



1995

Factors Perceived to Foster Or Impede the Implementation of Site (School) Based Management: Principals' and Teachers' Perspectives

Myra C. Sanders
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sanders, Myra C., "Factors Perceived to Foster Or Impede the Implementation of Site (School) Based Management: Principals' and Teachers' Perspectives" (1995). *Dissertations*. 3484.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3484

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1995 Myra C. Sanders

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

FACTORS PERCEIVED TO FOSTER OR IMPEDE THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF SITE (SCHOOL) BASED MANAGEMENT:
PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES

VOLUME I: CHAPTERS 1 - 4

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

MYRA C. SANDERS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 1995

© Copyright by Myra C. Sanders, 1995
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges and thanks her committee members, Dr. Max Bailey, Dr. Art Safer, and Dr. Janis Fine, for their time, for their efforts, and for their encouragement. All are appreciated for their genuine interest in and support of their students at Loyola University Chicago. Dr. Bailey is appreciated for his direction and support both as advisor and director of the dissertation committee.

Additionally, the author acknowledges the support of her husband, Ted, and daughter, Alison. Their continued encouragement provided the support necessary to complete such a task. Ted's expertise in computers and statistics was invaluable in the completion of this dissertation. His support and patience were greatly appreciated throughout the process.

Finally, the author recognizes the valuable role model provided by her father, Walter F. Kessel, and her mother, Colette M. (Brumleve) Kessel. Their life long love of learning and value of formal education provided the initial impetus for seeking such a degree.

I dedicate this work to my family in honor of their loving support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background	
Purpose	
Research Questions	
Procedures	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations	
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH.....	13
Site Based Management	
Historical Perspective	
Evolution of U.S. Educational Labor Relations	
Influence of Industrial Models	
Effective Schools Focus	
National Reports	
Current Impetus	
Individual Efforts	
Political Impetus	
Negotiated Efforts	
Changing Roles	
Central Office Administrators	
Principals	
Teachers	
Parents	
Factors and Barriers to Consider	
Key Site Based Management Issues	
Shared Decision Making	
Budgeting	
Staffing	
Curriculum Development	
Accountability	
Productivity	
Summary	

3.	METHODOLOGY Statement of Problem Research Questions Research Procedure History of Delphi as an Educational Research Technique Reliability of the Delphi Delphi Procedures Advantages and Disadvantages Conclusion Panel Selection Procedure for Gathering Data Procedure for Analyzing Data	54
4.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS Introduction Results of Qualitative Surveys for Selection Results of the Delphi Study Delphi Results and Discussion for Research Question One Principals' Perceptions Teachers' Perceptions Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Summary of Results for Research Question One Delphi Results and Discussion for Research Question Two Principals' Perceptions Teachers' Perceptions Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Summary of Results for Research Question Two Delphi Results and Discussion for Research Question Three Principals' Perceptions Teachers' Perceptions Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors Summary of Results for Research Question Three	67

Delphi Results and Discussion for Research Question Four	
Principals' Perceptions	
Teachers' Perceptions	
Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions	
Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Summary of Results for Research Question Four	
Delphi Results and Discussion for Research Question Five	
Principals' Perceptions	
Teachers' Perceptions	
Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions	
Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Summary of Results for Research Question Five	
Delphi Results and Discussion for Research Question Six	
Principals' Perceptions	
Teachers' Perceptions	
Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions	
Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors	
Summary of Results for Research Question Six	

5.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	181
	Summary of Purpose	
	Summary of Procedures	
	Research Questions	
	Conclusions	
	Implications	
	Recommendations for Further Research	

Appendix

1.	Qualitative Surveys for Principals' and Teachers' Panel Selection	193
2.	Round One of the Delphi Study	202
3.	Round Two of the Delphi Study	217

4.	Round Three of the Delphi Study.....	252
5.	Round Four of the Delphi Study.....	299
	REFERENCE LIST.....	367
	VITA.....	375

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Principals' ratings of factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	73
2. Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development	75
3. Teachers' ratings of factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	77
4. Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development	79
5. Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	82
6. Principals' ratings of literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	85
7. Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	87
8. Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	89

9.	Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	91
10.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	93
11.	Principals' ratings of factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	97
12.	Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	99
13.	Teachers' ratings of factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	101
14.	Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	103
15.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	105
16.	Principals' ratings of literature based factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	108
17.	Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	110
18.	Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	111

19.	Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	113
20.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	115
21.	Principals' ratings of factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	120
22.	Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	122
23.	Teachers' ratings of factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	124
24.	Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	125
25.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	127
26.	Principals' ratings of literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	130
27.	Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	131
28.	Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	132
29.	Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	133

30.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	135
31.	Principals' ratings of factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development...	138
32.	Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	140
33.	Teachers' ratings of factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development...	142
34.	Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	144
35.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	146
36.	Principals' ratings of factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	150
37.	Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	152
38.	Teachers' ratings of factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	154
39.	Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	156
40.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	158

41.	Principals' ratings of literature based factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	160
42.	Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	161
43.	Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	162
44.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	163
45.	Principals' ratings of factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	166
46.	Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	168
47.	Teachers' ratings of factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	170
48.	Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	172
49.	Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	174
50.	Principals' ratings of literature based factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	176
51.	Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.....	177

52. Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development..... 179

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Site (school) based management is one of the most far-reaching trends in the current school reform movement and is significantly influencing the management of American schools in the 1990's. Tied in theory to shared decision making, team management, collaborative efforts, and industrial models such as Total Quality Management, site based management involves shared decision making at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented. It involves central office staff, principals and teachers, and often involves parents, staff members other than teachers, and even students in decision making efforts.

Integral to site based management is transferring key decision making authority and shifting management of schools from a centralized decision making model to a decentralized model. The degree of decision making authority which has been transferred via site based management has varied, but decision making in the three essential management areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are usually involved. In some schools where radical change in decision making structures has taken place, fundamental power and authority to govern have been shifted. In these schools parents often assumed the power and authority to govern through school councils.

While the concept of site based management has appealed to many educators, implementation has proven to be an involved task, initiated in varying ways and to varying extents, and assumed to be so situational and contextual that no clear model for implementation has developed. Examination of research and literature on site based management suggested that it requires strong leadership; staff development which promotes goal setting, teaming, professionalism, and decision making strategies; and years of systematic implementation. Even without a developing model for implementation, site based management has continued to enjoy broadening support from educators in recent years as an effective method of reform through reorganization.

Site based management is a reform method which seeks to improve schools by fundamentally changing how schools operate and subsequently improving the quality of education to America's children. According to David, site based management seeks to provide "long-term, comprehensive change guided by a conception of schools as stimulating work places and learning environments."¹ It is grounded in the idea that "school staff members need the skills, authority, and time to create new roles and environments appropriate for them"² and in the concept that "restructuring

¹Jane L. David, "Restructuring in Progress: Lessons from Pioneering Districts," in Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform, ed. Richard F. Elmore, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1990), 223.

²Ibid.

schools requires building new coalitions of support and creating conceptions of accountability."³

An analysis of the literature on site based management illustrated a relatively small body of research on site based management. That which exists has been conducted largely in the 1990's with only a few studies completed in the mid and late 1980's. Much of the literature on site based management is theoretical and anecdotal emphasizing the situational and contextual nature of site based management.⁴ It is also qualitative in nature and focused on the specifics of school sites and their struggles to decentralize.

Previous studies focused on issues related to initiating site based management as a component of restructured schools. Such studies examined the readiness levels and attitudes of school administrators, school board members, parents and teachers to shared decision making and the resulting shift in power, authority, work load, and responsibility inherent in the shift to site based management. Other studies examined principal leadership styles and strategies needed to implement site based management. As a whole, these studies represent a first wave of research on site based management focused on individuals and their perceptions of and attitudes toward initiating site based management in schools. They resulted in recommendations for staff development for involved parties and leadership style shifts in keeping with the demands of shared decision making.

³Ibid., 243.

⁴John J. Lane and Edgar G. Epps, "Introduction and Overview," in Restructuring the Schools: Problems and Prospects, ed. John J. Lane and Edgar G. Epps, (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1992), xi.

As schools implement site based management, principals and teachers must have a better understanding of the factors which foster or impede implementation. While site based management has been perceived as situational and contextual, an examination of the literature and research suggested a commonality of experiences among educators who have implemented this reform. Therefore, a better understanding of the common factors faced by implementors of site based management would further reform efforts.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of building principals and teachers who are implementing site based management methods in Illinois schools. It endeavored to produce a consensus opinion from each group. Specifically, it identified the factors which building principals and teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceived as fostering or impeding the implementation of site (school) based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system. This study focused on three specific areas of site based management: budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development.

This study utilized a consensus building technique know as the Delphi Method. This research technique involves the use of a panel with expertise in a specific subject -- in this case -- site based management. It establishes consensus of opinion which has been shown to be valid and reliable. Studies on the technique have demonstrated that similar panels produce similar

results thus allowing results from Delphi study panels to be generalized.⁵ Thus, the purpose of this study was to utilize the Delphi Method to identify factors which principals and teachers perceived to foster or impede the implementation of site based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system so that results could be generalized and used as a guide by schools embarking on the implementation of site based management.

Research Questions

Research Questions examined by this study were:

1. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
2. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
3. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering shared decision making in the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

⁵John F. Preble, "The Selection of Delphi Panels for Strategic Planning Purposes," Strategic Management Journal 5, no. 2 (April-June 1984): 159.

4. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding shared decision making in the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
5. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
6. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
7. How do principals' and teachers' perspectives on factors perceived to foster or impede the implementation of site (school) based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system align with factors found in the literature and research?

Procedures

The research procedure used in this study is known as the Delphi. Delphi is a research technique developed to provide a systematic method for soliciting and collating expert opinions. Developed as a consensus model, the Delphi is conducted "through a set of carefully designed sequential questionnaires interspersed with summarized information and feedback of opinions derived from earlier responses."⁶ It assumes that "experts are

⁶Ibid., 157.

experts because they are objective, take into account new or discrepant information, and construct logically sound deductions"⁷ It also assumes that several experts are better than one yet seeks to aggregate their opinions without bringing them together in the same room.⁸

The first step in this Delphi study was the selection of two panels: a panel of principals and a panel of teachers. Initially, principals of public schools in the suburban area of Chicago were identified for possible participation in the Delphi study based on the length and extent of their involvement in site (school) based management and shared decision making. Panel members had to have been involved in at least two areas (budgeting, staffing, or curriculum development) of site based management and have been utilizing site based management techniques for a minimum of two years. Building principals and teachers with expertise in site based management and shared decision making were selected for possible participation on separate Delphi panels. These principals and teachers were interviewed via telephone using a qualitative interview to assess their knowledge and personal experiences in site based management. Since the results of Delphi research are highly influenced by the expertise of the panel members, principals and teachers were selected based on their level of expertise as determined by the interview process.

⁷W. Timothy Weaver, "The Delphi Forecasting Method," Phi Delta Kappan 52, no. 5 (January 1971): 269.

⁸Harold A. Linstone and Murray Turoff, "The Evolution of Delphi," in The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications, ed. Harold A. Linstone and Murray Turoff, (London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975), 10.

Ten building principals were selected, each from different school districts. One teacher was selected from each principal's school. Effort was made to select principals and teachers from elementary, middle level, and secondary schools representing the three types of Illinois school districts: Elementary, High School, and Unit Districts.

The principals and teachers participated on separate panels. A Delphi study was conducted with each of the two panels to identify factors which selected building principals of Illinois public schools (excluding Chicago Public Schools) perceived as fostering or impeding the implementation of site (school) based management and to identify factors which teachers of Illinois public schools (excluding Chicago Public Schools) perceived as fostering or impeding the implementation of site (school) based management.

During the first round of the study, participants were asked to identify factors related to implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, curriculum development, shared decision making and accountability which they perceived to foster or impede site based management implementation. A pure Delphi was used initially so as not to prejudice the panels by introducing ideas before panelists shared their views.

In round two, factors identified in the literature were added to the participants' list of factors, and participants rated the importance of factors on a scale of zero to ten.

In round three, ratings were shared. Mean ratings were given from round two along with the panel member's original ratings. Panel members were asked to examine their ratings and were given the opportunity to adjust those ratings. If a response was two or more points above or below the mean and left unchanged, respondents were instructed to write their rationale for

the rating of each of those responses. Rounds continued until consensus was attained or until movement on the ratings no longer took place. Four rounds were used. In this way, panel members were brought to consensus on factors which they perceived to foster or impede the implementation of site based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system.

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Shared decision making: a collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of decision making at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

Limitations

Three limitations of this study must be considered. The first limitation was potential bias in the selection of panel members. An existing, recognized, panel of principal and teacher experts in the implementation of site based management could not be found. Therefore, practitioners of site based management were identified through a network of professional associates and used as a pool of potential panelists. Although a consistent, qualitative interview was used to assess the expertise of panel members prior to their selection, the original pools of panelists may represent biased groups.

Secondly, the expertise of a Delphi panel is critical to the results of any Delphi study. The credibility of the consensus results of this study were directly tied to the expertise of the principal and teacher panel members which was determined through the use of a qualitative interview conducted by telephone. Bias of the researcher may have influenced the interpretation of responses and thus influenced panelist selection.

Finally, Delphi research was originally developed as a technological forecasting tool. Since social sciences such as education do not have the preciseness of language which technological forecasting possesses, educational Delphi measurements are not as accurate.⁹ Therefore, the "soft" definitions found in education were a limitation of this Delphi research because the panelists may have rated factors based on their own definitions thus affecting

⁹Weaver, 268.

consensus results through inconsistent definition of terms. To control for this limitation, definitions of key terms were provided for the panelists and clarification of terms was provided as requested during the Delphi rounds. As panelists shared their rationales for responses, insight into their working definitions was also gained and shared.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Site Based Management

Site (school) based management has enjoyed broadening support as a school reform method through decentralized decision making. Site based management focuses decision making authority at levels where decisions are implemented. It is grounded in the assumption that employees most involved in implementing decisions should be involved in making those decisions which directly affect their abilities to do their jobs well. Under site based management, "professional responsibility replaces bureaucratic regulations"¹ and with this professional responsibility comes accountability.

The organizational changes which take place under site based management are fundamental and alter the basic nature of how schools operate. Authority and responsibility with their resultant accountability are shifted. Roles and responsibilities at the school and district level are redefined. Previous models for decision making which require administration to consult with staff are often replaced by consensus models. The school principal and staff become the primary decision makers, and decisions are made at the lowest level possible. Ownership is engendered through opportunity to make decisions which directly affect one's

¹Jane L. David, "Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management," Educational Leadership 46, no. 8 (May 1989): 45.

performance, and the dollars needed to effect the decisions are made available to the schools.² While the central office staff often maintains control over certain decisions, the central office changes its operations to better support schools. Its commitment toward working with teachers and principals in shared decision making is needed. Negotiated agreements often establish "structures and ground rules for joint decision making conducted away from the contract bargaining table."³ David stated that "'Districts are implementing school-based management today to bring about significant change in educational practice; to empower school staff to create conditions in schools that facilitate improvement, innovation, and continuous professional growth.'"⁴

Historical Perspective

Site based management is not a new concept. According to Cawelti, private and public schools have historically "ridden a pendular swing between centralized and decentralized management structures"⁵ of which site based management is a part. In the last three decades of the 19th century, site based management was evident in the cooperative and democratic schools

²Ibid., 45-6.

³Joseph B. Shedd, "Collective Bargaining, School Reform, and the Management of School Systems," Educational Administration Quarterly 24, no. 4 (November 1988): 412.

⁴David, "Synthesis of Research," 45.

⁵Gordon Cawelti, "Will Site-Based Management Improve Productivity?" ASCD Update 31, no. 1 (January 1989): 2.

developed by Colonel Francis Parker in Massachusetts.⁶ After Parker, John Dewey endorsed the use of cooperative and collaborative learning models along with shared decision making, and in 1903 reflected on its importance if not its implementation when he said:

As to the teacher: If there is a single public school system in the United States where there is official and constitutional provision made for submitting questions of methods of discipline in teaching and the questions of curriculum, textbooks, etc., to the discussion of these actually engaged in the work of teaching; the fact has escaped my notice; indeed the opposite situation is so common that it seems, as a rule, to be absolutely taken for granted as the normal and final condition of affairs.⁷

The most recent pendulum swing toward site based management appears to be motivated by a sequence of historical events in American education. A review of schools implementing site based and participatory decision making models suggested that movement toward restructuring efforts has been more of an evolution than revolution.

Evolution of U.S. Educational Labor Relations

The current movement toward negotiated site based management appears to have been enabled by changing labor relations and the rise in professionalism among teachers. This movement started with a post World War II baby boom which necessitated an increase in the supply of teachers and saw changes in the type of teachers joining the profession. Men, financed by

⁶David W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson, Edythe Johnson Holubec, and Patricia Roy, Circles of Learning (United States: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1984), 13-14.

⁷Frank Ambrosie, "The Case for Collaborative, Versus Negotiated, Decision Making," NASSP Bulletin 73, no. 518 (September 1989): 56.

the GI Bill and motivated to seek education, joined the ranks of the teaching profession along with career focused women whose work outside the home had been sanctioned by war time experiences.⁸

Interested in building better compensated careers and in doing a better job in the classroom, teachers became increasingly disenchanted with the paternalistic, bureaucratic model of supervision previously decried by Dewey. By the late 1950's, a growing number of teachers were unhappy with the economic, professional, and managerial profile of the American educational system, and by the 1960's the collective bargaining movement was underway in education as these same teachers strived for better working conditions and salaries. However, the industrial union model which was overlaid on organizing educational unions never fit well with the needs and interests of public education.⁹ "By the 1970's the 'advocacy revolution' was in full swing, and the drive for a new form of professionalism [for teachers] was under way"¹⁰ as teachers' unions sought input into issues related to policy.

Originally, unions were "prohibited from bargaining about policy. Management set policy; unions negotiated about the conditions under which that policy would be executed. However, over time, this restriction has been relaxed; the distinction between labor and management has blurred."¹¹ Increasingly educational unions negotiated matters akin to policy such as

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., 766-767.

¹⁰Ibid., 767.

¹¹Susan Moore Johnson, "Can Schools Be Reformed at the Bargaining Table?" Teachers College Record 89, no. 2 (Winter 1987): 270.

"class size, the composition of instructional committees, the format of in-service training, procedures for teacher evaluation, and the assignment of staff,"¹² and a 1979 longitudinal study by McDonnell and Pascall of 150 teacher contracts revealed that those "contracts had become increasingly comprehensive over time and addressed more and more policy issues."¹³ Other literature on bargaining over teacher working conditions and educational policy suggested that the content of current collective bargaining contracts may affect student educational experiences, organizational structures, and the professional aspects of teaching.¹⁴ Additionally, these contracts represented a maturing of the relationships between teachers, boards of education, and administrators which appeared to be necessary for the implementation of site based management.

Simultaneously with the development of educational unions and since the time of Parker and Dewey a "very strong, research-based triangular relationship has been established between collaborative decision-making, organizational satisfaction (school climate), and organizational effectiveness (the manner in which schools perform)."¹⁵ Given this recognized research base and the current cry for school reform, site based management became a

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Steven M. Goldschmidt and Suzanne R. Painter, "Collective Bargaining: A Review of the Literature," Educational Research Quarterly 12, no. 1 (1987-1988): 22.

