its inception with hundreds of million dollars expended, the
Director of Chapter I programs cites as his most pressing single problem the
failure of regular class teachers and school base administrators to integrate the
supplemental remedial services into the basic educational program (Chapey,
1983).

Gallager (1984) of the Chicago Tribune relates the teacher participation
problem to the most recent imposed state mandates. Gallager writes:

One year after a national commission detailed the shortcomings of
American education, many states and school districts have
responded by imposing rougher classroom routines and curriculum
standards. But the long term success of this rescue effort is still

4

considered doubtful by some educational planners because too little has been done to beef up the commitment of the average classroom teacher . . . We have to find ways to make teachers feel we're not taking them for granted, that they have a leading role to play in implementing reforms and that they will get recognition for it (P. 15).

Cumberland Unit District #77, the setting for this field study, is characterized by many of the descriptive problems referenced above. There has been high staff turn-over and high administrative turn-over. A recent survey of faculty and non-certified personnel indicated low morale and numerous complaints (see Appendix A). Conversely, there appears to be a correlation between district successes in music, vocational education, computer curriculum and positive administrative/staff relationships in those particular areas. These successes allow for the hypothesis that nurturing a positive administrative image and extending it to additional staff members will result in additional success.

In seeking increased participatory management, problem solving can take place in a systematic, professional manner such as that provided in the Quality Circle System. Teacher lounge complaints based on opinion can be replaced by decisions arrived at by research and data collection. Energy devoted to staff conflict can be directed at improved teaching performance. Administrators within District #77 have the opportunity, through Quality Circles, to make teachers partners in the educational process.

Specific Project Objectives

1. At the completion of the 1984-85 school year, the teaching
   staff at Cumberland High School involved in the Quality Circle

5

Program will demonstrate an improvement in attitude, problem solving, and interaction as measured by the Quality Circle member survey (see Appendix B).

2. At the completion of the 1984-85 school year teacher productivity will improve as measured by increased performance in meeting evaluation goals as compared to the previous year's written evaluation instrument (see Appendix C).

3. By the completion of the 1984-85 school year, there will be an improvement in administrator teacher relations as measured by teacher responses on the Administrative Image Questionnnaire (see Appendix D).

4. By the end of the 1984-85 school year, the Cumberland High School staff will exhibit commitment and responsibility in dealing with school problems as indicated by 60% staff membership in the Quality Circle Program.

Operational Definitions

For the purpose of this study "teacher morale" is defined as a mental and emotional condition of an individual or group of teachers with regard to their daily teaching activities. A positive outcome of this study would be nurturing of a positive attitude by teachers toward their everyday work activities. It is hoped that ingredients involved in the Quality Circle, giving the individual teacher a significant voice in their workplace activites, will lead to positive teacher morale.

As is related to this study "teacher productivity" is defined as the amount of success a teacher has in affecting student achievement. During the past

6

three years student achievement, as measured by standard achievements tests, has been inconsistent. The researcher believes that teacher evaluation aimed at improving teacher productivity has been unsuccessful. He theorizes that increased participation and involvement by teachers in problem solving will result in significant gains in teacher productivity.

The definition of "Quality Circles" although found in many different sources, is consistent with the following given by Chapey (1984): "A Quality Circle is a group of people who meet regularly to identify issues, to analyze problems, and to suggest actions (P. 394). Linder (1984) refers to the purpose of Circles when he describes them as "a concept that has been used by U.S. business and industry over the past ten years to address the problems of employee participation, efficiency, and productivity" (P. 9).

Quality Circles are distinguished from past committee approaches through their meticulous structure. This structure consists of the following as presented by the Illinois State Board of Education:

1. Problem Identification and Selection - Using a formal brainstroming technique, a list of problems is generated by Circle Members. Clarification occurs followed by a voting process that allows for the problems to be prioritized. Then the group votes to select the number one problem they want to adopt.