¹⁵Ambrosie, 56.

focus for negotiations as significant reports on educational reform pointed to teachers as the problem and the solution.

As part of the wave of significant reports on needed educational change, the 1986 Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession called on school districts to find ways of "giving teachers a greater voice in decisions"¹⁶ and the 1987 National Governor's Association called for "school-site management' that respects the professional judgement of teachers."¹⁷ As these significant reports argued that in order to reform, school systems needed the advice and involvement of their teachers as a precondition to change, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers moved to support site based management which empowered teachers in the decision making process. A 1988 National Education Association report followed, encouraging associations to consider site based management stating that "site-based decision-making programs offer many opportunities for local associations."¹⁸

During the 1980's, districts undertook the task of reorganizing their schools to incorporate increased school autonomy and implementing decentralized models by employing site based decision making. "Districts are implementing school-based management today to bring about significant change in educational practice; to empower school staff to create conditions in

¹⁶Sharon C. Conley and Samuel B. Bacharach, "From School-Site Management To Participatory School-Site Management," Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 7 (March 1990): 539.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid.

schools that facilitate improvement, innovation, and continuous professional growth."¹⁹ Many of these efforts were accomplished through existing collective bargaining agreements as boards and unions strived for better ways to negotiate and to deal with the issues of school reform. "It is not coincidental that the local NEA affiliates ... had won strong collective bargaining contracts that provided above-average wages and working conditions for teachers ... before they began working with their school districts on school-based decision-making initiatives. These are what Teachers Unions and Educational Reform, a 1988 RAND report by Lorraine McDonnell and Anthony Pascal, called the 'enabling conditions that unions must attain before they can move on to questions of professional autonomy and full participation.'"²⁰

Influence of Industrial Models

In addition to the maturing of educational labor relations with their resulting emphasis on professionalism and shared decision making, industrial management models were being re-examined for their effectiveness during the 1970's and 1980's. The decline in American industry and the rise of Japan as an international, industrial giant, spotlighted W. Edwards Deming and his Total Quality Management concept.

Originally developed and implemented in the United States, Deming's statistical management style was utilized during World War II but evaporated from the American industrial scene following the war. Invited to Japan by

¹⁹David, "Synthesis of Research," 45.

²⁰Watts and McClure, 773.

industrial leaders looking for ways to rebuild their war torn economy, Deming taught the Japanese his management model founded on the philosophy of continuous improvement of quality.²¹ During the next three decades, Deming refined his Total Quality Management model and established his "Fourteen Points" which delineate his philosophy. These points emphasize the importance of constancy of purpose, commitment to the philosophy, education of workers, leadership, eliminating fear in the work place, and taking action to transform the organization. His philosophy also emphasizes the continuous need to evaluate the process to enhance quality and for employees and managers to work as a team toward organizational and product improvement.²² Deming's approach called for a fundamental change in company culture. It established "quality circles" which allow workers to reflect in a formal yet non-threatening setting to identify and set their course for improvement.²³

The historic link between industrial management styles and educational management styles caused many educators to examine Deming's TQM for its potential as a school reform method. Coming on the American management scene at the same time that decentralization and site based management have experienced a renaissance of support, the commonalities

²¹John Jay Bostingle, Schools of Quality: An Introduction to Total Quality Management in Education (United States: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1992), 16-17.

²²Mary Walton, The Deming Management Method, with a foreword by W. Edwards Deming (New York: The Putnam Publishing Group, 1986), 33-36.

²³Maurice Holt, "The Educational Consequences of W. Edwards Deming," Phi Delta Kappan 74, no. 5 (January 1993): 383.

between the management systems was not overlooked. Similar in many ways, site based management and Total Quality Management call for teaming to accomplish organizational goals. Both focus resources at levels needed for improvement and involve those closest to where the decisions will be implemented in making decisions vital to the improvement of the organization and the quality of its product or services. Both seek to improve the product of their systems, to enhance trust within the organization by developing relationships and reducing fear, and identify the role of the leader as fostering harmony and teamwork in the workplace. Additionally, both styles place a value on the worker within the system, believing that they will make choices and direct resources toward organizational improvement if given the opportunity.

Effective Schools Focus

Along with the examination of American industrial settings, school settings came under scrutiny in the 1970's with the advent of the effective schools research. Bailey suggested that the effective schools research studies fell into three categories: outlier studies, schoolwide case studies, and program evaluation studies.²⁴ Bailey described the outlier studies as those which attempted to compare most effective and least effective schools such as those by Edmonds and Lezotte et al. He described schoolwide case studies as those that have attempted to list common attributes of effective schools based on generalized observations such as studies by Weber and Rutter. Results of

²⁴William J. Bailey, School-Site Management Applied, (Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc., 1991), 7.

these studies focused attention on school climate, classroom management, expectations of student success and strong leadership. Program evaluation studies identified similar patterns. Published reports such as those by Hunter and Tursman, focused on strong leadership, clear goals, and good discipline.²⁵

Bailey commented that while the methodologies of these studies may continue to generate debate, they provided a common focus for school improvement efforts -- the individual school site -- through the qualitative studies within the body of the effective schools research. Bailey stated that "qualitative research methods have made a tremendous impact on educational management in the last two decades, and the data come from enterprising schools that have formed their own mission with excellence as a goal."²⁶ Bailey went on to write that while "the methodology and conclusions of effective school research have been challenged ... the challengers' solutions ... still come back to the fact that the source of data on school improvement lies in individual schools ... school by school ... by school" and "... that the individual school building is the most effective unit of change."²⁷ Thus the effective schools research of the 1970's focused school reform on individual school sites and their management for success which furthered support for site based management.

²⁵Ibid., 7-9.

²⁶Ibid., 8.

²⁷Ibid., 9.

National Reports

Following analysis of individual school sites and their effectiveness, a series of national reports in the 1980's highlighted school autonomy and shared decision making and named site based management as a preferred reform effort. The first report to focus national attention on schools in the 1980's was *A Nation At Risk* published in 1983. This document recommended enhanced fiscal support and leadership along with recommendations on teaching, time spent in school, and content to be studied.²⁸ In 1986, the Governors published a report titled *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education*. Funded by the National Governors' Association, this report specifically recommended school-site management.²⁹ It called for "incentives and technical assistance to districts to promote school site management and improvement."³⁰ Following the Governors' report, "the National Education Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals jointly issued a report stating 'The NASSP and NEA remain committed to the principle that substantial decision-making authority at the school site is the essential pre-requisite for quality education.'"³¹

Complementing these national reports, recommendations of researchers such as Theodore Sizer and John Goodlad supported

²⁸Ibid., 9-10.

²⁹Ibid., 10.

³⁰Brian J. Caldwell and Jim M. Spinks, *The Self-managing School*, with a foreword by David Reynolds (London: The Falmer Press, 1988), 17.

³¹Ibid.

decentralized models for school improvement. While Sizer expressed belief in imperatives for better schooling which "'implies that there must be substantial authority in each school'," Goodlad proposed "'genuine decentralization of authority and responsibility to the local school within a framework designed to assure school-to-school equity and a measure of accountability.'" He noted that 'the guiding principle being put forward here is that the school must be largely self-directing.'"³²

Often described as the second wave in school reform, these significant reports and writings "pointed to the need to decentralize authority, create more professional workplaces, and focus resources on teaching and learning."³³ They had a profound effect furthering site based management as a reform method for American schools.

Current Impetus

An examination of studies such as those by David (1989), Harrison et al. (1989), and Brown (1990) suggested that the current implementation of site based management has been initiated by varying means. In some schools, site based management has been driven by the efforts of key individuals who subscribe to this management theory. In other schools, it has been driven by political processes. Legislated by state governments or mandated by courts, site based management has been initiated to decentralize schools as a way of

³²Ibid.

³³Jane L. David, "Restructuring in Progress: Lessons from Pioneering Districts," in Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform, ed. Richard F. Elmore (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1990), 211.

reforming these large, burdened systems.³⁴ Still other schools moved toward site based management through collective bargaining as unions along with school boards and administrators sought a better way of doing business.

Individual Efforts

Enabled by maturing educational labor relations as well as industrial management shifts characterized by Deming's Total Quality Management and highlighted by the focus on effective schools and significant reports calling for site based management, individual efforts have significantly affected the choice and implementation of site based management as a current, school reform tool. Throughout the United States and Canada, school districts have implemented this reform based on the driving efforts of key people within their systems.

Brown reported in his study on decentralization and school based management that in the Edmonton School System in Canada that the Superintendent, Michael Strembitsky, was perceived as the visionary and significant force behind their restructuring effort.³⁵ Brown also reported that Emery Dodsall, Superintendent of Langley, Canada, and a former employee of Strembitsky's, was credited with the implementation of school based management in Langley.³⁶ David credited the superintendent of Jefferson County Schools in Kentucky with laying the groundwork on which their

³⁴Daniel J. Brown, Decentralization and School-Based Management (London: The Falmer Press, 1990), 200-201.

³⁵Brown, Decentralization and School-Based Management, 202.

³⁶Ibid., 203.

restructuring efforts were built.³⁷ She also credited Poway Unified School District north of San Diego with decentralizing under the leadership of a superintendent committed to decentralized decision making who advocated that "educational decisions should be made by the professional closest to the students."³⁸ These examples of districts show how decentralization and site based management were implemented based on the impetus of strong leadership and individual efforts.

Political Impetus

Following the significant reports of the 1980's, states emerged to take on roles in education as governors became education governors, leading their states toward school reform.³⁹ Site based management was thrust upon school districts through politically motivated processes in efforts to force change in school systems. Timar stated that "there is increasing evidence that schools are products of the political cultures of states and districts."⁴⁰

The Chicago Public Schools is an example of one such mandated decentralization effort. The Chicago School Reform Act of 1988 (P.A. 85-1418) established Local School Councils "consisting of six parents (one of whom must be an LSC chair), two community representatives, and only two teachers

³⁷David, "Lessons from Pioneering Districts," 216.

³⁸Ibid., 219.

³⁹Bailey, 10.

⁴⁰Thomas Timar, "The Politics of School Restructuring," Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 4 (December 1989): 274.

(plus the principal)..."⁴¹ Power formally shifted from the central office to the Local School Council (LSC). As the result of this legislative action, " ... responsibility and power - including control of finance- have been taken away from the central office and moved to the schools. Through local school councils, parents, teachers, and principals have broad control over budget and personnel."⁴²

In Florida, schools such as the Dade County Public Schools changed their governance structure in part because of "the state's mandates and incentive for faculty participation in school governance."⁴³ Pilot schools in the project were allowed significantly greater flexibility in staffing, budgeting, and staff development. The four year pilot was know as the School Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Program.

The Cleveland Public Schools also decentralized for political reasons, but the impetus for their change was distinctly different from the legislated changes characterized by the Chicago Public Schools and the Dade County Public Schools. Cleveland was decentralized in conjunction with court ordered desegregation. The Cleveland Public Schools Superintendent was ordered to file a plan for desegregation which encompassed the decentralization of the Cleveland Public Schools. In developing their plan,

⁴¹Edgar G. Epps, "School-Based Management: Implications for Minority Parents," in Restructuring Schools: Problems and Prospects, ed. John J. Lane and Edgar G. Epps (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1992), 152.

⁴²"Struggling with Decentralization," ASCD Update 35, no. 2 (February 1993): 3.

⁴³David, "Lessons from Pioneering Districts," 212.

they restructured to "provide building principals with a vital role in staff selection and evaluation, resource allocation and building accountability" and stated that "providing principals with the resources to perform needed tasks must be a major priority of the unitary and decentralized system."⁴⁴ Their rationale was based on "an abundance of educational research (that) confirms that the vital element in student achievement is the building principal."⁴⁵

Negotiated Efforts

While site based management has been implemented for political reasons and as the result of individual efforts by key administrators, it has also been implemented as the result of negotiated efforts between unions and management. The earliest negotiated reorganization dates back to 1981 in the Toledo School System. Utilizing a win/win bargaining system which focussed on issues, their contract "called for details to be worked out informally between union and management prior to a fall 1981 implementation date"⁴⁶ for educational programs. Other site based provisions called for teachers to assist new teachers and experienced teachers in peer consulting capacities.⁴⁷

⁴⁴Brown, Decentralization and School-Based Management, 201.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Marilyn Rauth, "Exploring Heresy in Collective Bargaining and School Restructuring," Phi Delta Kappan, 71, no. 10 (June 1990): 782.

⁴⁷Ibid.

Following Toledo, other districts utilized win/win bargaining or principled bargaining to negotiate aspects of site based reform. Contracts in Hammond, Indiana in 1981; Rochester, New York in 1984; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1985; Albuquerque, New Mexico in 1986; Bellevue, Washington in 1986; Dade County, Florida in 1986; Jefferson County, Kentucky in 1988; and Greece, New York in 1989 embodied aspects of school reform through negotiated site based management.⁴⁸ Many of these schools had histories of bitter negotiations and/or strikes, but as stated by Albert Fondy, president of the Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, "Real change has a much better chance in a collaborative climate than in a climate of adversarial bargaining."⁴⁹ Adam Urbanski, president of the Rochester Teachers Association commented, "If site-based management and shared decision-making are taken to their logical conclusion, groups of teachers may negotiate their own environment on an ongoing basis. The union, like the central office, would become a resource."⁵⁰ Additionally, he stated "If you are not secure enough to try different things in collective bargaining, you are not secure enough to do different things in education."⁵¹

Due largely to the differing ways site based management has been initiated, it has taken many forms as it has been negotiated and implemented in the United States and Canada, and no clear implementation model for

⁴⁸Ibid., 783-790.

⁴⁹Ibid., 783.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 788.

⁵¹ Ibid.

districts to follow has emerged. What has emerged is a growing concept of site based management as situational, contextual, and accomplished within the specific context of each school district's contract. In her "Synthesis of Research on Site Based Management," David stated that this pattern stands to reason and that educators must remember that "school-based management is not a fixed set of rules."⁵² She went on to state that site based management operates differently from one school to the next because the "goal is to empower school staff by providing authority, flexibility, and resources to solve the educational problems particular to their school."⁵³

Changing Roles

Regardless of the impetus for decentralizing, the shared decision making, team work, and professionalism inherent in site based schools dramatically alter the roles of central office administrators, principals, teachers, and parents in decentralized schools. Strong leadership is necessary as districts implement site based management. A higher caliber of leadership is required as administrators attempt to stem the isolation that exists in teaching and direct the faculty toward establishing collaborative behaviors and shared authority in such tasks as goal setting, allocating resources, developing curriculum, staffing schools, and overseeing professional development.⁵⁴

⁵²David, "Synthesis of Research," 52.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Stuart C. Smith, "The Collaborative School Takes Shape," Educational Leadership 45, no. 3 (November 1987): 5-6.

Throughout the United States, administrators seem ready to undertake the challenge of site based management. In Heller's (1989) study of 4,800 school executives representing suburban, rural, small town, and urban areas from every state in the United States except Hawaii, 87% of the respondents said "school decisions are best made at the building level."⁵⁵ When asked who should be involved in making building level decisions, 99% of respondents said that the principal should be involved, and 97% said that teachers should be involved.⁵⁶ When asked about parents, "some 70 percent said ... these also should be involved in school-based decisions."⁵⁷

However, Lopez's earlier research on site based management suggested that support for increased parental involvement in schools is not so assured. In his 1983 study of Texas schools, Lopez noted that teachers distrusted parental involvement and viewed parental involvement as beneficial only in non-instructional areas such as public support, increased attendance and decreased discipline problems. Lopez viewed this perception as a barrier to the successful role of parents in governing school councils.⁵⁸

⁵⁵Robert W. Heller, Beth E. Woodworth, Stephen L. Jacobson, and James A. Conway, "Administrator Opinions on School-Based Management," The Executive Educator 11, no. 11 (November 1989): 15-18.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Jose A. Lopez, "Barriers to Curriculum Decentralization of an Urban School System: A Process Model for the Implementation of Site Based Management" (Ph. D. diss., North Texas State University, 1983), 324.

Central Office Administrators

As site based management is implemented in schools, the roles of central office administrators shifts. David stated that the shift is often a difficult one for districts. The role of top district leaders becomes one of "... communicating a vision of effective learning, both to the community and to their school staffs, and help provide their immediate staff with the leadership and management skills needed to transmit the same message to the next district level."⁵⁹

Bailey concurred that the role of the central office changes dramatically. He stated that "this is not only a different job description for most current school district central office operations personnel, but, more importantly, it is a different philosophical base."⁶⁰ He stated that "the new superintendent becomes the chief recruiter of the best people to be found, hires them, and lets them do the job they were hired to do with the least amount of restrictions possible."⁶¹

Principals

The principal's role is key to the successful implementation of site based management.⁶² "The principal must take on a number of different roles in the process of school improvement and restructuring, including ...

⁵⁹David, "Lessons from Pioneering Districts," 231.

⁶⁰Bailey, 60.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Johnson, 276.

planner, facilitator, visionary, experimenter, risk taker, catalyst, model, team-builder, and coach"⁶³ "Providing leadership and articulating the vision for teachers" is a significant responsibility of the site administrator according to Kent.⁶⁴

In addition to providing vision and leadership, principals must empower themselves as well as create conditions which empower teachers. In order to effectively implement site based schools, principals must believe that teachers can and will define their own professional needs as well as work to achieve these needs. Meshanko (1990) concluded that "principals should redefine their role and formulate procedures that allow for teacher involvement in shared decision-making."⁶⁵ They must provide training by credible and respected persons as well as coaching and feedback by credible persons. Thus, staff development becomes a key responsibility for principals as they provide leadership in shifting their schools from centralized to site based and collaborative schools.⁶⁶

Along with training, another and equally essential aspect of the principal's role in staff development centers around encouraging the staff to experiment and become risk-takers. "In American schools, there is

⁶³Joseph F. Lagana, "Managing Change and School Improvement Effectively," NASSP Bulletin 73, no. 518 (September 1989): 54.

⁶⁴Karen M. Kent, "Conditions for Collaboration Among Colleagues: Is Your District Ready?" Teacher Education Quarterly 14, no. 3 (1987): 54.

⁶⁵Edward J. Meshanko, "Teacher Decision-Making: An Analysis of Teachers', Principals' and School Board Members' Perspectives" (Ed. D. diss., Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1990), 56.

⁶⁶Lagana, p. 53.

disincentive for risk taking. We have unintentionally discouraged our teachers and others from risk taking and thinking on the job."⁶⁷ Therefore, in districts implementing site based management, principals must use compassionate and situational leadership styles which encourage teachers to try and to share techniques which they believe to be in the best interests of the students.⁶⁸

In addition to providing vision and the training necessary to carry out the vision, principals in site based schools must also act as advocates to secure the needed resources for successful implementation of collaborative efforts. "Many principals believe that they and their staffs will have significant authority only when significant unencumbered funds are provided to do their jobs better."⁶⁹ Access to resources and sufficient funds to allow teachers to spend more time planning, reflecting and developing instruction are critical since teachers identify time as the single largest deterrent to successful collaboration.⁷⁰

The principal also plays an essential role in conflict resolution. Since teachers often lack the conflict resolution skills needed to smooth out problems which arise during collaborative efforts, the principal's skills as a mediator or ability to secure a skilled mediator can determine whether issues

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Cawelti, 2.

⁷⁰Brown, Decentralization and School-Based Management, 260.

counter to continued collaboration may be resolved, and thus support the continued use of collaboration in their schools or contribute to its decline.

With the shift of responsibilities inherent in site based management, the principal must act as instructional leader in three significant areas of responsibility -- budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development -- as these responsibilities are transferred to the building level. While curriculum development has been a traditional responsibility of teachers and continues to remain so, budgeting and staffing are fairly new arenas of responsibility which must be managed at the site level.

Bailey summarized the changing role of the principal when he stated that "the new principal must be an expert in small group facilitation, must learn to delegate, must learn to share the decision making and know when to share and when it is not efficient to do so, must be in charge of the building budget and plan according to teacher input, and must be an expert communicator especially when it comes to parental involvement."⁷¹ Similarly, Alexander stated that "principals on the cutting edge of change ... will become leaders of leaders, facilitators, orchestrators of change, directors of change, and cheerleaders of change."⁷²

Teachers

Like the role of principal, the role of teacher also changes dramatically under site based management. Lieberman and Miller stated that "the role of

⁷¹Bailey, 63.

⁷²Gary Curn Alexander, "The Transformation of the Principal in a Metropolitan District: Uncertain Times, Uncertain Roles" (Ph. D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1991), 165.

teachers in school restructuring involves two behaviors: collegueship and leadership."⁷³ They believed these roles are most easily assumed in schools where administrators and teachers work to develop cultures that promote collaborative efforts, risk taking, and experimentation.

Brown noted that site based management offers teachers the opportunity to immerse themselves in critical decisions such as resource allocation in their schools. It offers teachers opportunities to influence priorities in schools. He noted, however, that not all teachers want to be involved in budget planning. Many teachers are much more concerned with instructional issues than with school governance issues, and do not involve themselves.⁷⁴

David noted that the shift in role for teachers is also a difficult one " ... because administrators are used to telling teachers what to do, and teachers have been conditioned to expect to be told what to do."⁷⁵ She noted that in districts she studied administrators helped teachers assume their new roles through release time for training, time to review new materials, and visit other schools involved in restructuring.⁷⁶ Additionally, she noted that "successful district practices incorporate plans for reducing teachers' work loads; providing extra time for professional development; and at the school

⁷³Ann Lieberman and Lynn Miller, "Restructuring School: What Matters and What Works," Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 10 (June 1990): 762.

⁷⁴Daniel J. Brown, Decentralization: The Administrator's Guidebook to School District Change (Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc., 1991), 80-81.

⁷⁵David, "Lessons from Pioneering Districts," 231.

⁷⁶David, "Lessons from Pioneering Districts," 236-237.

level, reorganizing schedules to free teachers to participate in decision making and other collegial activities."⁷⁷

Parents

Unlike the roles of principals and teachers, the role of parents in site based schools appears to change based on the impetus for implementation. In radical restructuring moves which were politically based, the role of parents altered dramatically such as in the Chicago Public Schools where parent councils have the authority to hire and fire the principal, to negotiate contracts, evaluate principal performance, approve the school budget, and make other operational decisions.⁷⁸ However, in schools where site based management involved changes in the internal management structure, parental roles remained those traditionally assumed by parents.

Factors and Barriers to Consider

Although no clear model for the implementation of site based management has emerged as it has been implemented in the United States and Canada, the various qualitative studies and anecdotal writings on site based management offer a variety of factors to be considered as districts prepare for and implement this reform.

In her article "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration" Hord (1986) noted that institutions will not change to more

⁷⁷David, "Synthesis of Research," 52.

⁷⁸Epps, 152-153.

cooperative or collaborative models unless organizational leaders provide the vision for desired change and can offer "practical first steps toward this desired state"⁷⁹

Based on their experiences implementing site based management in Colorado, Harrison, Killion, and Mitchell "strongly recommend that school districts clearly define their understanding of the desired end results early in the change process."⁸⁰ They suggested that the following questions be asked as the initial first steps in implementing site based management:

1. What do we mean by site-based management?
2. What roles need to be redefined, and how will we provide the necessary training and support?
3. What are the parameters, expectations, or limitations of local site-based decision-making?
4. What do we know about the change process, and how well does this apply to our situation?
5. To what degree will variations and differences among schools within the district be accommodated?
6. What underlying conditions must be present for site-based management to work? How can we clarify and communicate them?
7. What can we learn from other organizations in the public and private sector about making this transition?⁸¹

By addressing these questions, Harrison et al. believed that schools may avoid the problems inherent in expecting teachers used to working in isolation and principals used to making decisions without input from experiencing the

⁷⁹Shirley M. Hord, "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration," Educational Leadership 43, no. 5 (February 1986): 23.

⁸⁰Cynthia R. Harrison, Joellen P. Killion, and James E. Mitchell, "Site-Based Management: The Realities of Implementation," Educational Leadership 46, no. 8 (May 1989): 56.

⁸¹Ibid.

natural difficulties in working collaboratively as team members while making essential decisions.

As districts shift their organizational structures from centralized to decentralized systems, David (1989) said that the research on school-based management offers districts fifteen suggestions to support successful change.

David encouraged districts to:

1. Build strong alliances with the teachers' union
2. Delegate authority to schools to define new roles, select staff, and create new learning environments
3. Demonstrate and promote shared decision-making
4. Communicate goals, guiding images, and information
5. Create direct communication links between school staff and top leaders
6. Encourage experimentation and risk taking
7. Provide waivers from restrictive rules
8. Motivate principals to involve teachers in school-site decisions
9. Promote creation of new roles in schools and central office
10. Create new forms of accountability with school staff
11. Provide broad range of opportunities for professional development
12. Provide time for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
13. Reduce size of central office
14. Promote role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change
15. Match salaries to increased responsibilities. ⁸²

Through the aforementioned practices, David stated that schools are more likely to be successful in their implementation of site based management.

Aronstein, Marlow, and Desilets (1990) reported from their experiences moving to a site based management system in Massachusetts that "restructuring a school is quite similar to learning to drive on the left side of

⁸²David, "Synthesis of Research," 47.

the road after you've been driving on the right side your whole life."⁸³ They identified the following factors as key: 1) establishing the credibility of the process, 2) establishing continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure, and 3) developing "a sense of trust in order to establish a credible framework of self-governance"⁸⁴

Lieberman and Miller suggested that "what distinguishes the restructuring movement from other school reform efforts is the understanding that it is necessary to create the conditions that will enable teachers to accomplish the desired outcomes."⁸⁵ They stated that each school starts with its own set of conditions, but in order to restructure schools each school must have a vision of what it will accomplish. Lieberman and Miller wrote that "... restructuring without an accompanying vision will have no place to go."⁸⁶ They further stated that:

many ... factors influence the starting point for a school restructuring effort. These include such things as the source of the initial leadership, the current state of the school, the level of communication that already exists among faculty members, the level of trust that already exists between faculty and the principal, the values espoused by the district leaders, and the degree of support they give to the project, the kinds and amount of support available to teachers, and the formal and informal sources of leadership within the faculty.⁸⁷

⁸³Laurence W. Aronstein, Marcia Marlow, and Brendan Desilets, "Detours on the Road to Site-Based Management," Educational Leadership 47, no 7 (April 1990): 61.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 63.

⁸⁵Lieberman and Miller, 763.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Ibid.

In his pioneering research on barriers to decentralization, Lopez concluded that there are thirteen barriers to site based reform. He stated that:

1. Principals are not prepared to implement site based management. Training is needed in budgeting, planning, curriculum, and instruction.
2. Middle managers pose a barrier ... due to the loss of authority they will experience.
3. Teachers' attitudes towards parental involvement in instructional matters pose barriers to the successful operation of site based councils.
4. Central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve parents and teachers in decision-making process regarding curriculum and instruction.
5. Directors do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems.
6. Teachers' and parents' perceptions of the lack of importance of the instructional leadership role of the principal is a barrier to SBM [Site Based Management] and to this function for the principal.
7. Budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs, which is inherent in SBM.
8. Instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted through middle managers' control of the curriculum and by centralized program development. The implementation of SBM can be hindered by the continuation of this control by middle managers.
9. ...the principals could pose a barrier to SBM if they do not understand the concept fully or if they do not support SBM.
10. Educators' attitudes towards parental involvement pose a barrier to SBM.
11. The major failure of the district is seen by parents as the lack of parental involvement in the schools. This could pose a barrier to the successful operation of the site based councils if the perception is valid.
12. The instructional leadership role of the principal is further minimized by teachers because he is not seen as an important source in assisting teachers to individualize instruction.
13. Since the principal is the most important source of information on district-wide matter, he is in a critical position to either aid the implementation of SBM or present a formidable barrier.⁸⁸

⁸⁸Lopez, 325 - 327.

In his research on site based systems, Brown (1990) also identified a number of barriers to the implementation of site based management. He noted that "opposition to school-based management is voiced by some groups and individuals,"⁸⁹ and that "retrenchment makes the change to decentralization much more difficult."⁹⁰ "External constraints imposed in schools under decentralization limits ... flexibility."⁹¹ He also noted that principals and teachers see the leading weakness of site based management as the time required to implement it.⁹² Principals also recognized the stress created by decentralization.⁹³

Key Site Based Management Issues

In addition to the various factors and barriers to be considered as schools decentralize their decision making structures, there are major responsibilities that shift as site based management is implemented. The extent to which shared decision making will be used, in what areas and to what extent school sites will have decision making authority must be considered. How individual school sites will be held accountable for decisions which they make also becomes a significant issue with which schools must deal.

⁸⁹Brown, Decentralization and School-Based Management, 261.

⁹⁰Ibid., 261.

⁹¹Ibid., 259.

⁹²Ibid., 260.

⁹³Brown, Decentralization: The Administrator's Guidebook, 79.

Shared Decision Making

Shared decision making is an integral part of site based management, yet the literature and research on shared decision making is limited. While the successful implementation of site based management seems dependent on the ability of the principal to develop effective teams of decision makers at the school site, the literature offers little guidance in the practical aspects of developing shared decision making in schools.

Walkington (1991) offered several conclusions from her research on shared decision making. Walkington found that "training is a key issue in the successful implementation of shared decision-making."⁹⁴ Elaborating on this statement she added that in order to "build collegial teams, communicate effectively, resolve inevitable conflicts, establish goals, solve problems, and make good decisions" additional training in shared decision making is essential for all participants. Walkington also noted that shared decision making takes time to implement and teams must have a clear understanding of their role in the decision making process. She also found that "a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision-making process is needed in order for it to be successful."⁹⁵

Industrially based research on teaming, adult cooperation and collaboration also provided practical information on shared decision making. In their book *TeamWork: What Must Go Right/What Can Go Wrong*, Larson and LaFasto stated that effectively functioning teams have eight

⁹⁴Barbara A. Walkington, "Strategies Principals Use to Implement Shared Decision-Making" (Ed. D. diss., University of LaVerne, CA, 1991), 182.

⁹⁵Walkington, 185.

characteristics. "In brief, those characteristics are: (1) a clear, elevating goal; (2) a results-driven structure; (3) competent members; (4) unified commitment; (5) a collaborative climate; (6) standards of excellence; (7) external support and recognition; (8) principled leadership."⁹⁶ The results of cooperative efforts according to Johnson and Johnson show that it "promotes achievement, positive interpersonal relationships, social support, and self-esteem."⁹⁷

Budgeting

Since "many principals believe that they and their staffs will have significant authority only when significant unencumbered funds are provided to do their jobs better,"⁹⁸ budgeting becomes a major issue in the implementation of site based management. Under site based management, the budgeting system is decentralized to provide school sites with significant authority for determining resource allocation. According to Hartman (1988), the school site budgeting process contains five elements:

1. The establishment of an overall district budget target.
2. The establishment of basic (nonschool site) costs.
3. The assignment of all remaining funds to individual schools on a per capita basis.
4. The development of individual school expenditure plans.

⁹⁶Carl E. Larson and Frank M. J. LaFasto, TeamWork: What Must Go Right/What Can Go Wrong. (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1989), 26.

⁹⁷David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson, "Research Shows the Benefits of Adult Cooperation," Educational Leadership 45, no. 3 (November 1987): 30.

⁹⁸Cawelti, 2.

5. The assembly of individual school expenditure plans into a comprehensive district budget in accordance with Item 1.⁹⁹

In site based budgeting, each school usually receives a lump sum budget or a portion of the district's budget. Often this money is designated for materials, supplies, and equipment. These allotments are often made on a per pupil basis with students requiring special services (such as English as a Second Language and Special Education) having greater per pupil allotments. Because money is often equated with power, schools having greater discretionary funds available to support their decisions feel more empowered than do those where the bulk of the dollars remain under central office control. In some cases schools have more discretionary funds because federal grant monies designated for special programs are passed on to the schools who house those programs.¹⁰⁰

Hartman (1988) suggested that there are a number of ways to shift the essential budget decision making in site based management. One involves transfer of authority for making budget decisions from the central office to the principal. The principal can then work with or without his/her staff to make budget allocations. Another and far more radical approach involves transfer of the budget decision making to a council comprised of teachers, parents, and the principal. In this approach which is similar to the school reforms initiated in the Chicago Public Schools, the building principal becomes a site manager.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹William T. Hartman, School District Budgeting. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1988), 39.

¹⁰⁰David, "Synthesis of Research," 47.

¹⁰¹Hartman, 40.

Staffing

Since staffing is the largest part of any school district's budget, the power to determine staffing needs is a key authority in any school district. A primary issue in site based management becomes whether the building principal and teachers have input into or control over this very important set of decisions and expenditures. Some districts implementing site based management do involve the principal and teachers in making staffing decisions which are generally two-fold.

The most basic staffing decision a district undertakes is to determine the number of staff positions needed and then to determine who will fill these positions. Often schools are assigned a number of full-time equivalents based on enrollment. After these positions are filled, the principal and staff are given the responsibility to make decisions regarding additional staff such as hiring aides and/or additional teachers. Schools may elect not to hire additional staff but to use their available funds on other instructional or support expenditures.¹⁰²

After identifying the number of positions and who will fill them, the second major staffing decision lies in filling vacancies. Under site based management, the teachers and the principal select personnel to fill these vacancies. While the principal may retain the authority to make the official recommendation to the central office, the selection process is usually participatory and may involve selecting from a pool screened by the district.¹⁰³

¹⁰²David, "Synthesis of Research," 47.

¹⁰³Ibid.

Curriculum Development

While curriculum has historically been an area in which teachers and principals have had input if not decision making authority, the essential difference under site based management is that school staff initiates and leads the efforts to change rather than the central office.¹⁰⁴ Additionally, teachers are encouraged to develop curriculum and select materials to be used in its implementation. A collaborative model is often employed which breaks down the traditional isolation of the teaching profession. Teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions (usually within contractual lines) and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues. When contractual lines may be crossed, negotiated agreements often require administrators and teachers to discuss ways of allowing these innovations. In essence, "the collaborative school provides a climate and a structure that encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth."¹⁰⁵

Site based management empowers teachers to make changes in the area of curriculum and instruction to meet professional and student needs. This broadening of educational opportunities has enabled teachers to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships, and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods or may return to methods of yesteryear.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

¹⁰⁵Smith, 6.

Accountability

As defined, site based management shifts authority for decision making to levels closest to where the decisions will be implemented. This shift in responsibility is accompanied by a resulting shift in accountability for making and implementing those decisions. David stated that "the goal of restructuring education is to raise significantly the performance of all students."¹⁰⁶ She also questioned "What happens if these outcomes are not reached?"¹⁰⁷

A review of the related literature supported Brown's statement that "the topic of accountability is not addressed extensively by writers on school-based management," but he suggested that key issues have emerged from the available literature.¹⁰⁸ Notably, they are the gathering of student performance data and information, parent and community satisfaction data and information, and the school's ability to meet state mandated expectations.

Bailey suggested that "the challenge to educators is to take charge of the accountability function in a proactive fashion."¹⁰⁹ He endorsed the taxpayers right to know how schools spend their money and said that part of the problem is that accountability measures have had to be demanded because educators have not provided them' on their own initiative.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶Jane L. David, "What It Takes to Restructure Education," Educational Leadership 48, no. 8 (May 1991): 14.

¹⁰⁷Ibid.

¹⁰⁸Brown, Decentralization and School-Based Management, 93.

¹⁰⁹Bailey, 133.

¹¹⁰Bailey, 133.

David suggested that "creating a system of shared accountability based on measures of valued goals is ... a critical requirement for school change."¹¹¹ Brown offered a variety of measures to assess these valued goals. They included student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations as effective measures of accountability in a site based system.¹¹² Yet, David saw thorny issues in site based accountability. She said that schools are wrestling with how to measure the results of schooling that are valued and how to allocate responsibilities in ways that match re-aligned authority. While many educators are developing new ways to measure student learning such as portfolios and performance assessment, they are caught in a "time warp between the old and the new. On the one hand, teachers are being asked to teach their students to think - to forsake superficial coverage of content for depth and understanding. On the other hand, they are still judged publicly and privately by standardized tests that emphasize isolated facts, rote learning, and content coverage."¹¹³ She also suggested that teachers are not the only ones who need to be held accountable since necessary conditions are often created by district and state staff members. She contended that sharing accountability is a challenging thing to do.¹¹⁴

Bailey agreed that site based management increases the complexities of accountability, but he saw communication between professional educators

¹¹¹Jane L. David, "What It Takes to Restructure Education,"15.

¹¹²Brown, Decentralization and School-Based Management, 94.

¹¹³Jane L. David, "What It Takes to Restructure Education," 15.

¹¹⁴ibid.

and their lay community as critical to its success. He expressed his belief that the accountability assumed by superintendents and school boards should not diminish; it should merely change to meet the new role requirements under site based management.¹¹⁵ While the board maintains its role to establish and monitor policy, the superintendent assumes the role of providing training for the board on the policy issues of site based management. With respect to accountability at the school level, Bailey advocated the use of school goal setting and reporting to the board of education on their progress as a measure of school accountability.¹¹⁶ He stated that "we have not policed ourselves. Educators must be proactive in the area of accountability, so in addition to state requirements and local board requirements, each school needs to develop its own system of quality control and public announcements of those controls."¹¹⁷ He advocated school goal setting, selection of three to four goals to implement within a two to three year period, directing resources toward those goals within the school, publicizing the goals, and progress reports with periodic checks toward progress using data surveys, interview, documentation, and observation to evaluate those broader goals not focused at student achievement. He suggested that results should influence the next goal cycle and a report to the board on accomplishment and difficulties should chronicle the efforts of the schools.¹¹⁸ In these ways, Bailey suggested

¹¹⁵Bailey, 134.

¹¹⁶Ibid., 137.

¹¹⁷Ibid., 139.

¹¹⁸Ibid., 141.

that educators in a site based system can address the issues of accountability to their public even though accountability under site based management is a complex issue.

Productivity

While the literature on shared decision making and accountability in site based management is limited, the literature on productivity and site based management is even more limited. Yet increased productivity of schools is a bottom line issue which may ultimately determine whether site based management as a school reform is justified. While the literature provided some thoughts on productivity in schools in general, Brown's study of site based school districts provided virtually the only study on productivity in site based school systems.

Brown analyzed productivity from the stand point of efficiency such as increased services and reduced costs, as well as equality of student access to programs, and administration costs of decentralized systems. He also questioned whether there was evidence that output in the form of learning had increased as the result of site based management.