2. Problem Verification - The Circle Members gather data and analyze it to verify that the selected problem is indeed a problem. Data is displayed using bar charts, Pareto charts, line

7

graphs and so on. Specialists may be called in to assist the Circle in this step.

3. Cause and Effect Analysis - Using basic cause and effect analysis or process cause and effect analysis, the major cause(s) of the problem is identified.

4. Cause Verification - The Circle Members again gather data and analyze it to verify that they did identify the primary cause of the problem.

5. Solution Generation and Selection - The Circle Members use the formal brainstorming technique and voting procedure to generate solutions to the problem. After prioritizing the solutions, the Circle selects the number one solution or package of solutions they wish to present to management. Circle Members must also collect information to support and "sell" the solution to management.

6. Management Presentation - A verbal presentation involving all Circle Members is made to the Circle Leader's supervisor. The entire process is reviewed using the charts that were developed along the way. This process gives the Circle Members recognition. The Supervisor then has a specified amount of time in which to respond in writing to the Circle indicating his/her acceptance or rejection of the recommendations.

Summarizing the philosophy of Quality Circle, it consists of three main components: trust between management and workers, awareness of each persons strengths and weaknesses, and the nurturing of a family feeling.

8

"Steering committee" as related to the Quality Circle participative management program is defined by the Illinois State Board of Education. The steering committee "is a group of people who lead the Quality Circle acitivity and set goals and objectives for the program."

Assumptions

It is assumed that the standard Quality Circle procedures will be adhered to in relation to teacher training and actual problem solving.

It is assumed that there is a direct correlation between improved teacher morale and productivity and improved student achievement.

Limitations

This field study will deal with a pilot group (7 teachers) who met the voluntary requirement of the Quality Circle Program. The mechanics of training and completing of the Quality Circle system will not be considered in the study. Noncertified personnel will not be included in the pilot group.

Quality Circles historically and for the purpose of this study will not address the following issues:

a) negotiated contract items such as salary or benefits

b) disciplinary policies

c) grievances

d) employment or termination policies

e) personalities

f) issues contrary to state statutes, regulations or State Board of Education policy.

9

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

Participative Management

As early as 1973 Ratsoy conducted a study which proposed that moves toward participative management approaches and away from rigid hierarchical organization of schools should lead to positive consequences such as improved supervisor effectiveness, greater teacher satisfaction, less student alienation and improved student achievement.

Mitchell-Wise (1978), speaking from a teacher's point of view, indicated that it is common knowledge in education that information relayed by administrators in formalized positions is often distrusted, distorted, or completely overlooked. Teachers must identify with the source and be comfortable in the setting. Mitchell-Wise goes on to say that in these circumstances other teachers, who have an awareness of the situation and a commitment to the programs, are the best source for disseminating the desired information.

Mitchell-Wise also made recommendations closely parallel to a Quality Circle Program. She states that a joint effort must be made to minimize the perceived difference between teachers and administrators and to determine common goals. Groups must respect and enhance each other with respect to priorities and expectations. Data must be valid and relevant to the shared situations. All significant data needs to be made available to avoid false and misleading assumptions. Time and energies must be used efficiently so that good working relationships are not jeopardized. Mitchell-Wise explains the importance

of data collection when she notes the power is inherent in both administration and staff. "This power generates energy and change; it should be used to its fullest. In order for power to be used as a positive force it must be based on knowledge and rationality." (P. 13)

Levin (1981) wrote that because a main educational function is to prepare workplace roles, education's organizational forms and functions tend to correspond to those of the workplace. He made a strong case for the inevitability of participatory management in education when he reasoned that education has created today's participative movement in industry today by producing a workforce that is over-educated in relation to available job opportunities.

This has caused unrest in the industrial workplace which, in time, has turned these workplaces toward greater democratization. If Levin's theory holds true, this eventually will create a more democratic educational organization, where according to Levin, "former attempts by educators such as Pestalozzi, Neef, and Dewey failed the test of implementation because they did not correspond to industry." Levin felt that these consequences for education would result in a push for four changes. These include participatory decision making, individual problem solving, minimum competencies, and peer tutoring.