From his study, Brown concluded that decentralization in the districts he studied "was not introduced to cut costs. However, some school-level costs may be reduced because of increased cost awareness."¹¹⁹ He also noted that "school based management districts do not demonstrate a preoccupation with efficiency conceived as cost accounting." He determined that "outputs, as measured by parental and student satisfaction, have increased under

¹¹⁹Brown, Decentralization and School-Based Management, 260.

school-based management," and that "decentralization provides a measure of equal access to educational resources for students." However, he noted that "the evidence is unclear about the overall efficiency of decentralization."¹²⁰ Brown stated that his study "offered some grounds for the idea that school productivity was most likely increased under school-based management" but qualified his conclusions by conceding that his study focused on the process of learning and not the outcomes of learning.¹²¹

Summary

In summary, the literature and research on site based management offered a view of site based management as a reform effort aimed at decentralizing decision making. It enables those closest to implementing the decision to make those decisions which most directly affect their ability to do their jobs well. It is a reform aimed at making genuine change in schools as learning and work environments.

Site based management has come about as the result of converging forces from labor relations, industrial management, effective schools research and national reports that called for decentralization. Initiated in varying ways, site based management usually involved shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development. Issues of accountability are raised as authority is re-aligned in the system. Roles of central office administrators, principals, teachers, and parents change as the result of site based management. Factors and barriers related to

¹²⁰Ibid.

¹²¹Ibid., 265.

implementation have been identified with some suggestions for successful implementation coming from research and anecdotal writings. However, site based management was presented in the literature as situational and contextual with no clear model for implementation having emerged.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Statement of Problem

As schools implement site (school) based management, principals and teachers continue to be viewed as significant implementors of this school reform. Site based management has been perceived as situational and contextual largely because of the individual, negotiated school contracts and school cultures within which it has been implemented. However, an examination of the literature and research suggested a commonality in experiences of educators who have implemented this reform. Therefore, a better understanding of the common factors faced by implementors of site based management would further reform efforts.

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of building principals and teachers who have implemented site based management methods. It endeavored to produce a consensus opinion among each group. Specifically, it identified the factors which principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceived as fostering or impeding the implementation of site (school) based management. This study focused on three specific areas of site based management: budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development. It also focused on shared decision making and accountability as key aspects of site based management.

Research Questions

Research Questions examined by this study were:

1. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
2. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
3. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering shared decision making in the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
4. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding shared decision making in the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
5. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
6. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

7. How do principals' and teachers' perspectives on factors perceived to foster or impede the implementation of site (school) based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system align with factors found in the literature and research?

Research Procedure

The research procedure used in this study is known as the Delphi. Delphi was developed nearly 40 years ago to provide a systematic method for soliciting and collating expert opinions. Developed as a consensus model, the Delphi is conducted "through a set of carefully designed sequential questionnaires interspersed with summarized information and feedback of opinions derived from earlier responses."¹ It assumes that "experts are experts because they are objective, take into account new or discrepant information, and construct logically sound deductions ..." ² much like Lockean, Kantian, and Hegelian (Dialectical) philosophies.³ It also assumes that several experts are better than one yet seeks to aggregate their opinions without bringing them together in the same room.

The Delphi was developed in the early 1950's by the Rand Corporation in conjunction with the United States Air Force. The purpose of Project

¹John F. Preble, "The Selection of Delphi Panels for Strategic Planning Purposes," Strategic Management Journal 5, no. 2 (April-June 1984): 157.

²W. Timothy Weaver, "The Delphi Forecasting Method," Phi Delta Kappan 52, no. 5 (January 1971): 269.

³Ian A Mitroff and Murray Turoff, "Philosophy: Philosophical and Methodological Foundations of Delphi," in The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications, ed. Harold A. Linstone and Murray Turoff, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975): 19.

Delphi was to "... obtain the most reliable consensus of opinion of a group of experts ... by a series of intensive questionnaires interspersed with controlled opinion feedback."⁴ This first study asked experts to assume the view point of a Soviet strategic planner and to identify a system for optimal U.S. industrial target strikes along with the number of A-bombs needed to reduce those targets to a certain level of functioning.⁵ Since the only reasonable alternative to the use of expert opinion was the development of costly models and computer simulations, the Rand Corporation opted for the more creative approach of bringing together a panel of experts via the use of survey instruments. Publication of a subsequent study in 1964 by Olaf Helmer and T. J. Gordon of Rand Corporation brought the Delphi technique to public attention. Entitled "Report on a Long-Range Forecasting Study," this publication by two of the Delphi founders included a paper on the philosophies on which Delphi is based and established the method as a new research technique.⁶

History of Delphi as an Educational Research Technique

Developed as a forecasting technique for industry, early studies also established the Delphi as an educational research technique. These Delphi studies concentrated on one of three categories: the formation of goals and

⁴Harold A. Linstone and Murray Turoff, "Introduction: The Evolution of Delphi," in The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications, ed. Harold A. Linstone and Murray Turoff, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975): 10.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., 10-11.

objectives, curriculum and campus planning, or the development of educational criteria.⁷

"One of the earliest uses of Delphi in educational thinking was Helmer's study incorporated as part of the 1965 Kettering project to elicit preference judgements from a panel of educational experts and experts in various fields related to education."⁸ The purpose of this study was to utilize a panel of experts to compile a list of preferred goals for federal funding.

In addition to Helmer's study, other early Delphi studies were conducted by Cyphert and Gant and by Anderson. Cyphert and Gant used the Delphi technique as "an opinion questionnaire to elicit preferences from the faculty of the School of Education at the University of Virginia and other concerned parties;" while Anderson solicited the same information but focused on Ohio county school districts.⁹ These early educational studies differed from the Rand forecasting studies in that the researchers asked respondents to focus on what they would like to see happen as opposed to what was likely to happen.¹⁰

Other educational studies have since been conducted which used the "purer" form of the Delphi technique as a forecasting tool. Staff at the Institute for the Future of Middletown, Connecticut, and the Educational Policy Research Center of Syracuse University Research Corporation have

⁷Bernard J. Dodge and Richard E. Clark, "Research Briefing: Research on the Delphi Technique," Educational Technology 17, no. 4 (April 1977): 59.

⁸Weaver, 268.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

conducted educational forecasting studies. The main purpose of their studies was to identify "prospective developments which might have an impact on educational administration, their probable dates of occurrence, the desirability of such developments should they occur, and the potential intervention."¹¹

Reliability of the Delphi

In making the shift from industrial forecasting to educational technique, four difficulties were encountered in Delphi research. "First, there was no comprehensive theoretical framework to guide the inquiry."¹² A second issue is that the social sciences such as education do not have the preciseness of language which technological forecasting possesses, therefore educational Delphi measurements are not as accurate. A third difficulty in shifting this research method to education is that technological data are more stable and therefore more reliable than the shifting data base available to social sciences. Finally, there is more potential for personal bias in social science research because there is considerable variance in the meaning of educational terms used as indicators.

In spite of these four difficulties in transferring the Delphi Method from industrial technique to educational technique, the Delphi Method has become established as a reliable educational research method in part due to research by Dalkey, Martino, and Preble. In 1969, Dalkey concluded that the research to date using first round almanac type questions indicated that "with a panel no larger than fifteen, consisting of a cross section of experts in the

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid.

given field, it is highly unlikely that another equally expert panel will produce a radically different media."¹³

In 1972, Martino compared the results of expert panels to determine the consistency of their predictions. He concluded, based on his results, "that the members of a panel do tend to integrate available scientific information into the panel forecast, and that where such information is generally available, different panels will tend to produce similar results."¹⁴ Martino also compared a number of overlapping events on the Gordon/Helmer study (1964) with the Parsons/Williams (1969) study and concluded that the panels developed consistent forecasts.

In 1984, Preble conducted a study to determine if internal and external company experts would make similar forecasts under virtually identical circumstances. Preble carefully controlled the test conditions and utilized statistical tests to determine the results. Following his study, Preble concluded "these research findings [internal expert panel v. external expert panel] provide empirical support for the consistency hypothesis developed by Martino (1972) that different Delphi panel types tend to produce the same results."¹⁵

Delphi Procedures

Since the Delphi is a research technique for structuring collective opinions of experts, the first step in the procedure is the selection of experts

¹³Preble, 159.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid, 167.

for panel participation. Panels are selected in a variety of ways depending upon the issue to be studied. Some educational Delphi researchers utilize large panels in excess of several hundred panelists. Others utilize random samples or select groups of experts known to the researcher. While methods for panel selection vary, current trends in panel selection suggest choosing the panel with care in order to avoid potential bias in selection.

The second step in the Delphi technique is the development of a survey instrument. Sometimes the respondents generate the statements and sometimes the researcher generates the statements and/or allows the respondents to add items which they think are pertinent to the study. Since Helmer and Gordon believed that "the statements which comprise the elements of a Delphi exercise inevitably reflect the cultural attitudes, subjective bias, and knowledge of those who formulate them,"¹⁶ they began their original Delphi exercise with a blank questionnaire.

After the survey instrument is developed, surveys are sent to respondents who are asked to rate the statements, usually with a Likert-type scale. During the second round, respondents are given feedback which includes the mean response and/or a frequency distribution of the group's responses. Each respondent is offered the opportunity to revise his/her responses based on this feedback.

During the third round, respondents are asked to provide reasons for their responses if they fall outside a prescribed deviation. Three to five

¹⁶Harold A. Linstone and Murray Turoff, "Evaluation: Delphi Statements," in The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications, ed. Harold A. Linstone and Murray Turoff, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975): 232.

rounds may be utilized to derive consensus from the expert panel. However, three cycles are usually enough to derive consensus since most movement toward the mean occurs in the second round.¹⁷

Advantages and Disadvantages

The Delphi holds several distinct advantages over face-to-face meetings of experts. First, it enables respondents to offer opinions yet avoids the conflicts and politics often inherent in groups because the panel of respondents remains anonymous. The Delphi encourages innovative and independent thinking in the initial rounds, and can reflect the most up-to-date consensus of experts. Also, "... the ability to expose uncertainty and divergent views is an inherent strength of the Delphi process."¹⁸

Disadvantages of the Delphi are also apparent. The procedure can be time consuming and costly with large panels because of the number of rounds and preparation of response summaries which are an integral part of the design. Secondly, respondents sometimes "fall out" of the process for a variety of reasons. Thirdly, there is a lack of independent thinking after the first round because it is a consensus model. One danger in the Delphi is the

¹⁷Arlene Hartman, "Reaching Consensus Using the Delphi Technique," Educational Leadership 38, no. 6 (March 1981): 496-497.

¹⁸Harold A. Linstone, "Eight Basic Pitfalls: A Checklist: The Prediction Urge," in The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications, ed. Harold A. Linstone and Murray Turoff, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975): 578.

ability of the researcher to mold opinion as well as solicit it. Careful administration of the Delphi is needed in order to avoid these drawbacks.¹⁹

Conclusion

Although the Delphi technique was originally developed as a forecasting tool for industry, it is a promising technique for educational research in the areas of planning, goal setting, and the development of evaluation criterion.²⁰ According to Linstone and Turoff, the Delphi technique is still evolving and continues to be largely an art as opposed to a science due to the lack of directives for implementation.²¹ In spite of its relative newness as a research technique, it holds many advantages and a proven reliability which make it a useful tool in educational studies where consensus of expert opinion is desired or required.

Panel Selection

The first step in this Delphi study was the selection of two panels: a panel of principals and a panel of teachers. Initially, principals of elementary, middle level, and high schools in the suburban area of Chicago were identified for possible participation in the Delphi study based on the length and extent of their involvement in site (school) based management. Principals had to have been involved in at least two areas (budgeting, staffing,

¹⁹Frederick R. Cyphert and Walter L. Gant, "The Delphi Technique: A Case Study," Phi Delta Kappan 52, no. 5 (January 1971): 273.

²⁰Dodge and Clark, 58.

²¹Linstone and Turoff, "Evolution of Delphi," 3.

or curriculum development) of site based management and have been utilizing site based methods and shared decision making for a minimum of two years. Building principals were interviewed by telephone via a qualitative interview to assess their knowledge and personal experiences with site based management (see Appendix 1). Since the results of Delphi research are highly influenced by the expertise of the panel members, principals were selected based on their level of expertise as determined by the interview process. Ten building principals were selected, each from different schools in different districts.

Following principal selection, teachers from each principal's school were identified for possible participation. Teachers were interviewed by telephone via a qualitative interview to assess their knowledge and personal experiences in site based management and shared decision making (see Appendix 1). One teacher was selected from each principal's school. Effort was made to select principals and teachers from elementary, middle level, and secondary schools representing the three types of Illinois school districts (Elementary, High School, and Unit Districts) in order to generate panels representing a cross section of educational organizations.

Procedure for Gathering Data

The principals and teachers participated on separate panels. A Delphi study consisting of four rounds was conducted with each of the two panels to identify factors which building principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceived as fostering or impeding the implementation of site (school) based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system.

During the first round of the study, a "pure" Delphi was used to generate the Delphi survey instrument so as not to prejudice the panels by introducing ideas before panelists shared their views. During round one, participants were asked to identify factors related to implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, curriculum development, shared decision making, and accountability which they perceived to foster or impede site based management implementation (see Appendix 2).

Following round one, factors identified in the literature were added to those generated by the participants, and a comprehensive survey instrument was developed. During round two, participants were asked to rate the importance of factors on a scale of zero to ten (see Appendix 3).

In round three, mean ratings were reported from round two along with each panel member's original ratings (see Appendix 4). Panel members were asked to examine their ratings, compare their ratings to the mean responses of the panel, and were given the opportunity to adjust their ratings. If a response was two or more points above or below the mean and left unchanged, respondents were instructed to state their rationales for the rating of each of those responses. Rounds continued until consensus was attained or until movement on the ratings no longer took place. Four rounds were used. In this way, panel members reviewed the group opinion, shared their views, and were brought to consensus on factors which they perceived to foster or impede the implementation of site based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability is a site based system.

Procedure for Analyzing Data

During each round of the Delphi study, mean and range responses of each panel were calculated. Panelists were provided the group's mean responses along with their own individual responses. As movement toward consensus continued, as determined by changes in ratings, the study continued. When movement toward consensus stopped, as determined by lack of changes in ratings, the rounds ceased. After concluding the Delphi rounds, the final mean and range responses of each panel were calculated.

An analysis of the resulting data was conducted in four stages. First, lists of factors identified by each panel as fostering or impeding implementation of site based management in the areas of staffing, budgeting, curriculum development, shared decision making, and accountability were listed in order by descending mean. Second, consensus among panel members was calculated based on all final ratings being within two points above or below the final mean. Third, the factors from each panel were compared and contrasted to determine similarities and differences in perceptions of the principals' panel and the teachers' panel. Finally, the factors were compared and contrasted to the literature and previous research findings to determine whether those factors identified as being important in the implementation of site based management were indeed the factors which principals and teachers in this study perceived as important factors.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Introduction

This study was designed to examine the perceptions of building principals and teachers who have depth of knowledge and experience implementing site based management. While much of the literature suggested that site based management is situational and contextual, this study endeavored to produce a consensus opinion among building principals and teachers of selected Illinois schools as to the factors they perceived as fostering or impeding 1) the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development, 2) shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development, and 3) the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development. The study provided data for comparison and contrast of practitioners' opinions with factors listed in the literature and research. A qualitative survey was used to interview possible participants for the study. The results of these two surveys were used to select ten principals and ten teachers to form two expert panels. Each panel subsequently participated in a Delphi study to identify and rate factors for their importance.

Results of this study have been divided into two parts: results of the qualitative surveys for panel selection and results of the Delphi study of principals' and teachers' perceptions. The results and discussions from the Delphi study have been divided by research questions one through six to relate 1) principals' perspectives on all rated factors along with consensus and non-consensus factors from the principals' panel, 2) teachers' perspectives on all rated factors along with consensus and non-consensus factors from the teachers' panel, 3) a comparison of principals' and teachers' perspectives on all factors surveyed, 4) principals' perspectives on factors identified in the literature along with consensus and non-consensus factors from the principals' panel, 5) teachers' perspectives on factors identified in the literature along with consensus and non-consensus factors from the teachers' panel, and 6) a comparison of principals' and teachers' panel ratings on factors identified in the literature. Results and discussions for research question seven have been integrated with those of research questions one through six as indicated above.

Results of Qualitative Surveys for Selection

The first step in this Delphi study was the selection of two panels: a panel of principals and a panel of teachers. Principals of public schools in the suburban area of Chicago were identified for possible participation in the Delphi study based on the length and extent of their involvement in site (school) based management and shared decision making.

A telephone survey was conducted to identify principals and teachers who had been involved in at least two areas of site based management (budgeting, staffing, or curriculum development) and who had been utilizing

site based management methods for a minimum of two years (see Appendix 1).

Since the results of Delphi research are influenced by the expertise of the panel members, principals were selected based on their level of expertise as determined by the interview process. Twenty building principals of suburban schools in the Chicago suburban areas were contacted to assess their knowledge and personal experiences with site based management. Of those interviewed by telephone, ten building principals were selected based on their expertise in site based management and shared decision making. The selected principals demonstrated a high level of knowledge of site based management and shared decision making. Each principal had implemented site based management methods although not all schools or districts had formal site based management models. Each principal had a minimum of two years experience as a building principal.

Teachers from each principal's school were identified for possible participation. Nineteen teachers were contacted. A qualitative interview was used to assess teachers' knowledge and personal experiences in site based management (see Appendix 1). Ten teachers were selected, one from each principal's school. All teachers had a minimum of two years experience in implementing site based management efforts in their schools. All demonstrated a high level of knowledge of site based management and had participated in at least two of the three areas (budgeting, staffing, or curriculum development).

Principals' and teachers' panels were selected to represent elementary, middle level, and secondary schools from the three types of school districts in Illinois: Elementary, High School, and Unit Districts. Panelists were selected

in this manner in order to generate panels representing a cross section of educational organizations.

During the successive rounds of the Delphi study, two principals and four teachers dropped out. Eight principals and six teachers completed all rounds of the study. In spite of participant drop out, all district types remained represented in the final panels. However, panel composition in which there was a direct match of one principal and one teacher representing each school was not sustained.

Results of the Delphi Study

During the first round of the Delphi study, a "pure" Delphi method was used. Participants were asked to identify factors which they perceived to foster or impede the implementation of site based management, shared decision making and the acceptance of accountability (see Appendix 2).

Factors offered by principals and teachers were combined with factors identified in the literature to develop a survey instrument used in successive rounds with both panels. The survey consisted of six questions and 180 factors. During round two, principals and teachers were asked to rate factors for their importance using a scale of 0 to 10 with 0 being unimportant and 10 being essential (see Appendix 3).

In round three, panelists were given their ratings and the mean ratings of their panel. Participants were asked to review their ratings and the panel's mean ratings. Participants were given the opportunity to adjust their ratings and were asked to provide a rationale for any rating with remained two or more points above or below the mean (see Appendix 4).

In round four, panelists were given their ratings and the panel's mean ratings. They were also given the range of ratings for each factor and the rationales which panelists offered for their ratings in round three. Factors were separated into two categories: those in which all panel responses were in consensus (consensus was defined as all ratings being within two points of the mean) and those factors which were not in consensus. Panelists were given the opportunity to adjust all ratings and were asked to provide a rationale for each response which remained two or more points above or below the mean (see Appendix 5).

The Delphi study concluded with round four. Outlying movement toward the mean had stopped as panelists became entrenched. Entrenchment was evidenced by stated rationales and lack of adjustment in panelists' responses.

Delphi Results and Discussions for Research Question One

Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

Round one of the Delphi study produced factors not found in the literature. These factors were combined with factors from the literature to produce a forty-five factor survey used for all subsequent rounds of the Delphi study (see Appendix 2).

Principals' Perceptions

Using a scale of zero to ten, principals rated the forty-five factors. Final results showed that all factors were perceived to foster the implementation of site based management but with varying degrees of importance. After four rounds, principals perceived 0 factors as essential, 9 as critically important, 26 as very important, 8 as important, 1 as moderately important, and 1 as somewhat important (see table 1). Issues of principal motivation, organizational communication, encouraging experimentation and risk taking, active and involved building level staff, shared decision making, professional opportunities, collegial atmosphere, teacher ownership, and trust were critical factors as perceived by principals. Of lesser importance were factors regarding the role and size of the central office, parental input, and salaries matched to increased responsibilities.

Table 1.--Principals' ratings of factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.25	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
9.25	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
9.12	building level staff is active and involved
9.00	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
9.00	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
9.00	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers
9.00	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
9.00	a sense of trust in the organization is established
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
8.88	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
8.62	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
8.50	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
8.50	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
8.50	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
8.50	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
8.50	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
8.38	high degree of support exists for site based management
8.38	the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
8.38	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
8.38	a credible process is established
8.25	adequate resources are available
8.12	site based management is authorized via school board policy
8.12	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
7.88	new roles are created in schools
7.88	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
7.88	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
7.75	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
7.75	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district
7.75	various kinds of support are available to teachers
7.50	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
7.50	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
7.50	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
7.38	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work

Table 1.--Continued

Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
7.38	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.88	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
6.88	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
6.62	new roles are created in the central office
6.62	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
6.25	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
5.88	parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
5.62	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
5.50	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
Mean	Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
Mean	Factors Rated Somewhat Important
1.88	the size of the central office is reduced

Although site based management was often described in the literature as situational, contextual, and requiring individualized implementation by schools and districts, the principals' panel reached consensus on many factors. With consensus defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean, principals came to consensus on the importance of 28 of 45 factors which they believed to foster the implementation of site based management in schools (see table 2). Twenty-four of these factors were identified as critically or very important. This finding is significant in that the principal panel was comprised of principals with varying years of experience in varying types of school districts, yet they were able to come to consensus on the importance of 62% of the factors surveyed and found 86% of these factors critically or very important.

Table 2.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	8 to 10	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.00	7 to 10	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
9.00	7 to 10	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
9.00	7 to 10	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers
9.00	7 to 10	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	8 to 10	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
8.88	7 to 10	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
8.62	7 to 10	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
8.50	7 to 10	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
8.50	7 to 10	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
8.50	7 to 10	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
8.38	7 to 10	high degree of support exists for site based management
8.38	7 to 10	the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
8.38	7 to 10	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
8.12	7 to 10	site based management is authorized via school board policy
7.88	6 to 9	new roles are created in schools
7.88	7 to 9	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
7.75	7 to 9	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
7.75	6 to 9	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district
7.50	6 to 9	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
7.50	7 to 8	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
7.50	6 to 9	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
7.38	6 to 8	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
7.38	6 to 8	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	5 to 8	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
6.62	5 to 8	new roles are created in the central office
5.50	4 to 7	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Somewhat Important
1.88	0 to 3	the size of the central office is reduced

Table 2.--Continued

Mean	Range	Non Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.25	6 to 10	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
9.25	7 to 10	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
9.12	7 to 10	building level staff is active and involved
9.00	6 to 10	a sense of trust in the organization is established
Mean	Range	Non Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.50	6 to 10	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
8.50	6 to 10	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
8.38	6 to 10	a credible process is established
8.25	6 to 10	adequate resources are available
8.12	6 to 10	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
7.88	7 to 10	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
7.75	6 to 10	various kinds of support are available to teachers
Mean	Range	Non Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	5 to 10	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
6.62	5 to 10	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
6.25	4 to 10	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
5.88	5 to 10	parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
5.62	0 to 9	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
Mean	Range	Non Consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	3 to 7	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities

Teachers' Perceptions

Rating the same 45 factors, teachers perceived 1 as essential, 26 as critically important, 13 as very important, 5 as important, and 0 as moderately important or as somewhat important in fostering the implementation of site based management (see table 3). Training was considered essential to teachers. District vision, site based values, time to assume new roles, collegial atmosphere, commitment, and adequate resources topped the list of twenty-six critically important factors.

Table 3.--Teachers' ratings of factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Essential
10.00	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
9.83	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
9.83	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
9.83	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers
9.83	the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
9.83	adequate resources are available
9.67	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
9.67	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
9.67	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
9.67	high degree of support exists for site based management
9.67	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
9.67	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
9.67	building level staff is active and involved
9.50	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
9.50	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
9.50	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.33	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
9.33	a sense of trust in the organization is established
9.33	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
9.33	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
9.17	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
9.17	a credible process is established
9.17	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
9.00	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
9.00	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
9.00	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
8.83	various kinds of support are available to teachers
8.83	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
8.67	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management

Table 3.--Continued

Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.67	site based management is authorized via school board policy
8.67	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district
8.33	new roles are created in schools
8.33	parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
7.83	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
7.67	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
7.50	new roles are created in the central office
7.33	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
7.33	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.50	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
6.33	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
6.00	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
5.67	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
5.50	the size of the central office is reduced

Of the forty-five surveyed factors, teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 41 or 91% of factors (see table 4).

Four factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual teachers who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 4). Non-consensus factors included the value of a district having a strong alliance with its teachers' union. The range on this factor was 1 to 8 with 1 teacher rating it somewhat important, 2 teachers rating it important, and 3 rating it very important. No one rated it critically important or essential.

Table 4.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Essential
10.00	10 to 10	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	9 to 10	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
9.83	9 to 10	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
9.83	9 to 10	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
9.83	9 to 10	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers
9.83	9 to 10	the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
9.83	9 to 10	adequate resources are available
9.67	8 to 10	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
9.67	9 to 10	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
9.67	8 to 10	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
9.67	8 to 10	high degree of support exists for site based management
9.67	8 to 10	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
9.67	9 to 10	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
9.67	9 to 10	building level staff is active and involved
9.50	8 to 10	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
9.50	8 to 10	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
9.33	8 to 10	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
9.33	8 to 10	a sense of trust in the organization is established
9.33	8 to 10	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
9.33	8 to 10	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
9.17	8 to 10	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
9.00	8 to 10	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
9.00	7 to 10	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
9.00	7 to 10	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	7 to 10	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
8.83	7 to 10	various kinds of support are available to teachers
8.83	7 to 10	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
8.67	7 to 10	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
8.67	7 to 10	site based management is authorized via school board policy
8.67	7 to 10	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district
8.33	7 to 9	new roles are created in schools

Table 4.--Continued

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.33	7 to 9	parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
7.83	6 to 9	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
7.67	6 to 9	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
7.50	6 to 9	new roles are created in the central office
7.33	6 to 9	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
7.33	6 to 9	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Important
6.50	5 to 8	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
6.33	5 to 8	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
6.00	5 to 8	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
5.50	4 to 7	the size of the central office is reduced
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	7 to 10	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.17	7 to 10	a credible process is established
9.17	7 to 10	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Important
5.67	1 to 8	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions

The mean ratings of the principals' and teachers' panels were compared to determine consensus between the two groups. Of the forty-five factors which were perceived to foster the implementation of site based management, the principals' and teachers' panels reached consensus on 41 factors or 91% (see table 5).

Eight factors were rated by both panels as critically important. Included were principal's motivation to involve teachers, encouraging experimentation and risk taking, a sense of trust in the organization, continuous and good communication, teacher ownership through initiating

issues, active and involved staff at the building level, shared decision making which is demonstrated and promoted, and a collegial atmosphere existing between principal and teachers. Of these eight factors, three were not directly found in the literature as factors which promoted site based management. These included teacher ownership through initiating issues, active and involved staff at the building level, and a collegial atmosphere existing between principal and teachers.

Four factors remained in non-consensus due to wider variations in perceptions between the principals' and teachers' panels (see table 5). These included the existence of formal and informal leadership existing within the faculty, seeking and using parental input, matching salaries to increased responsibilities, and reducing the size of the central office. Teachers perceived all four factors to be of much greater importance than did principals.

Table 5.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
9.50	9.50	0.00	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.00	8.83	0.17	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
7.88	7.67	0.21	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
9.25	9.00	0.25	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
6.25	6.50	0.25	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
9.00	9.33	0.33	a sense of trust in the organization is established
9.25	9.67	0.42	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
7.88	8.33	0.46	new roles are created in schools
6.88	7.33	0.46	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
5.50	6.00	0.50	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
9.00	9.50	0.50	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
8.12	8.67	0.54	site based management is authorized via school board policy
9.12	9.67	0.54	building level staff is active and involved
8.50	7.83	0.67	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
8.50	9.17	0.67	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
9.00	9.67	0.67	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
5.62	6.33	0.71	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
8.88	9.67	0.79	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
8.38	9.17	0.79	a credible process is established
9.00	9.83	0.83	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers
6.62	7.50	0.88	new roles are created in the central office

Table 5.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
7.75	8.67	0.92	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district
8.88	9.83	0.96	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
8.38	9.33	0.96	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
6.62	5.67	0.96	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
7.75	8.83	1.08	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
7.75	8.83	1.08	various kinds of support are available to teachers
8.50	9.67	1.17	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
8.62	9.83	1.21	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
8.38	9.67	1.29	high degree of support exists for site based management
7.38	8.67	1.29	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
8.50	9.83	1.33	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
8.38	9.83	1.46	the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
7.50	9.00	1.50	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
8.50	10.00	1.50	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
8.12	9.67	1.54	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
8.25	9.83	1.58	adequate resources are available
7.88	9.50	1.62	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
7.38	9.17	1.79	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
7.50	9.33	1.83	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
7.50	9.33	1.83	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created

Table 5.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-Consensus Factors
6.88	9.00	2.12	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
5.88	8.33	2.46	parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
4.25	7.33	3.08	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
1.88	5.50	3.62	the size of the central office is reduced

Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Thirty-three of the forty-five factors surveyed were found in the literature on site based management. Principals rated 0 as essential, 3 as critically important, 18 as very important, 7 as important, 1 as moderately important, and 1 as somewhat important (see table 6).

Table 6.--Principals' ratings of literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.25	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
9.25	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
9.00	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
9.00	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
9.00	a sense of trust in the organization is established
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
8.88	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
8.62	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
8.50	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
8.50	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
8.50	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
8.38	high degree of support exists for site based management
8.38	a credible process is established
8.25	adequate resources are available
8.12	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
7.88	new roles are created in schools
7.88	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
7.75	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
7.75	various kinds of support are available to teachers
7.50	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
7.50	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
7.50	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
7.38	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Important
6.88	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
6.88	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
6.62	new roles are created in the central office
6.62	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
6.25	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
5.62	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
5.50	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management

Table 6.--Continued

Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Somewhat Important
1.88	the size of the central office is reduced

Of these thirty-three factors, principals reached consensus on 18 factors or 55% (see table 7). Three of these eighteen factors were rated critically important. They included principals motivated to involve teachers, shared decision making being demonstrated and promoted, and a broad range of opportunities for professional development being provided. Also noteworthy was the principals' opinion on reducing the size of the central office. Principals reached consensus on the lack of importance this factor held. Fifteen factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual principals who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 7).

Table 7.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	8 to 10	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.00	7 to 10	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
9.00	7 to 10	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	8 to 10	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
8.88	7 to 10	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
8.62	7 to 10	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
8.50	7 to 10	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
8.38	7 to 10	high degree of support exists for site based management
7.88	6 to 9	new roles are created in schools
7.75	7 to 9	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
7.50	6 to 9	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
7.50	7 to 8	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
7.50	6 to 9	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
7.38	6 to 8	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	5 to 8	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
6.62	5 to 8	new roles are created in the central office
5.50	4 to 7	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Somewhat Important
1.88	0 to 3	the size of the central office is reduced
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.25	7 to 10	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
9.25	6 to 10	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
9.00	6 to 10	a sense of trust in the organization is established
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.50	6 to 10	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
8.50	6 to 10	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
8.38	6 to 10	a credible process is established
8.25	6 to 10	adequate resources are available
8.12	6 to 10	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process

Table 7.--Continued

Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
7.88	7 to 10	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
7.75	6 to 10	various kinds of support are available to teachers
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	5 to 10	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
6.62	5 to 10	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
6.25	4 to 10	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
5.62	0 to 9	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	3 to 7	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities

Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Rating the same list of factors, teachers rated 0 as essential, 20 as critically important, 8 as very important, 5 as important, and 0 as moderately important or as somewhat important (see table 8.) Among the top rated factors were district leaders espousing site based management values, district vision, adequate resources, time, a clear definition of site based management, shared decision making demonstrated and promoted, organizational communication, and support for site based management.

Table 8.--Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
9.83	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
9.83	adequate resources are available
9.83	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
9.67	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
9.67	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
9.67	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
9.67	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
9.67	high degree of support exists for site based management
9.50	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
9.50	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.33	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
9.33	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
9.33	a sense of trust in the organization is established
9.17	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
9.17	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
9.17	a credible process is established
9.00	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
9.00	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
9.00	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
8.83	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
8.83	various kinds of support are available to teachers
8.33	new roles are created in schools
7.83	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
7.50	new roles are created in the central office
7.33	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
7.33	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Important
6.50	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
6.33	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
6.00	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management

Table 8.--Continued

Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Important
5.67	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
5.50	the size of the central office is reduced

Of these thirty-three factors, teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 29 factors or 88% (see table 9). Four factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual teachers who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 9). Among the non-consensus responses, the need for the district to have a strong alliance with its teachers union/association was perceived in varying ways. The range on this factor was very broad (one to eight).

Table 9.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	9 to 10	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
9.83	9 to 10	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
9.83	9 to 10	adequate resources are available
9.83	9 to 10	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
9.67	8 to 10	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
9.67	9 to 10	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
9.67	8 to 10	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
9.67	8 to 10	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
9.67	8 to 10	high degree of support exists for site based management
9.50	8 to 10	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
9.33	8 to 10	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
9.33	8 to 10	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
9.33	8 to 10	a sense of trust in the organization is established
9.17	8 to 10	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
9.00	8 to 10	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
9.00	7 to 10	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
9.00	7 to 10	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	7 to 10	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
8.83	7 to 10	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
8.83	7 to 10	various kinds of support are available to teachers
8.33	7 to 9	new roles are created in schools
7.83	6 to 9	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
7.50	6 to 9	new roles are created in the central office
7.33	6 to 9	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
7.33	6 to 9	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.50	5 to 8	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
6.33	5 to 8	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
6.00	5 to 8	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
5.50	4 to 7	the size of the central office is reduced

Table 9.--Continued

Mean	Range	Non-Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	7 to 10	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.17	7 to 10	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
9.17	7 to 10	a credible process is established
Mean	Range	Non-Consensus Factors Rated Important
5.67	1 to 8	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

The means of the principals' and teachers' panels were compared to determine consensus between the panels on factors found in the literature. Of the thirty-three literature based factors which were perceived to foster the implementation of site based management, the panels reached consensus on thirty factors (see table 10).

Of these thirty factors, both panels rated five factors to be critically important. These included principal's motivation to involve teachers, encouraging experimentation and risk taking, a sense of trust, continuous and good communication, and shared decision making demonstrated and promoted.

Three factors remained in non-consensus due to wider variations in perceptions between the principals' and teachers' panels (see table 10). These included the existence of formal and informal leadership within the faculty, salaries matched to increased responsibilities, and reducing the size of the central office. Teachers rated all three factors higher than principals.

Table 10.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
9.50	9.50	0.00	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9.00	8.83	0.17	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
9.25	9.00	0.25	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
6.25	6.50	0.25	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
9.00	9.33	0.33	a sense of trust in the organization is established
9.25	9.67	0.42	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
7.88	8.33	0.46	new roles are created in schools
6.88	7.33	0.46	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
5.50	6.00	0.50	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
8.50	7.83	0.67	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
9.00	9.67	0.67	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
8.50	9.17	0.67	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
5.62	6.33	0.71	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
8.88	9.67	0.79	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
8.38	9.17	0.79	a credible process is established
6.62	7.50	0.88	new roles are created in the central office
8.88	9.83	0.96	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
6.62	5.67	0.96	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
7.75	8.83	1.08	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
7.75	8.83	1.08	various kinds of support are available to teachers

Table 10.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
8.62	9.83	1.21	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
8.38	9.67	1.29	high degree of support exists for site based management
8.50	9.83	1.33	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
7.50	9.00	1.50	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
8.12	9.67	1.54	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
8.25	9.83	1.58	adequate resources are available
7.88	9.50	1.62	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
7.38	9.17	1.79	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
7.50	9.33	1.83	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
7.50	9.33	1.83	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
6.88	9.00	2.12	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
4.25	7.33	3.08	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
1.88	5.50	3.62	the size of the central office is reduced

Summary of Results for Research Question One

Although site based management has been described as situational and contextual, principals and teachers reached consensus on 91% of factors

surveyed indicating a strong commonality across district types for factors which foster the implementation of site based management.

Principals' and teachers' perceptions on the importance of factors did vary in some important ways. Factors included the existence of formal and informal leadership existing within the faculty, seeking and using parental input, matching salaries to increased responsibilities, and reducing the size of the central office. Teachers perceived all four factors to be of much greater importance than did principals. School personnel should be aware of the variations in perceptions as they attempt to meet the needs of both groups during the implementation of site based management.

Principals and teachers reached consensus on 91% of the literature based factors underscoring the accuracy of the literature in predicting factors which foster the implementation of site based management. However, principals and teachers did not reach consensus on three literature based factors. These included the existence of formal and informal leadership within the faculty, salaries matched to increased responsibilities, and reducing the size of the central office. Teachers rated all three factors higher than principals. School personnel implementing site based management should be aware of these factors as well.

Delphi Results and Discussions for Research Question Two

Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

Round one of the Delphi study produced additional factors not found in the literature. Since much of the literature on site based management is written in the positive, fewer factors were identified as impediments. Factors proposed by the principal and teacher panelists were added to those factors derived from the literature to produce a survey of thirty-eight factors perceived to impeded the implementation of site based management. This survey was used for all subsequent rounds of the Delphi study (see Appendix 2).

Principals' Perceptions

Using a scale of zero to ten, principals rated the thirty-eight factors. Final results showed that all factors were perceived to impede the implementation of site based management but to varying degrees. After four rounds, principals perceived 0 factors as essential or critically important, 19 as very important, 15 as important, 3 as moderately important, and 1 as somewhat important (see table 11).

Most important impediments to site based management included the administration continuing to use an authoritative approach, lack of commitment to site based management, lack of trust, poor communication, lack of principal support or understanding of the concept, lack of shared vision, and lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators. The aforementioned factors which principals perceived to impede site based management closely mirrored factors which principals perceived to foster site based management. Factors considered to be of only moderate importance were the stress created by decentralization and a parent community that is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals.