Productivity and Potential Problems

Bellanca (1984) noted that any disadvantages encountered in the Quality Circle process are greatly outweighed by the many positive aspects of the program. In general he noted the benefits of participatory decision making, motivational climate, people development, and the emphasis on an improvement process.

More specifically, Bellanca notes that "in the two years since the first . . . . training the following accomplishments have been noted:"

1. Quality Circles is a people building method that motivates teachers and administrators to improve.

2. Quality Circles is a team-building method that motivates teachers and administrators to seek out win-win solutions.

3. Quality Circles get results. When meetings produce results, individuals are more willing to give time and energy.

Eldon Shafer, President of Lane Community College in Eugene, Oregon, listed successes in Quality Circle use in several areas. A computer review and development process was developed by a department which found itself adding courses more on whim than on a carefully thought-out plan. A computerized listing and scoring process was developed for a department whose members became concerned over the growing amount of time devoted to testing instead of teaching. Processes for coordination, scheduling classes, rotation of equipment were all developed at Lane during a single school year. (Shafer, 1982)

As in all new programs, problems arise which need to be solved and this awareness may then benefit future Quality Circle participants. Although the Quality Circle concept dates back to the Japanese development in 1962, the

12

first verified educational Quality Circle was begun in January, 1981, at Central Piedmont Community College in Charlotte, North Carolina. Dr. Lynn Moretz, Director of Quality Circles at Central Piedmont gave examples of that college's experience in the area of implementation problems.

1. Because of its industrial origins, many teachers questioned its applicability.

2. The teaching staff is composed of a highly educated membership which sometimes leads to excessive philosophizing and semantic hair splitting. This creates a problem in getting these circles to focus efficiently.

3. Budget restrictions in the public sector are another negative factor. Tied to this is a growing perception by teachers that they will not be able to affect change. This feeling has been nurtured by budget cuts, salary freezes, lack of parental support, and student discipline problems (Moretz, 1983, P. 177).

Kahn warns of the danger of administrators consciously or unconsciously attempting to manipulate circles. He sees the Quality Circle as a possible Machiavellian tactic, pointing out that the administrator chooses the facilitator whose job is to establish, coordinate, and direct the Quality Circle. The facilitator gives the administrator continuous reports on progress and items being discussed within the circle. Thus, the administrator knows what the group is doing, feeling, and saying. Dissenters in the group can be identified and treated accordingly (Kahn, 1984).

Implementation

Despite the neoteric nature of Quality Circles, literature is available as relates to implementation. Warnings are given concerning the importance of long range planning prior to any attempt at implementation. Bellanca (1984) summarizes the school principal's role with Quality Circles:

1. Inform faculty about Quality Circles and encourage participation.

2. Train leaders and members to use the method.

3. Consult with each circle as invited.

4. Provide requested data, ideas, and support.

5. Communicate regularly with leaders about the progress of the circle.

6. Review minutes with the leaders.

7. Assist leaders to interpret policy conflicts.

8. Respond to circle recommendations.

9. Encourage members and recognize accomplishments of each circle.

10. Communicate with the central administration about progress and results of circles.

11. Evaluate the circle program (P. 6).

More general implementation guidelines emphasize prior top level commitment, voluntarism, slow growth, and general organization. Many individuals and groups must accept the merits of the program.

A summary of steps for implementation of circles was given as part of a panel discussion by Babington et al:

1. Obtain top level commitment.

2. Establish a suitable organizational climate for the program.

    a. Management must "buy in" to the concept of participatory decision making.

    b. The union must be involved from the beginning in any plans.

    c. A pilot study can be considered.

    d. An awareness program on Quality Circles should be provided to all employees.

3. Appoint a Steering Committee.

4. Select a facilitator and provide training for him/her.

5. Adopt goals and objectives for the program. This helps establish reasonable expectations and avoids confusion.

6. Develop operating policies.

7. Select a promising area to begin implementation.

8. Keep the program voluntary.

9. Provide training.

10. Inform and communicate regularly with everyone.

11. Start slowly and let the program grow slowly.

12. Be open and positive.

13. Develop methods of recognition.

14. Maintain publicity (Babington, Bandy, and Chase, 1984, P. 71).

Other Research

    The brainstorming aspect of Quality Circles is described by Bellanca (1984) as being more highly structured in order to keep the group on task. He notes that educators, like many professional, tend to say whatever they want, whenever they want and balk at formal structure. Only with structure and

eventual positive results can this be accomplished. The structure described by Bellanca can be broken down into the following:

1. Do not judge ideas. Negative responses or gestures such as raised eyebrows, sighs, or head shakes are not tolerated.

2. One idea is presented at a time. Only one person speaks at a time in a round robin approach.

3. Variety is important. Discussion is a refinement process that starts with a vast variety of ideas.

4. Energy is needed to stay on task. A beginning and ending time for meetings are strictly enforced. Idle chatter and stories are not acceptable (P. 2)

Administrators "buying in" to the Quality Circle concept must understand that their authority is not being threatened. Marchant (1971) describes participative management as "forcing decisions down to the level best suited to determine them by virtue of availability of relevant information and the effect of the decision on the operation." Linder (1984) concurs when he notes that school districts "will realize that areas of responsibility charged to the superintendent and school board should remain with them." He suggests areas under the jurisdiction of principals and teachers be the basis of circle projects. He gives examples of "low student effort, parent pressure, conflicts in scheduling, paperwork, test results, and school bus behavior" (P. 11).

Beth Bandy, director of Quality Circles for the Illinois State Board of Education supports management advantages with statistics showing over 90

percent of the recommendations made by the Circle in their program have been accepted by management (Bandy et al., 1984).

The growing popularity of Quality Circle is noted by Edward Wakin (1984). With Quality Circles, business's focus changes from checks on production to actual quality production. He also cites the versatility of Quality Circles observing the Sperry Corporation, which has Circles in areas ranging from engineering, marketing, and accounting to software development. Quality Circles are in department stores, hospitals, hotels, airlines, banks, and government offices (Wakin, 1984).

Linder (1984), summarizes several Circle concepts when he states that the primary reason people join a voluntary organization is that there is indeed something in it for them. The same principle applies to Quality Circle members. Quality Circle members must believe their participation makes a difference.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

General Design

The focus of this research is the development of a Quality Circle Program for Cumberland High School which may eventually be adopted throughout Unit #77 and adapted to meet the needs of other school districts. The Quality Circle Program will be developed from a review of the literature and research as well as modifications necessary and unique to District #77.

The basic philosophy of Quality Circle is successful participative management: administrators and teachers working together to identify and solve educational problems. This field study will examine whether the Quality Circle problem-solving approach can be implemented in the district and then measure whether it meets the problem-solving objectives intended.

It should be noted that every effort will be made for initial success of the pilot group, through the selection of problems that can be more easily solved than more complex situations. The Quality Circle concept by design has a long term view of success. Emphasis is placed on quality, while permitting "risk and experimentation", and tolerating short term losses. The first year of data collection and analysis will not be as significant in measuring the success of the program as the second and third year of measurement.

In addition to the actual Quality Circle group, a steering committee will be formed composed of this researcher, the School Board Secretary, Jim Carpenter, who is a former Board member presently involved in Quality Circle at the industrial level, and a member selected by the teachers' union.

18

The teaching staff of Cumberland High School will serve as the population for this research. The teaching staff of Cumberland High School is composed of 33% of Cumberland High School graduates, individuals who were born and raised in Cumberland County. At the Elementary level this local trend soars to 70%, for a district-wide total of 57% of C.U.D. #77 teachers who were born and raised in the community.