Table 11.--Principals' ratings of factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
8.75	lack of commitment to site based management
8.62	lack of trust
8.62	poor communication
8.25	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
8.00	lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
8.00	lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
7.88	lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
7.88	inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
7.62	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
7.62	union contract limitations
7.62	lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
7.50	lack of cooperation from union leadership
7.38	lack of school board authorization of site based management
7.38	restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
7.00	administrators with over abundant egos
7.00	frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
7.00	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
7.00	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.88	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
6.88	lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
6.50	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
6.38	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
6.25	lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs
6.25	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
6.12	slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation
6.00	lack of willingness to change
5.88	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
5.88	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
5.75	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
5.62	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
5.62	lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
5.50	state mandates limit flexibility of schools

Table 11.--Continued

Mean	Factors Rated Important
5.00	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
Mean	Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
3.38	stress is created by decentralization
3.00	parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
Mean	Factors Rated Somewhat Important
2.62	merit pay

Of the thirty-eight factors surveyed, principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 18 factors or 47% (see table 12). The lower level of consensus on impeding factors implied that impediments to site based management may be more situational than the factors which foster site based management.

Twenty factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual principals who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 12). These factors included such issues as union contract limitations and lack of cooperation by unions. Rationales provided by principals during round three and round four of the study ranged from expressing the essential nature of good relations with the local union/association to such remarks as "Phooey on unions." "Unions again - they are a waste of energy and only commit to ideas which eventually self-serve," and "Unions are a burden, not worth alliance." Other discrepant factors included opinions on the central office's ability to impact site based management, the merits of middle managers as impediments, and how people react to the change process.

Table 12.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	7 to 10	administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
8.62	7 to 10	lack of trust
8.62	7 to 10	poor communication
8.25	7 to 10	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
8.00	6 to 10	lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
8.00	6 to 10	lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
7.88	7 to 9	lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
7.00	5 to 8	administrators with over abundant egos
7.00	6 to 8	frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	5 to 8	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
6.88	5 to 8	lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
6.50	5 to 8	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
6.38	5 to 8	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
6.25	5 to 8	lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs
5.62	4 to 7	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
5.62	4 to 7	lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
5.50	4 to 7	state mandates limit flexibility of schools
5.00	4 to 6	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
3.38	2 to 5	stress is created by decentralization
3.00	2 to 4	parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.75	6 to 10	lack of commitment to site based management
7.88	5 to 10	inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
7.62	6 to 10	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
7.62	6 to 10	union contract limitations
7.62	5 to 10	lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
7.50	5 to 9	lack of cooperation from union leadership
7.38	5 to 10	lack of school board authorization of site based management
7.38	4 to 9	restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
7.00	5 to 10	the time required to implement site based management is not provided

Table 12.--Continued

Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.00	2 to 10	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Important
6.25	4 to 10	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
6.12	4 to 9	slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation
6.00	2 to 8	lack of willingness to change
5.88	4 to 8	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
5.88	4 to 10	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
5.75	4 to 8	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	0 to 6	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Somewhat Important
2.62	1 to 5	merit pay

Teachers' Perceptions

Of the thirty-eight factors surveyed, teachers perceived 0 factors as essential, 12 as critically important, 22 as very important, 2 as important, 2 as moderately important, and 0 as somewhat important (see table 13). Teachers identified the time required to implement site based management, the inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together, and a lack of commitment to site based management as the top three impediments. These were followed by lack of trust, administration continuing to use an authoritative approach, lack of school board authorization, poor communication, principals not fully understanding the concept or endorsing site based management, lack of training, lack of effort, and lack of a shared vision as other critical factors. Again teachers rated factors slightly higher in general than did principals.

Table 13.--Teachers' ratings of factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
9.83	inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
9.83	lack of commitment to site based management
9.67	lack of trust
9.67	administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
9.67	lack of school board authorization of site based management
9.67	poor communication
9.50	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
9.33	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
9.33	lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
9.17	lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
9.00	lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
8.83	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
8.83	lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
8.83	lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs
8.67	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
8.67	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
8.67	lack of willingness to change
8.50	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
8.50	lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
8.50	administrators with over abundant egos
8.50	restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
8.17	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
8.17	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
8.17	union contract limitations
8.00	lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
8.00	lack of cooperation from union leadership
7.83	state mandates limit flexibility of schools
7.83	parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
7.83	frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
7.33	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
7.17	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems

Table 13.--Continued

Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
7.00	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.67	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
6.17	slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation
Mean	Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.17	stress is created by decentralization
3.33	merit pay

Teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 32 of 38 factors or 84% (see table 14). Six factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual teachers who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 14). Notable was the wide range of rationales giving insight into ratings on merit pay. Some panelists commented that the issue of merit pay was a separate issue from site based management. Others commented that increased responsibility should be accompanied by more pay.

Table 14.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	9 to 10	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
9.83	9 to 10	inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
9.83	9 to 10	lack of commitment to site based management
9.67	8 to 10	lack of trust
9.67	9 to 10	administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
9.67	9 to 10	lack of school board authorization of site based management
9.67	8 to 10	poor communication
9.50	8 to 10	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
9.33	8 to 10	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
9.00	7 to 10	lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	7 to 10	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
8.83	7 to 10	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
8.83	7 to 10	lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
8.83	7 to 10	lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs
8.67	7 to 10	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
8.67	7 to 10	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
8.67	7 to 10	lack of willingness to change
8.50	7 to 10	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
8.50	7 to 10	lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
8.50	7 to 10	administrators with over abundant egos
8.50	7 to 10	restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
8.17	7 to 10	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
8.17	7 to 9	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
8.17	7 to 10	union contract limitations
8.00	7 to 9	lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
8.00	7 to 9	lack of cooperation from union leadership
7.83	7 to 9	state mandates limit flexibility of schools
7.83	6 to 9	parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
7.33	6 to 9	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
7.17	6 to 9	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
7.00	5 to 8	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making

Table 14.--Continued

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.67	5 to 8	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.33	7 to 10	lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
9.17	7 to 10	lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.83	6 to 10	frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Important
6.17	3 to 8	slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.17	3 to 7	stress is created by decentralization
3.33	0 to 5	merit pay

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions

With respect to principals' and teachers' perspectives on factors which impede the implementation of site based management, the panels reached consensus on 24 of 38 factors or 63% (see table 15). Among the consensus items, both panels identified the central office and unions as very important impediments to site based management. The central office continuing to maintain budget control and staffing control, along with setting restrictive policies and procedures, lack of a district statement identifying decision to be made at the site, administrator ego, and the impact by middle managers were all very important issues. Lack of cooperation by unions and union contract limitations were again comparably rated by both principals and teachers. Fourteen factors perceived to impede the implementation of site based management remained in non-consensus (see table 15).

Table 15.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
6.12	6.17	0.04	slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation
6.88	6.67	0.21	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
7.50	8.00	0.50	lack of cooperation from union leadership
7.62	8.17	0.54	union contract limitations
2.62	3.33	0.71	merit pay
3.38	4.17	0.79	stress is created by decentralization
8.88	9.67	0.79	administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
7.00	7.83	0.83	frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
8.00	9.00	1.00	lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
7.62	8.67	1.04	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
8.62	9.67	1.04	lack of trust
8.62	9.67	1.04	poor communication
8.75	9.83	1.08	lack of commitment to site based management
6.88	8.00	1.12	lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
7.38	8.50	1.12	restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
8.00	9.17	1.17	lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
7.62	8.83	1.21	lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
8.25	9.50	1.25	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
7.88	9.33	1.46	lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
5.88	7.33	1.46	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
7.00	8.50	1.50	administrators with over abundant egos
7.00	8.67	1.67	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions

Table 15.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
7.88	9.83	1.96	inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
5.00	7.00	2.00	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
6.38	8.50	2.12	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
5.88	8.17	2.29	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
7.38	9.67	2.29	lack of school board authorization of site based management
5.50	7.83	2.33	state mandates limit flexibility of schools
5.62	8.17	2.54	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
6.25	8.83	2.58	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
6.25	8.83	2.58	lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs
6.00	8.67	2.67	lack of willingness to change
7.00	9.83	2.83	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
6.50	9.33	2.83	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
5.62	8.50	2.88	lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
4.25	7.17	2.92	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
5.75	8.83	3.08	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
3.00	7.83	4.83	parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals

Factors with the greatest differences in ratings were principals' and teachers' perspectives on opposition to site based management voiced by groups, insufficient training of principals, lack of information on school performance, lack of willingness to change, the time required to implement site based management, the impact of principals who control information, lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff, middle managers perceptions that school personnel are not capable of making good decisions, teachers perceptions that principals are not effective instructional leaders, and a parent community that is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals. In all cases, teachers rated these factors as more significant impediments than principals did.

Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Fifteen of thirty-eight factors which impede the implementation of site based management were taken from the literature. Principals perceived 0 factors as essential or critically important, 4 as very important, 9 as important, 2 as moderately important, and 0 as somewhat important (see table 16). The highest rated literature based impediments were principals not fully understanding the concept of site based management or not supporting it, budget control by central office, the time required to implement site based management, and middle manager opposition to site based management because they will lose authority.

Table 16.--Principals' ratings of literature based factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.25	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
7.62	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
7.00	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
7.00	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.88	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
6.50	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
6.38	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
6.25	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
5.88	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
5.88	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
5.75	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
5.62	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
5.00	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
Mean	Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
3.38	stress is created by decentralization

Principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on seven of fifteen factors (see table 17). The highest rated impediment on which the principals' panel reached consensus was principals not fully understanding the concept of site based management or not supporting it.

Eight factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual principals who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 17). These factors ranged from budget control by central office, time and

middle managers opposition to middle managers not feeling that school personnel are best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems.

Table 17.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.25	7 to 10	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	5 to 8	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
6.50	5 to 8	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
6.38	5 to 8	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
5.62	4 to 7	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
5.00	4 to 6	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
3.38	2 to 5	stress is created by decentralization
Mean	Range	Non-Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.62	6 to 10	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
7.00	5 to 10	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
7.00	2 to 10	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
Mean	Range	Non-Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.25	4 to 10	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
5.88	4 to 8	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
5.88	4 to 10	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
5.75	4 to 8	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
Mean	Range	Non-Consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	0 to 6	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems

Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Teachers perceived 0 of the 15 factors taken from the literature as essential, 3 as critically important, 10 as very important, 1 as important, 1 as

moderately important, and 0 as somewhat important (see table 18). The top three impediments perceived by teachers were the time it takes to implement site based management, principals not fully understanding or supporting site based management, and principals purposefully controlling the flow of district information.

Table 18.--Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
9.50	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
9.33	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
8.83	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
8.67	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
8.67	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
8.50	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
8.17	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
8.17	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
7.33	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
7.17	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
7.00	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Important
6.67	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.17	stress is created by decentralization

Teachers reached consensus on 14 factors or 93% (see table 19). One factor remained in non-consensus due to the outlying response by an individual teacher who remained entrenched in his/her opinion (see table 19). This factor was also the lowest rated of the factors - stress created by decentralization.

Table 19.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	9 to 10	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
9.50	8 to 10	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
9.33	8 to 10	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	7 to 10	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
8.83	7 to 10	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
8.67	7 to 10	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
8.67	7 to 10	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
8.50	7 to 10	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
8.17	7 to 10	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
8.17	7 to 9	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
7.33	6 to 9	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
7.17	6 to 9	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
7.00	5 to 8	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.67	5 to 8	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.17	3 to 7	stress is created by decentralization

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

With respect to principals' and teachers' perspectives on literature based factors which impede the implementation of site based management,

the panels reached consensus on 7 of 15 factors (see table 20). Eight literature based factors perceived to impede the implementation of site based management remained in non-consensus (see table 20). In all cases teachers rated factors higher than principals did.

Table 20.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
6.88	6.67	0.21	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
3.38	4.17	0.79	stress is created by decentralization
7.62	8.67	1.04	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
8.25	9.50	1.25	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
5.88	7.33	1.46	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
7.00	8.67	1.67	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
5.00	7.00	2.00	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
6.38	8.50	2.12	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
5.88	8.17	2.29	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
5.62	8.17	2.54	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
6.25	8.83	2.58	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
6.50	9.33	2.83	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
7.00	9.83	2.83	the time required to implement site based management is not provided

Table 20.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
4.25	7.17	2.92	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
5.75	8.83	3.08	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders

Principals and teachers rated stress from decentralization as the least important of the literature based factors rating it only moderately important. Principals not fully understanding or supporting site based management was the highest rated impediment on which they reached consensus.

Of note is the fact that teachers rated "time" as their most important impediment giving it a 9.83 rating on the 0 to 10 scale while principals rated time a 7.00 on the 0 to 10 scale. Although principals rated time as very important, this rating varies significantly from the teachers' perspective of time as critically important.

The greatest difference in rating was given to teachers not perceiving principals as effective instructional leaders. While teachers rated this factor as "very important" with an 8.83 rating, principals labeled it "important" with a 5.75 rating. Principals' and teachers' perceptions were farthest apart on the importance of this factor.

Summary of Results for Research Question Two

Less consensus was reached by principals on impediments to site based management, suggesting that impediments may be more situational. Consensus was reached on only 47% of factors. However, teachers reached consensus on 84% of factors perceived to impede the implementation of site based management suggesting that teachers view impediments more cohesively.

Significant differences were found between principals' and teachers' perceptions on 37% of factors. Factors with the greatest differences in ratings were principals' and teachers' perspectives on opposition to site based management voiced by groups, insufficient training of principals, lack of information on school performance, lack of willingness to change, the time required to implement site based management, the impact of principals who control information, lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff, middle managers perceptions that school personnel are not capable of making good decisions, teachers perceptions that principals are not effective instructional leaders, and a parent community that is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals. In all cases, teachers rated these factors as more significant impediments than principals did. School districts should be aware of the variation in perception in order to meet both group's needs during the implementation process.

Delphi Results and Discussions for Research Question Three

Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering shared decision making in the implementation

of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

The writings and research on shared decision making offered nine factors which were believed to foster shared decision making. The principals' and teachers' panels offered additional factors which they perceive to foster the implementation of shared decision making in a site based system. From these factors, a survey of twenty-four factors was constructed and used in all rounds of the Delphi study (see Appendix 2). Principals and teachers rated the factors for their importance using a scale of 0 to 10 with 0 being unimportant and 10 being essential.

Principals' Perceptions

Principals perceived 0 of the 24 factors as essential, 4 as critically important, 20 as very important, 0 as important, 1 as moderately important, and 0 as somewhat important (see table 21). Critically important factors as perceived by principals included training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal setting, problem solving, and decision making; a collaborative climate which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth; a clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are not; and a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process. Completing the ten highest rated factors were using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones; teachers encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods;

shared goals; open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes; participants involved in a decision supporting, implementing, and monitoring the success of their decision; time to implement shared decision making; and plans for implementation of shared decision making. The lowest rated factor was visiting other sites to learn from their experiences. Principals perceived the latter as moderately important.

Table 21.--Principals' ratings of factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.38	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9.38	clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
9.12	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
8.62	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
8.50	shared goals
8.50	open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
8.50	participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision
8.25	time to implement shared decision making
8.25	plans for implementation of shared decision making
8.12	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
8.00	cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
7.75	administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
7.62	resources available for shared decision making
7.50	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
7.50	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
7.50	training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
7.50	staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
7.50	openness to change
7.50	clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
7.50	use of consensus decision making
7.12	changes impact on every level of the school organization
Mean	Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.88	visiting other sites to learn from their experiences

Of the twenty-four factors, principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 19 factors or 79% (see table 21). Five factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by principals who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 21). A non-consensus factor that should be noted was a high level of trust by constituents in the shared decision making process. Trust was considered essential or critically important by 75% of the panel, but was rated very important by 25% of the panel. Although not considered a consensus item as defined for this study, this factor was still a highly rated factor and should not be minimized by the panel's inability to reach consensus.

Table 22.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	8 to 10	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.38	8 to 10	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9.38	8 to 10	clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	7 to 10	using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
8.62	7 to 10	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
8.50	7 to 10	shared goals
8.50	7 to 10	open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
8.50	7 to 10	participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision
8.25	7 to 10	time to implement shared decision making
8.25	7 to 9	plans for implementation of shared decision making
8.12	7 to 9	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
8.00	7 to 10	cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
7.75	6 to 9	administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
7.50	6 to 9	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
7.50	6 to 9	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
7.50	6 to 9	training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
7.50	6 to 9	staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
7.50	6 to 9	openness to change
7.50	6 to 8	clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.12	7 to 10	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.62	4 to 9	resources available for shared decision making
7.50	5 to 9	use of consensus decision making
7.12	5 to 8	changes impact on every level of the school organization
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.88	2 to 6	visiting other sites to learn from their experiences

Teachers' Perceptions

Teachers perceived four of the twenty-four factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management as essential. They rated 15 as critically important, 5 as very important, 0 as important, moderately important, or as somewhat important (see table 23). Of these twenty-four factors, teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on all factors (see table 24).

Essential factors included time to implement shared decisions, a clear understanding of team roles in decision making, a clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making, and open communication among parties involved in shared decision making.

Table 23.--Teachers' ratings of factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated as Essential
10.00	time to implement shared decision making
10.00	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
10.00	clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
10.00	open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
Mean	Factors Rated as Critically Important
9.83	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.83	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9.83	training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
9.83	administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
9.50	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
9.50	shared goals
9.50	cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
9.50	plans for implementation of shared decision making
9.50	staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
9.50	participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision
9.33	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9.33	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
9.33	resources available for shared decision making
9.33	openness to change
9.17	clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
Mean	Factors Rated as Very Important
8.67	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
8.50	use of consensus decision making
8.17	using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
8.00	visiting other sites to learn from their experiences
7.67	changes impact on every level of the school organization

Table 24.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Essential
10.00	10 to 10	time to implement shared decision making
10.00	10 to 10	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
10.00	10 to 10	clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
10.00	10 to 10	open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	9 to 10	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.83	9 to 10	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9.83	9 to 10	training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
9.83	9 to 10	administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
9.50	9 to 10	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
9.50	8 to 10	shared goals
9.50	8 to 10	cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
9.50	9 to 10	plans for implementation of shared decision making
9.50	9 to 10	staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
9.50	9 to 10	participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision
9.33	8 to 10	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9.33	8 to 10	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
9.33	8 to 10	resources available for shared decision making
9.33	8 to 10	openness to change
9.17	8 to 10	clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.67	7 to 10	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
8.50	7 to 10	use of consensus decision making
8.17	7 to 10	using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
8.00	7 to 9	visiting other sites to learn from their experiences
7.67	6 to 9	changes impact on every level of the school organization

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions

Of the twenty-four factors which were perceived to foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management, the principals' and teachers' panels reached consensus on twenty factors (see table 25).

Teachers rated almost all factors higher than principals. The panels were in closest agreement on the critical importance of trust; training in team building, communication and conflict resolution; and the need for a collaborative climate which encourages teachers to work together and with the principals and other administration toward school improvement as important. Similarly, teachers and principals were in close agreement on the importance of having a clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making; the need for ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making; the need to use shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones; the importance of change impacting on every level of the school organization; and the importance of encouraging teachers to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods.