Sample and Population

The sample population of this study will be seven teacher volunteers who will form the pilot Quality Circle group. These seven teachers expressed interest in being Quality Circle members after being exposed to presentations and literature describing the Quality Circle concept.

Two teachers are from the social studies department, two are from guidance, and one each is from physical education, art, and the school librarian. One of the seven is the teacher union president, three are strong supporters of the building administration, one has filed the only grievance district-wide in the past three years, and two may be considered neutral in respect to their allegiance between administration and teachers.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

An instrument has been developed in relation to each of the objectives of this study.

Objective one seeks improvement in teacher attitude, willingness and ability in problem-solving, and improved teacher/teacher, teacher/administration interaction. The survey instrument is adapted from that used at Central Piedmont Community College and is divided into three categories (See Appendix B).

19

Attitude is measured through questions concerning communication, trust, cooperation, and commitment. Problem-solving is judged by teacher evaluation of the techniques common to Quality Circle problem-solving. These techniques include cause and effect analysis, development of consensus based solutions, and the ability to implement solutions. Interaction is measured with questions dealing with communication between teacher, administrator, and student. The measuring instrument for this objective allows teachers a choice of better, worse, or no change in gauging Quality Circle effect in these three areas.

The second objective of this study is to improve teacher productivity. The present teacher evaluation instrument will allow for measurement of this increase or decrease in productivity. Final evaluations of the seven members of the pilot group will be analyzed using the preceding two years evaluations as a basis of measurement.

Objective three of this study seeks improvement of teacher/administrator relations. The Administrative Image Questionnaire will be completed by teachers involved in the Circle Program. The administrator, most often the building principal, should be designated. With a "before" and "after" relative to Quality Circle implementation the questionnaire will serve as the measurement for this objective (See Appendix D).

Finally, an important measure of Quality Circle success is the growth in the number of teachers volunteering for membership into the Circle. This researcher has set a goal of 60% staff membership by the beginning of the following year. This is an increase from the pilot group of 7 to 19 teachers out of the high school staff of 32.

Data Analysis

The steering committee described earlier in this study will be the group responsible for analyzing the data derived from the instruments described above. This committee will adapt the same cause and effect diagram used in the Quality Circle Program in analyzing data (see appendix E). Each question in both the member survey and administrative questionnaire will be broken down into percentages to allow for detailed analysis.

A teacher productivity form developed by the researcher will be completed by the building principal for analysis by the steering committee. This form is based on the teacher evaluation instrument and covers a three year period (see appendix F). Teacher participation will be measured by the percentage of new membership above the original seven as well as the percentage of total membership relative to the 32 teachers at Cumberland High School.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Education in the United States must utilize the resource of teacher power to solve the problems it faces today. To widen the distance between management and teachers through bitter power struggles, strikes, and disputed collective bargaining agreements, is counterproductive to achieving quality education. With the introduction of participative management programs, many industries in our country have reversed the trend of negative employee relations. With new collective bargaining laws giving teacher unions more voice in school operations, it seems logical that schools structure themselves to allow for teacher participation in solving school problems.

The Quality Circle approach, with emphasis on facts and data collection, seems an ideal tool in uniting administrators and teachers in problem solving. In addition, the Quality Circle approach takes aim at the adversarial role between teacher and administrator which has been cultivated during the past few years by pressures and demands for accountability and teacher evaluation.

Education and educators are at a crossroads. On the verge of a crisis in labor relations, it will be difficult to focus on curriculum, teacher preparation, finances, and other areas in desperate need of remediation. It thus seems logical that the development of an employee relations policy which will facilitate the remediation of other educational problems must be the goal.

Conclusions

Upon a review of the literature the researcher is immediately impressed by the incipience of the Quality Circle Program. This would also account for

many of the problems described in the literature. Several themes run through the text of the literature, one being that administrators must have more "people" skills than ever before. A premium is placed on honesty and trust by the teaching staff in the administrator/teacher relationship. Today's administrator must deal with and foster high morale in his staff.

Numerous educational studies in the research indicate that true success in educational innovation must have the cooperation of the classroom teacher. It would follow the reasonable approach to innovation would be teacher involvement from the inception. This would again call on the efforts of a skillful administrator.

Within the Quality Circle Program itself the consensus of literature lists top-level commitment, slow movement, and maintenance of structure as integral parts of success. Ranging from the Board of Education through the superintendent, and middle management, their must be a willingness and acceptance of the program. This commitment must be both financial and philosophical.

Finally, Quality Circles achieve success slowly. The Circle goal of long-term success, with its complex structure, extends problem solving, in many instances, to months. It will be difficult for educators or Americans in general, who are used to the "quick fix" to cherish the necessary patience in proceeding with the program.

Recommendations

1. The researcher recommends that a pilot program of Quality
   Circle be implemented at Cumberland High School.

2. The steering committee must formulate and present a proposal to the Board of Education, outlining the Board's responsibilities. This would include financial facts and parameters of teacher involvement as listed earlier in this study.

3. The steering committee must recommend a facilitator who will be trained to lead the group in Circle structure. Facilitator selection is critical since this person will be the symbol of the integrity of the group.

4. Every effort should be made to achieve success in the initial meetings. Recommended areas which could be addressed are credit and time allotment for semester exams, achievement score analysis, teacher use of secretarial time, and a system for teacher telephone usage.

5. The pilot Quality Circle group should formally report back to the entire staff concerning their operation as well as their recommendations.

6. The program should be evaluated with the instruments developed. Analysis and recommendations by the steering committee should be presented to the superintendent and Board of Education.

REFERENCES

Babington, W. Bandy, B. & Chase, L. Quality Circles. Illinois School Board Journal, January-February, 1984, pp. 70-73.

Bellanca, J. Quality Circles: a tool for institutional leaders. Principals' Principles, February, 1984, pp. 1-8.

Chapey, G. Can we learn a lesson from Japan? The Clearing House, May, 1983, 56, P. 394.

Ford, P. The principal, contract administrator and instructional leader. NASSP Bulletin, February, 1980, pp. 40-47.

Gallagher, J. Put reform in teachers' hands, planners urge. Chicago Tribune, April 22, 1984, p. 15.

Kahn, M. Quality circles with a Machiavellian twist. The School Administrator, March, 1984, P. 14.

Karlitz, H. Teacher-administrator relationships. Urban Education, July, 1977, pp. 114-123.

Keys, C. B. & Bartunek, G. M. Organization and development in schools: agreement process skills, and fusion of change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1979, 15, p. 25

Levin, Henry M. Education and organizational democracy. In F. Heller and C. Crouch (Eds.), International Yearbook of Organizational Democracy. John Wiley & Sons, 1982.

Linder, J. Replacing 'lip service' with participation. The School Administrator, March, 1984, pp. 10-14.

Marchant, M. Participative management as related to personnel development. Library Trends, July, 1971, pp. 48-59.

Mitchell-Wise, M. Participatory management: a teacher's point of view. Thrust For Educational Leadership, November, 1978, pp. 12-13.

Moretz, L. QC team in education: experience and prospects. 1983 Transactions, IAQC Fifth Annual Conference, April, 1983, pp. 171-179.

Nichols, D. Can Theory Z be applied to academic management. The Chronicle of Higher Education, September, 1982, p. 25.

Patchen, R. The management and maintenance of quality circles. Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1983.

Ratsoy, E. Participative and hierarchical management of schools: some emerging generalizations. Journal of Educational Administration, October, 1973, p. 161-170.

Shafer, E. The Quality Circle approach to productivity. _Advisor_, July, 1983, p. 1.

Wakin, E. Quality Circles: business goes for the golden ring. _Todays Office_, May, 1984, pp. 54-56.

Williams, R. The administrator and collective bargaining. _Thrust for Educational Leadership_, October, 1977, pp. 14-17.