Table 25.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
9.12	9.33	0.21	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9.50	9.83	0.33	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.38	9.83	0.46	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
7.12	7.67	0.54	changes impact on every level of the school organization
8.12	8.67	0.54	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
9.38	10.00	0.62	clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
8.88	8.17	0.71	using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
8.62	9.50	0.88	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
8.50	9.50	1.00	shared goals
7.50	8.50	1.00	use of consensus decision making
8.50	9.50	1.00	participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision
8.25	9.50	1.25	plans for implementation of shared decision making
8.00	9.50	1.50	cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
8.50	10.00	1.50	open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
7.50	9.17	1.67	clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
7.62	9.33	1.71	resources available for shared decision making
8.25	10.00	1.75	time to implement shared decision making

Table 25.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
7.50	9.33	1.83	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
7.50	9.33	1.83	openness to change
7.50	9.50	2.00	staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
7.75	9.83	2.08	administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
7.50	9.83	2.33	training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
7.50	10.00	2.50	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
4.88	8.00	3.12	visiting other sites to learn from their experiences

Four factors remained in non-consensus due to wider variation in perception between the principals' and teachers' panels (see table 24). Teachers considered all items to be of greater importance than principals. While teachers perceived a clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes to be essential, principals rated it very important. Similarly teachers perceived administrative, staff and parent support for shared decision making and training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes to be critically important while principals rated them very important. Teachers

valued visiting other sites to learn from their experiences at a higher level rating it very important while principals perceived this factors as moderately important. These differences in perception are an important finding of which schools should be aware as they try to meet each group's perceived needs in the implementation shared decision making.

Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Nine of the twenty-four factors surveyed originated in the literature on fostering shared decision making. Principals perceived 0 as essential, 3 as critically important, 18 as very important, 7 as important, 1 as moderately important, and 1 as somewhat important (see table 26). Principals ratings bore out the importance of factors promoted in the literature as fostering the implementation of shared decision making in a site based system. Of most importance to principals were training of participants in team building, communication and conflict resolution; the existence of a collaborative climate which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement; and a high level of trust between constituents involved in the shared decision making process.

Table 26.--Principals' ratings of literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.38	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9.12	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Very Important
8.62	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
8.25	time to implement shared decision making
8.12	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
7.62	resources available for shared decision making
7.50	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
7.50	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues

Of the literature based factors, principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 7 factors or 77% (see table 27.) This high level of consensus suggests the commonality of shared decision making issues across schools and districts. Two factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual principals who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 27). As previously discussed, trust was highly rated by all principals but consensus was not reached because of one outlying response. Similarly, resources available for shared decision making remained in non-consensus due to the outlying opinion of one principal. This principal strongly perceived the role of the principal as the provider of resources when the district could not provide sufficient resources.

Table 27.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	8 to 10	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.38	8 to 10	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.62	7 to 10	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
8.25	7 to 10	time to implement shared decision making
8.12	7 to 9	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
7.50	6 to 9	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
7.50	6 to 9	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.12	7 to 10	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.62	4 to 9	resources available for shared decision making

Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Teachers rated 2 of the literature based factors on shared decision making as essential, 6 as critically important, 1 as very important, and 0 as important, moderately important, or as somewhat important in fostering shared decision making in the implementation of site based management (see table 28). A clear understanding of team roles and time to implement shared decision making were essential to teachers. The panel's high ratings on factors underscore the literature on shared decision making.

Table 28.--Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Essential
10.00	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
10.00	time to implement shared decision making
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.83	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9.50	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
9.33	resources available for shared decision making
9.33	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9.33	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Very Important
8.67	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making

Additionally, teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on all factors (see table 29). This high level of consensus further underscored the commonality of these literature based issues as factors important to teachers in varying types of positions and districts.

Table 29.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Essential
10.00	10 to 10	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
10.00	10 to 10	time to implement shared decision making
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	9 to 10	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.83	9 to 10	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9.50	9 to 10	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
9.33	8 to 10	resources available for shared decision making
9.33	8 to 10	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9.33	8 to 10	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.67	7 to 10	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Of the nine literature based factors which were perceived to foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management, the panels reached consensus on eight factors (see table 30). Of critical importance to both principal and teacher panels were a high level of trust; training of participants in team building, communication, and conflict resolution; and a collaborative climate which encouraged teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement. Although the panels reached consensus on the issue of time, it should be noted that consensus was reached at the 1.75 level. While

principals rated this factor very important (8.25), teachers perceived it as essential (10.0).

Similarly principals perceived the need for teachers to be given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues as very important (7.50) while teachers considered this factor critically important (9.33). Consensus was barely reached at the 1.83 level.

Only one of the nine factors remained in non-consensus due to wider variation in perception between the principals' and teachers' panels (see table 30). Teachers perceived a clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes as essential (10.0) while principals rated this factor 7.5 or very important.

Table 30.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
9.12	9.33	0.21	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9.50	9.83	0.33	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9.38	9.83	0.46	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
8.12	8.67	0.54	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
8.62	9.50	0.88	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
7.62	9.33	1.71	resources available for shared decision making
8.25	10.00	1.75	time to implement shared decision making
7.50	9.33	1.83	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
7.50	10.00	2.50	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes

Summary of Results for Research Question Three

Principals reached consensus on 79% of factors which foster shared decision making while teachers reached consensus on 100% of factors suggesting a strong commonality of factors faced by schools during the implementation of shared decision making. Teachers rated factors which foster the implementation of shared decision making higher overall than principals. School personnel should be aware of the variations in perceptions as they attempt to meet the needs of both groups during the implementation of site based management.

Principals' and teachers' panels reached consensus on 83% of literature based factors thus supporting the literature on shared decision making. However, significant differences in perception were held by principals and teachers on four literature based factors perceived to foster the implementation of shared decision making. A clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes; administrative, staff and parent support for shared decision making; training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes; and visiting other sites to learn from their experiences were factors on which principals and teachers held differing perspectives. School personnel should be aware of the variations in perceptions as they attempt to meet the needs of both groups during the implementation of site based management.

Delphi Results and Discussions for Research Question Four

Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding shared decision making in the implementation

of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

Since the research on shared decision making was somewhat limited and tended to be written in terms of fostering this decision making model as opposed to limiting it, no literature based factors were combined with principal and teacher generated factors for the survey. All twenty-six factors were offered by panelists during round one of the Delphi study.

Principals' Perceptions

Using a scale of zero to ten, principals rated these twenty-six factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management. They perceived 0 factors as essential, 4 as critically important, 16 as very important, 6 as important, 0 as moderately important or as somewhat important (see table 31).

Highest rated factors included administration not valuing or not perceived to value solicited teacher input, central office nullifying shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made, poor communication or closed communication, and administrators unwilling to relinquish power and authority.

Table 31.--Principals' ratings of factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
9.25	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
9.00	poor communication or closed communication
9.00	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	lack of trust
8.75	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
8.50	risk taking is not fostered
8.38	lack of training in shared decision making
8.12	poor planning in the decision making process
8.00	perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
8.00	failures are not used for growth
7.88	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
7.62	lack of common goals
7.62	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved
7.50	perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
7.50	lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
7.38	staff burdened with other tasks
7.38	central office processes for approving site decisions
7.25	conflicts within the administrative team
7.00	sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.88	lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
6.50	time it takes to implement shared decision making
6.50	unwillingness to change
6.50	emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems
6.38	inadequate resources for shared decision making
5.38	fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff

Of these twenty-six factors, principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 19 factors or 73% (see table 32.) Seven factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual principals who remained entrenched in

their opinions (see table 32). The remainder of the panel was in close consensus on these factors.

Table 32.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	8 to 10	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
9.25	8 to 10	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
9.00	7 to 10	poor communication or closed communication
9.00	8 to 10	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	7 to 10	lack of trust
8.75	7 to 10	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
8.50	7 to 10	risk taking is not fostered
8.38	7 to 10	lack of training in shared decision making
8.12	7 to 9	poor planning in the decision making process
8.00	7 to 10	perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
8.00	6 to 9	failures are not used for growth
7.88	7 to 9	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
7.62	6 to 9	lack of common goals
7.62	6 to 8	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved
7.50	6 to 9	perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
7.38	6 to 9	staff burdened with other tasks
7.25	6 to 8	conflicts within the administrative team
7.00	5 to 8	sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
6.50	5 to 8	time it takes to implement shared decision making
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.50	5 to 9	lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
7.38	5 to 8	central office processes for approving site decisions
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	2 to 8	lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
6.50	2 to 8	unwillingness to change
6.50	0 to 10	emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems
6.38	3 to 8	inadequate resources for shared decision making
5.38	0 to 8	fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff

Teachers' Perceptions

Teachers rated 2 of the 26 factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management as essential, 12 as critically important, 11 as very important, 1 as important, 0 as moderately important or as somewhat important (see table 33). Considered essential by the teachers' panel were lack of clear purpose in decision making process and lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff, and administration. Critically important factors in impeding shared decision making in a site based system included such issues as lack of cooperation at the building level, poor communication, lack of common goals, lack of trust, inadequate resources, lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved, and the perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters. Also perceived as critically important were administrative issues such as the central office nullifying shared decisions if it disagrees with a resulting decision at the building level, administration not valuing or perceived not to value solicited teacher input, and administrators unwilling to relinquish power and authority.

Table 33.--Teachers' ratings of factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Essential
10.00	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
10.00	lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
9.83	poor communication or closed communication
9.83	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
9.67	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
9.67	lack of common goals
9.67	lack of trust
9.50	inadequate resources for shared decision making
9.50	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
9.33	poor planning in the decision making process
9.33	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved
9.17	lack of training in shared decision making
9.00	perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
8.83	risk taking is not fostered
8.67	central office processes for approving site decisions
8.33	conflicts within the administrative team
8.17	lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
8.17	unwillingness to change
8.17	emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems
8.17	failures are not used for growth
7.50	staff burdened with other tasks
7.50	sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
7.33	time it takes to implement shared decision making
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.83	fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff

Teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 25 of 26 factors or 96% (see table 34). One factor remained in non-consensus due to the outlying, lower response by an individual teacher who rated the factor as important when the

remainder of the panel perceived it to be very important or essential. This factor was failures are not used for growth (see table 34).

Table 34.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Essential
10.00	10 to 10	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
10.00	10 to 10	lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	9 to 10	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
9.83	9 to 10	poor communication or closed communication
9.83	9 to 10	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
9.67	8 to 10	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
9.67	9 to 10	lack of common goals
9.67	8 to 10	lack of trust
9.50	8 to 10	inadequate resources for shared decision making
9.50	8 to 10	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
9.33	8 to 10	poor planning in the decision making process
9.33	8 to 10	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved
9.17	8 to 10	lack of training in shared decision making
9.00	7 to 10	perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	7 to 10	perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
8.83	7 to 10	risk taking is not fostered
8.67	7 to 10	central office processes for approving site decisions
8.33	7 to 10	conflicts within the administrative team
8.17	7 to 9	lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
8.17	7 to 10	unwillingness to change
8.17	7 to 9	emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems
7.50	6 to 9	staff burdened with other tasks
7.50	6 to 9	sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
7.33	6 to 8	time it takes to implement shared decision making
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.83	5 to 8	fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.17	6 to 10	failures are not used for growth

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions

With respect to principals' and teachers' perspectives on factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management, the panels reached consensus on 22 of 26 factors or 85% (see table 35). Of note is the finding that principals and teachers agreed that administration not valuing or perceived not to value solicited teacher input, central office nullifying shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made, poor communication or closed communication, and administrators unwilling to relinquish power and authority are critical impeders to the implementation of shared decision making in a site based system.

Four factors perceived to impede the implementation of site based management remained in non-consensus (see table 35). Of these factors teachers perceived all to be essential or critically important while principals perceived them to be very important or important. This significant discrepancy of opinion was held on lack of common goals; lack of clear purpose in decision making process; lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff, and administration; and inadequate resources for shared decision making. The greatest variation in opinion was on the latter with teachers rating inadequate resources for shared decision making 9.50 and principals rating it 6.38.

Table 35.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which impede shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
7.38	7.50	0.12	staff burdened with other tasks
9.50	9.67	0.17	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
8.00	8.17	0.17	failures are not used for growth
8.50	8.83	0.33	risk taking is not fostered
7.00	7.50	0.50	sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
9.00	9.50	0.50	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
9.25	9.83	0.58	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
8.88	9.67	0.79	lack of trust
8.38	9.17	0.79	lack of training in shared decision making
9.00	9.83	0.83	poor communication or closed communication
8.00	8.83	0.83	perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
6.50	7.33	0.83	time it takes to implement shared decision making
8.75	9.83	1.08	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
7.25	8.33	1.08	conflicts within the administrative team
8.12	9.33	1.21	poor planning in the decision making process
6.88	8.17	1.29	lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
7.38	8.67	1.29	central office processes for approving site decisions
5.38	6.83	1.46	fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff
7.50	9.00	1.50	perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
6.50	8.17	1.67	unwillingness to change
6.50	8.17	1.67	emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems
7.62	9.33	1.71	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved

Table 35.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
7.62	9.67	2.04	lack of common goals
7.88	10.00	2.12	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
7.50	10.00	2.50	lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
6.38	9.50	3.12	inadequate resources for shared decision making

Summary of Results for Research Question Four

Principals reached consensus on 73% of factors perceived to impede shared decision making in a site based system. This high level of consensus underscores the strong commonality of factors faced by schools during the implementation of shared decision making.

Teachers reached consensus on 96% of factors perceived to impede shared decision making also underscoring the strong commonality of factors faced by schools during the implementation of shared decision making.

A high level of agreement was reached between the principals' and teachers' panels as to the factors which impede the implementation of shared decision making. The panels reached consensus on 85% of factors underscoring the commonality of factors across positions and district types.

Significant differences in perception between principals and teachers were evident on four factors which impede the implementation of site based management. Teachers perceived all to be essential or critically important while principals perceived them to be very important or important. This significant discrepancy of opinion was held on lack of common goals, lack of

clear purpose in the decision making process; lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff, and administration; and inadequate resources for shared decision making. The greatest variation in opinion was on the latter with teachers rating inadequate resources for shared decision making critically important while principals rated it important. School personnel should be aware of the variations in perceptions as they attempt to meet the needs of teacher and principal groups during the implementation of site based management.

Delphi Results and Discussions for Research Question Five

Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

Research and writings by Bailey provided the literature foundation for factors surveyed in question five. Principals and teachers offered additional factors which were incorporated to develop a twenty-seven factor survey which was used in all successive rounds of the Delphi study (see Appendix 2).

Principals' Perceptions

Using a scale of 0 to 10, principals identified 0 of the 27 factors as essential, 3 as critically important, 21 as very important, 3 as important, 0 as moderately important or as somewhat important in fostering the acceptance of accountability in a site based system (see table 36). Top rated factors included creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated; where there is commitment to improving school programs;

and where the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders.

Table 36.--Principals' ratings of factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated
9.12	commitment to improving school programs
9.12	the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
8.88	collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
8.88	a high level of trust exists
8.75	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
8.75	emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure
8.62	support of administration and staff for ideas implemented
8.62	decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
8.50	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
8.50	training to help accomplish tasks
8.50	board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
8.38	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
8.38	shared goals
8.38	authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
8.25	adequate resources are available to implement decisions
8.00	recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
7.88	a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior
7.86	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
7.75	proper implementation of decisions
7.75	frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
7.75	site based management processes are revised as needed
7.62	consensus decision making is used
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.88	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
6.75	the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
5.88	enthusiastic and involved parents

Principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 19 of the 27 factors or 70% (see

table 37). Eight factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual principals who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 37).

It should be noted that all non-consensus factors had narrow ranges of 3 or 4 points. On items such as commitment to improving school programs, the decision making group using ideas from all members, a high level of trust, and authority and responsibility being clearly delineated to those involved in sharing in the decision making, the majority of principals rated these items as essential or as very important. However, one principal's lower rating held the group from consensus. Conversely, on two of the lowest rated factors, the majority of principals rated the factor as important while an individual principal persisted in rating them as very or critically important thus withholding the panel from consensus.

Table 37.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.50	8 to 10	creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	8 to 10	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
8.88	7 to 10	collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
8.75	7 to 10	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
8.75	7 to 10	emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure
8.62	7 to 10	support of administration and staff for ideas implemented
8.62	7 to 10	decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
8.50	7 to 10	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
8.50	7 to 10	training to help accomplish tasks
8.50	7 to 10	board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
8.38	7 to 9	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
8.38	7 to 10	shared goals
8.00	6 to 9	recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
7.86	7 to 9	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
7.75	7 to 9	proper implementation of decisions
7.75	6 to 9	frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
7.75	6 to 9	site based management processes are revised as needed
7.62	6 to 9	consensus decision making is used
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.75	5 to 8	the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.12	7 to 10	commitment to improving school programs
9.12	7 to 10	the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	6 to 10	a high level of trust exists
8.38	6 to 10	authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
8.25	6 to 10	adequate resources are available to implement decisions
7.88	6 to 10	a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior

Table 37.--Continued

Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	5 to 9	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
5.88	5 to 8	enthusiastic and involved parents

Teachers' Perceptions

Of the twenty-seven factors surveyed which foster the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management, teachers perceived 0 as essential, 21 as critically important, 5 as very important, 0 as important, 1 as moderately important, and 0 as somewhat important (see table 38).

Table 38.--Teachers' ratings of factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	training to help accomplish tasks
9.83	authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
9.83	board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
9.67	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
9.67	commitment to improving school programs
9.67	the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
9.67	collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
9.50	support of administration and staff for ideas implemented
9.50	proper implementation of decisions
9.50	a high level of trust exists
9.50	decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
9.50	adequate resources are available to implement decisions
9.50	emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure
9.33	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
9.33	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
9.33	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
9.33	site based management processes are revised as needed
9.17	frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
9.17	shared goals
9.00	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
9.00	enthusiastic and involved parents
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
8.83	consensus decision making is used
8.83	creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated
8.67	the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
7.50	recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
Mean	Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.67	a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior

Of these twenty-seven factors, teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on

twenty-six factors (see table 39). One factor remained in non-consensus due to the outlying response by an individual teacher who remained entrenched in his/her opinion (see table 39.) This factor, creating an environment where risking training is encouraged, was rated essential by two-thirds of the panel. Consensus was not reached because one teacher persisted in rating the factor important.

Table 39.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.83	9 to 10	training to help accomplish tasks
9.83	9 to 10	authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
9.83	9 to 10	board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
9.67	8 to 10	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
9.67	8 to 10	commitment to improving school programs
9.67	8 to 10	the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
9.67	8 to 10	collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
9.50	8 to 10	support of administration and staff for ideas implemented
9.50	8 to 10	proper implementation of decisions
9.50	8 to 10	a high level of trust exists
9.50	8 to 10	decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
9.50	9 to 10	adequate resources are available to implement decisions
9.50	8 to 10	emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure
9.33	8 to 10	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
9.33	8 to 10	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
9.33	8 to 10	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
9.33	8 to 10	site based management processes are revised as needed
9.17	8 to 10	frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
9.17	8 to 10	shared goals
9.00	8 to 10	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
9.00	8 to 10	enthusiastic and involved parents
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	7 to 10	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
8.83	7 to 10	consensus decision making is used
8.67	7 to 10	the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
7.50	6 to 9	recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.67	4 to 6	a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	6 to 10	creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions

Of the twenty-seven factors which were perceived to foster the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management, the panels reached consensus on 24 of the 27 factors (see table 40). In general factors were rated higher by teachers than by principals.