APPENDIX - A

OPINION SURVEY - SUMMARY
Cumberland Unit #77 Teachers and Non-Certified Staff

February, 1984
(Results reflect percentages only when indicated)

1. What do you think are the biggest problems which the schools in this community must face?

		(Rank Order)
a.	Finances, Salaries, Money, Etc.	69
b.	Community Support, Parent Apathy, Etc.	47
c.	Student Attitude, Discipline, Low Self-Image	27
d.	Management, Leadership, Conflict, Priorities	21
e.	Communications with Community & Staff	14
f.	Quality Education, Dedication, Etc.	14
g.	Too Many Sports	10

Less than 10 - Attention to Slower Students, Facilities, Curriculum, Teacher Burn Out, Class Size, Drugs & Alcohol, Attracting Top New Teachers, Schools Image to Others.

2. By using A, B, C, D, F; How would you grade your local schools?

A - 15 - 14%
B - 44 - 43%
C - 35 - 34%
D - 8 - 7%
F - 0

3. By using A, B, C, D, F; How would you grade the teachers in your local schools?

A - 19 - 19%
B - 55 - 53%
C - 24 - 24%
D - 4 - 4%
F - 1 - 1%

4. How do you feel about financial support for schools?

	Too Much	About Right	Too Low
Local Taxes	8	60	32
State Aid	2	25	73
Federal Support	7	28	66

27

5. How do you feel about instruction received in the following:

	Excellent	Acceptable	Needs Improvement
Reading	23	51	36
Math	23	56	23
Science	15	72	15
Social Studies	12	76	13
Language Arts	17	68	18
Computer Education	11	53	33
Vocational Education	14	61	22

6. Do you feel that the school year/school day should be lengthened?

Yes __4__   No __99__

7. How do you feel about placing a limit on viewing TV by children during the school week?

Yes __51__   No __41__

(It should be noted that this question was misunderstood, for some thought at school and some thought at home.)

8. How do you feel about extra-curricular activites in your schools?

	Excellent	About Right	Needs Improvement
Music – Band & Vocal	20	48	30
Clubs & Organizations	4	64	22
Football	1	29	65
Basketball	1	49	49
Volleyball	20	66	10
Wrestling	6	67	20
Track	10	71	14

9. Does this school district need citizens committees?

Yes __61__   No __38__

Total Sent – 133
Total Returned – 104

= 78.20%

Quality Circle Member Survey

For the following items, please indicate your judgment of the effect
of your workgroup's use of Quality Circle processes:
(Please use "NA" if item does not apply)

1. Attitude Factors (within group)

	Better	No Change	Worse
A. Communication within group			
B. Trust within group			
C. Cooperation/teamwork within group			
D. Commitment to achieving group's improvement goals			
E. Other: "Having fun together"			

2. Problem Solving Factors

   A. Goal Setting/prioritizing
   B. Problem identification/prioritizing
   C. Cause & effect analysis
   D. Data collection/analysis/use
   E. Developing consensus-based solutions
   F. Obtaining administration support
   G. Implementing solutions
   H. Other:

3. Interaction Factors

   A. Confidence in administration's support
   B. Providing input that helps your supervisor manage
   C. Communications with administrations
   D. Communications/interchange with students
   E. Communications with other workgroups
   F. Other:

Final Evaluation Form

Teacher _____

School Year _____

1. Goal #1   Goal Movement:

    Goal #2

    Goal #3

    Goal #4

    Goal #5

    Comments regarding Exceptions to meeting goals:_____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

II. Date of Initial Conference _____

Progress Conference _____

Final Conference _____

Evaluation: No Evidence   Progress
                   of Progress   Toward Goal
                   Goal #1 2 3 4 5   Goal #1 2 3 4 5

Reached Goal   Reached Goal   Exceeded Goal
with Exception   Goal #1 2 3 4 5   Goal #1 2 3 4 5
Goal #1 2 3 4 5

Teacher comments on progress and performance _____

_____

_____

Principal comments on progress and performance _____

_____

_____

Teacher Signature _____ Date _____

Principal Signature _____ Date _____

APPENDIX D

<u>ADMINISTRATIVE IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE</u>

Responses
1 = Poor
2 = Fair
3 = Satisfactory
4 = Good
5 = Excellent

		<u>Before</u>	<u>After</u>
1.	Does this person express his/her ideas smoothly and articulately?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Is this person patient, understanding, considerate and courteous?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Does this person show interest & enthusiasm toward his/her work?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Does this person demonstrate a thorough knowledge & understanding of those areas of school administration related to his/her job role?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Does this person demonstrate the initiative and persistence needed to accomplish goals & objectives?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Does this person support those responsible to him/her?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Does this person adjust rapidly to changes in plans or procedures?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Does this person function effectively under pressure?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Does this person consider divergent views?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Does this person encourage staff members to raise questions and express opinions?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Does this person assign tasks to personnel capable of carrying them out?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12.	Does this person show a willingness to try new approaches or methods?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
13.	Does this person clearly define and explain what is expected of staff members?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

		Before	After
14.	Does this person treat staff members in an unbiased & impartial manner?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
15.	Does this person create a feeling of unity & enthusiasm among those in contact with him/her?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16.	Does this person demonstrate a sense of humor at appropriate times?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
17.	Does this person make effective decisions?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
18.	Does this person effectively evaluate programs, practices and personnel?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
19.	Does this person coordinate the efforts of those responsible to him/her so that the organization operates at peak efficiency?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
20.	Is this person conscious of the problems that exist on your level?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
21.	Does this person maintain control of his/her emotions when things are not going right?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
22.	Does this person demonstrate leadership which results in meeting important goals and objectives?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
23.	Are this person's grooming and attire appropriate?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
24.	Are this person's communications properly written and do they accurately express his/her thoughts and ideas?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
25.	Does this person support the policies, procedures, and philosophy of the superintendent's office?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
26.	Does this person create an atmosphere in his/her building (or department) which is conducive to effectively meeting goals and objectives?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
27.	Does this person create a sense of trustworthiness when interacting with him/her?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

CAUSE AND EFFECT DIAGRAM

MATERIALS

Errors in material

Poor reproduction of
Advancement Studies material

Lack of test security
Storage
Administration

MANPOWER

Too little staff hours when busy

Lack of definite schedule for employees

Failure to ask about policy, equipment, etc.

Lack of defined staff roles

Need revision

Too little support and
interaction with campus personnel
Instructional

Failure to treat students, others
in friendly, positive, professional manner

High quality supportive and
academic atmosphere is not
always prevalent

EFFECT

Inadequate parking

Noise—no sound control
Bad for testing

Lack of shelf space
for student use
Ref.
Books

Congested registration area

Poor student break
facilities and amenities

Storage space for teachers
Lecture
Desk

Delay in getting equipment parts

Poor copy equipment

Need better telephone system

Lack of know-how
with technical equipment

No systematic, routine information flow

Lack of written policies and
procedures for off-campus centers

Too long test feedback

PHYSICAL PLANT

MACHINERY/EQUIPMENT

METHODS

ANOKA AREA LEARNING CENTER

APPENDIX F

TEACHER PRODUCTIVITY

Teacher A	No Evidence of Progress	Progress Toward Goal	Reached Goal	Exceeded Goal
1982-83				
1983-84				
1984-85				
Teacher B				
1982-83				
1983-84				
1984-85				
Teacher C				
1982-83				
1983-84				
1984-85				
Teacher D				
1982-83				
1983-84				
1984-85				
Teacher E				
1982-83				
1983-84				
1984-85				
Teacher F				
1982-83				
1983-84				
1984-85				
Teacher G				
1982-83				
1983-84				
1984-85				
Teacher H				
1982-83				
1983-84				
1984-85				