Three factors remained in non-consensus due to wider variation in perception between the principals' and teachers' panels (see table 40). These included the superintendent providing training for the board of education on policy issues related to site based management, enthusiastic and involved parents, and a climate existing where teachers "call" each other on their behavior. While the first two factors were rated higher by teachers, the last factor was rated higher by principals. Principals perceived a climate where teachers are willing to "call" others on inappropriate behavior and thus provide internal measures within their own ranks to safeguard a positive school climate as very important in fostering accountability. Teachers perceived the responsibility for policing their own ranks to be less important than did principals and rated this factor only moderately important.

Table 40.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
8.88	9.33	0.46	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
8.38	8.83	0.46	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
8.00	7.50	0.50	recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
9.12	9.67	0.54	commitment to improving school programs
9.12	9.67	0.54	the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
8.75	9.33	0.58	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
8.88	9.50	0.62	a high level of trust exists
9.50	8.83	0.67	creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated
8.75	9.50	0.75	emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure
8.38	9.17	0.79	shared goals
8.88	9.67	0.79	collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
8.50	9.33	0.83	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
8.62	9.50	0.88	support of administration and staff for ideas implemented
8.62	9.50	0.88	decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
7.86	9.00	1.14	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
7.62	8.83	1.21	consensus decision making is used
8.25	9.50	1.25	adequate resources are available to implement decisions
8.50	9.83	1.33	training to help accomplish tasks
8.50	9.83	1.33	board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
7.75	9.17	1.42	frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used

Table 40.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
8.38	9.83	1.46	authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
7.75	9.33	1.58	site based management processes are revised as needed
7.75	9.50	1.75	proper implementation of decisions
6.75	8.67	1.92	the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
6.88	9.67	2.79	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
5.88	9.00	3.12	enthusiastic and involved parents
7.88	4.67	3.21	a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior

Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Bailey's research and writings on accountability in site based systems provided six of the twenty-seven factors surveyed. Using a scale of 0 to 10, principals rated 0 as essential or as critically important, 5 as very important, 1 as important, and 0 as moderately important or as somewhat important (see table 41).

Table 41.--Principals' ratings of literature based factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
8.75	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
8.50	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
8.38	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
7.86	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
Mean	Literature Based Factors Rated Important
6.88	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability

Of these six factors, principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on five factors (see table 42). One factor remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by two principals who remained entrenched in divergent opinions with one rating this factor as important and the other rating it critically important (see table 42).

Table 42.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus literature based factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.88	8 to 10	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
8.75	7 to 10	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
8.50	7 to 10	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
8.38	7 to 9	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
7.86	7 to 9	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals

Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Important
6.88	5 to 9	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability

Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Of the six factors originating in the literature on fostering accountability in conjunction with the the implementation of site (school) based management, teachers rated 0 as essential, 5 as critically important, 1 as very important, and 0 as important, moderately important or as somewhat important (see table 43).

Table 43.--Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Means	Literature Based Factors Rated Critically Important
9.67	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
9.33	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
9.33	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
9.33	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
9.00	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
Means	Literature Based Factors Rated Very Important
8.83	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff

Of these six factors, teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on all factors thus supporting the existing research on accountability (see table 43).

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' perspectives of Literature Based Factors

Of the six literature based factors which were perceived to foster the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management, the panels reached consensus on 5 factors (see table 44). Teachers and principals from varying types of schools concurred with Bailey that school staffs must create new forms of accountability; take a pro-active approach to accountability; set goals, direct resources and efforts; create systems of shared accountability; and use a variety of measures.

One factor remained in non-consensus due to wider variation in perception between the principals' and teachers' panels (see table 44).

Teachers rated the importance of the superintendent providing training for the board of education on policy issues related to site based management as more important than the principals' panel. While teachers found this factor to be critically important (9.67), principals rated it important (6.88).

Table 44.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
8.38	8.83	0.46	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
8.88	9.33	0.46	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
8.75	9.33	0.58	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
8.50	9.33	0.83	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
7.86	9.00	1.14	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
6.88	9.67	2.79	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability

Summary of Results for Research Question Five

Principals reached consensus on 70% of factors perceived to foster the acceptance of accountability highlighting the strong commonality of factors faced by schools during the implementation of site based management.

Teachers reached consensus on 96% of factors which foster the acceptance of accountability highlighting the strong commonality of factors faced by schools during the implementation of site based management.

Agreement between the principals' and teachers' panels was reached on 89% of factors underscoring the commonality of factors perceived to foster the acceptance of accountability across positions and district types.

Principals and teachers reached consensus on 84% of literature based factors perceived to foster the acceptance of accountability in a site based system. This finding supports the literature on accountability and highlights the commonality of factors which foster the acceptance of accountability in a site based system across positions and district types.

Principals and teachers disagreed on one literature based factor related to accountability. Teachers rated the importance of the superintendent providing training for the board of education on policy issues related to site based management as more important than the principals. While teachers found this factor to be critically important, principals rated it important. School personnel should be aware of this difference in perception as they attempt to meet the needs of both groups during the implementation of site based management.

Delphi Results and Discussions for Research Question Six

Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

A survey of twenty factors was used to address the question of impediments to accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management. Three factors were derived from the literature. These were combined with seventeen factors offered by the principals and teachers during round one of the Delphi study (see Appendix 2).

Principals' Perceptions

Principals rated 0 of the 20 factors as essential or critically important, 10 as very important, 9 as important, 1 as moderately important, and 0 as somewhat important (see table 45). Lack of training was the top rated factor. Lack of time to properly implement decisions, lack of trust, lack of commitment of district goals and vision, lack of commitment to decisions, lack of resources to implement decisions, lack of evaluation procedures, frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals, and a school climate where negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved followed as very important factors. The concept that sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging was the lowest rated factor, earning a moderately important rating of 4.25.

Table 45.--Principals' ratings of factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.38	lack of training
7.75	lack of time to implement decisions properly
7.62	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
7.62	lack of trust
7.50	lack of commitment to district goals and vision
7.50	school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
7.50	lack of commitment to the decision
7.50	lack of resources to implement decisions
7.12	lack of evaluation procedures
7.12	frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
Mean	Factors Rated Important
6.62	lack of support for decisions made by others
6.62	competition between departments and schools
6.50	fear of repercussions from decisions
6.50	lack of willingness to change
6.25	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
6.00	lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what
6.00	the need to assign blame if something fails
5.62	lack of communication to the board of education
5.50	lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making
Mean	Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

Principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 15 of 20 factors or 75% (see table 46). This high level of consensus is an important finding demonstrating the commonality of factors negatively affecting the acceptance of accountability as perceived by principals.

Five factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual principals who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 46). Although principals failed to come to consensus, the mean responses of these factors indicated that all factors were perceived as very important or important. The variation in responses may suggest that these factors are more situational. For instance, one outlying principal rated lack of willingness to change as only somewhat important where the remainder of the panel identified it as important or very important. The ratings on competition as an impeding factor ranged from moderately important to critically important. While one might assume that the higher responses actually came from high school districts with multiple schools and departmentalized systems, the responses came from principals of elementary buildings serving kindergarten through sixth grade students. These buildings were part of elementary school systems.

Table 46.--Principals' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.38	7 to 10	lack of training
7.75	6 to 9	lack of time to implement decisions properly
7.62	6 to 9	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
7.62	6 to 9	lack of trust
7.50	6 to 9	lack of commitment to district goals and vision
7.50	6 to 9	school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
7.50	6 to 9	lack of commitment to the decision
7.12	6 to 8	lack of evaluation procedures
7.12	6 to 8	frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.62	5 to 8	lack of support for decisions made by others
6.50	5 to 8	fear of repercussions from decisions
6.25	5 to 8	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
6.00	4 to 8	lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what
5.50	4 to 7	lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	3 to 5	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.50	5 to 9	lack of resources to implement decisions
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Important
6.62	4 to 9	competition between departments and schools
6.50	2 to 8	lack of willingness to change
6.00	3 to 8	the need to assign blame if something fails
5.62	4 to 8	lack of communication to the board of education

Teachers' Perceptions

Teachers rated 0 of the 20 factors as essential, 12 as critically important, 7 as very important, 1 as important, and 0 as moderately important or as

somewhat important (see table 47). Lack of commitment to the decision, lack of commitment to district goals and vision, lack of time to properly implement decisions, lack of resources to implement decisions, lack of a clear directive from the board of education, lack of support for decisions made by others, lack of training, lack of trust, fear of repercussions from decisions, lack of evaluation procedures, lack of community and parent support for involvement of teachers in decision making, and lack of willingness to change were all rated critically important by teachers. The concept that sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging was rated important suggesting that teachers hold a negative outlook on accountability.

Table 47.--Teachers' ratings of factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
9.67	lack of commitment to the decision
9.50	lack of commitment to district goals and vision
9.50	lack of time to implement decisions properly
9.50	lack of resources to implement decisions
9.50	lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what
9.33	lack of support for decisions made by others
9.33	lack of training
9.33	lack of trust
9.17	fear of repercussions from decisions
9.00	lack of evaluation procedures
9.00	lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making
9.00	lack of willingness to change
Mean	Factors Rated Very Important
8.67	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
8.67	school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
8.17	lack of communication to the board of education
7.50	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
7.50	the need to assign blame if something fails
7.17	competition between departments and schools
7.00	frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
Mean	Factors Rated Critically Important
6.00	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

Teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on 16 of 20 factors or 80% (see table 49). Four factors remained in non-consensus due to outlying responses by individual teachers who remained entrenched in their opinions (see table 48).

The range on two factors was very small in comparison to the other non-consensus factors. Lack of trust was rated essential by two-thirds of the

teachers' panel. One teacher stood firm in a rating of very important thus creating non-consensus due to his/her outlying response. Similarly fear of repercussions from decisions was rated essential by half the panelists and critically important by one-third of the panelists. One outlying panel member who continued to rate the factor as very important forced the non-consensus result. A third factor, the need to assign blame if something fails, had the broadest range with one teacher continuing to rate the factor as somewhat important in comparison to the majority of the panel members who perceived this factor as critically important or essential. All three of these factors suggest that teachers perceive schools as potentially hostile environments where the lack of trust, fear of repercussions and the need to assign blame impede teachers' willingness to accept accountability in a site based system.

Table 48.--Teachers' ratings of consensus and non-consensus factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.67	9 to 10	lack of commitment to the decision
9.50	8 to 10	lack of commitment to district goals and vision
9.50	8 to 10	lack of time to implement decisions properly
9.50	9 to 10	lack of resources to implement decisions
9.50	9 to 10	lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what
9.33	9 to 10	lack of support for decisions made by others
9.33	8 to 10	lack of training
9.00	8 to 10	lack of evaluation procedures
9.00	8 to 10	lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making
9.00	7 to 10	lack of willingness to change
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.67	7 to 10	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
8.67	7 to 10	school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
8.17	7 to 9	lack of communication to the board of education
7.50	6 to 8	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
7.00	5 to 8	frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
Mean	Range	Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.00	4 to 8	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Critically Important
9.33	7 to 10	lack of trust
9.17	7 to 10	fear of repercussions from decisions
Mean	Range	Non-consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.50	2 to 10	the need to assign blame if something fails
7.17	5 to 8	competition between departments and schools

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions

With respect to principals' and teachers' perspectives on factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the

implementation of site based management, the principals' and teachers' panels reached consensus on 13 of 20 factors (see table 49.) Seven factors perceived to impede the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management remained in non-consensus between the two panels (see table 49.)

Table 49.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
7.12	7.00	0.12	frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
6.62	7.17	0.54	competition between departments and schools
8.38	9.33	0.96	lack of training
7.62	8.67	1.04	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
7.50	8.67	1.17	school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
6.25	7.50	1.25	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
6.00	7.50	1.50	the need to assign blame if something fails
7.62	9.33	1.71	lack of trust
4.25	6.00	1.75	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging
7.75	9.50	1.75	lack of time to implement decisions properly
7.12	9.00	1.88	lack of evaluation procedures
7.50	9.50	2.00	lack of commitment to district goals and vision
7.50	9.50	2.00	lack of resources to implement decisions

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
7.50	9.67	2.17	lack of commitment to the decision
6.50	9.00	2.50	lack of willingness to change
5.62	8.17	2.54	lack of communication to the board of education
6.50	9.17	2.67	fear of repercussions from decisions
6.62	9.33	2.71	lack of support for decisions made by others
5.50	9.00	3.50	lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making

Table 49.--Continued

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Non-consensus Factors
6.00	9.50	3.50	lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what

In general the teachers' panel rated all factors higher than did the principals' panel. While the teachers perceived over half of the factors as critically important, principals did not perceive any of the factors as critically important. The panels reached non-consensus at a much lower level on this research question.

Factors with the greatest consensus ratings included frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals, competition between departments and schools, lack of training, teachers caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures, a school climate where negativism is allowed to undermine, and teachers not wanting to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions. These factors suggest that principals and teachers perceive key factors in the same way.

Non-consensus results suggest that principals and teachers have significantly different perspectives on several other key factors. Teachers perceived lack of communication to the board of education and lack of clear directive from the board of education identifying who is responsible for what as significantly more important than did the principals' panel. The greatest discrepancy in panel perceptions occurred over lack of community and parent

support for involvement in decision making and lack of clear directive from the board of education identifying who is responsible for what.

Principals' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Three of twenty factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the the implementation of site (school) based management originated in the literature. Principals perceived 0 factors as essential or critically important, 1 as very important, 1 as important, 1 as moderately important, and 0 as somewhat important (see table 50). Of these three factors, principals reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on all factors (see table 50).

Table 50.--Principals' ratings of literature based factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Literature Based/Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
7.62	6 to 9	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
Mean	Range	Literature Based/Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.25	5 to 8	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
Mean	Range	Literature Based/Consensus Factors Rated Moderately Important
4.25	3 to 5	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

Principals agreed with David's concept that teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures and that teachers

do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions over which they have no control. However, principals did not place great importance on Bailey's and David's contention that sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging.

Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

Three of twenty factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the the implementation of site (school) based management were found in the literature. Teachers perceived 0 factors as essential or as critically important, 2 as very important, 1 as important, and 0 as moderately important or somewhat important (see table 51). Of these three factors, teachers reached consensus (defined as all final ratings being no more than two points above or below the mean) on all factors (see table 51).

Table 51.--Teachers' ratings of literature based factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Mean	Range	Literature Based/Consensus Factors Rated Very Important
8.67	7 to 10	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
7.50	6 to 8	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
Mean	Range	Literature Based/Consensus Factors Rated Important
6.00	4 to 8	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

Teachers confirmed David's concept that they perceive themselves to be caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures.

They also confirmed that teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions over which they have no control. Additionally, teachers rated Bailey's and David's contentions that sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging as important.

Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Literature Based Factors

With respect to principals' and teachers' perspectives on factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management, the panels reached consensus on all literature based factors (see table 52). However, it should be noted that consensus was attained with more than one rating point difference as teachers rated all items higher. The greatest difference was apparent on sharing accountability where consensus was barely reached at the 1.75 level. Principals rated this factor as moderately important suggesting a more positive and controllable perspective on the issue of accountability in a site based system. However, teachers' rating of the factor suggested a more negative and less controllable perspective on the issue of accountability in a site based system.

Table 52.--Comparison of consensus between principals' and teachers' ratings of literature based factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development

Principals' Mean	Teachers' Mean	Absolute Value of the Difference	Consensus Factors
7.62	8.67	1.04	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
6.25	7.50	1.25	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
4.25	6.00	1.75	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

Summary of Results for Research Question Six

Principals reached consensus on 75% of factors perceived to impede the acceptance of accountability in a site based system highlighting the strong commonality of factors faced by schools during the implementation of site based management.

Teachers reached consensus on 80% of factors perceived to impede the acceptance of accountability in a site based system highlighting the strong commonality of factors faced by schools during the implementation of site based management.

Agreement between principals' and teachers' panels was reached on 65% of factors indicating commonality of factors which impede the acceptance of accountability in a site based system yet highlighting lack of agreement on key factors related to accountability. Teachers perceived lack of communication to the board of education and lack of clear directive from the

board of education identifying who is responsible for what as significantly more important than did the principals' panel. The greatest discrepancy in panel perceptions occurred over lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making and lack of clear directive from the board of education identifying who is responsible for what. School personnel should be aware of these variations in perceptions as they attempt to meet the needs of both groups during the implementation of site based management.

Principals and teachers reached consensus on 100% of literature based factors perceived to impede the acceptance of accountability in a site based system. This level of consensus underscores the literature on accountability.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

FACTORS PERCEIVED TO FOSTER OR IMPEDE THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF SITE (SCHOOL) BASED MANAGEMENT:
PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES
VOLUME II: CHAPTER 5 - APPENDIX 5

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

MYRA C. SANDERS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 1995

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Purpose

This study was designed to examine the perceptions of building principals and teachers who have depth of knowledge and experience implementing site based management. While much of the literature suggested that site based management is situational and contextual, this study endeavored to produce a consensus opinion among building principals and teachers of selected Illinois public schools as to the factors they perceived as fostering or impeding 1) the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development, 2) shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development, and 3) the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development. Additionally, the study provided data enabling practitioners' perceptions to be compared and contrasted with factors identified in the literature.

Summary of Procedures

This study was conducted in two phases. A qualitative survey of principals and teachers was conducted to screen and select ten principals and

ten teachers who were practitioners of site based management who have depth of knowledge in at least two of three areas of site based management (budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development). These principals and teachers subsequently participated as expert panelists in a Delphi study which consisted of four rounds. During round one, factors which foster or impede the implementation of site based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system were proffered by the panelists. Following round one, factors derived from the literature were combined with panelists' factors to form a survey of 180 factors. During subsequent rounds of the study, expert panelists rated these 180 factors for their importance using a scale of zero (unimportant) to ten (essential). Rounds concluded when panelists reached consensus and/or entrenched in their opinions as evidenced by lack of movement toward the mean and by their written rationales.

Research Questions

Research Questions examined by this study were:

1. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
2. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?

3. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering shared decision making in the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
4. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding shared decision making in the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
5. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as fostering the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
6. Which factors do principals and/or teachers of selected Illinois public schools perceive as impeding the acceptance of accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site (school) based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development?
7. How do principals' and teachers' perspectives on factors perceived to foster or impede the implementation of site (school) based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system align with factors found in the literature?

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from this study:

1. Implementation of site (school) based management is an involved, multi-faceted process.

2. Consensus was reached between the principals' and teachers' panels on the importance of factors perceived to foster the implementation of site based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system.
3. Consensus was reached between the principals' and teachers' panels on the importance of factors perceived to impede the implementation of site based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system.
4. The teachers' panel reached consensus on more factors perceived to impede the implementation of site based management than did the principals' panel.
5. Significant differences in perception were evident in the way principals and teachers perceived the importance of several factors identified as fostering the implementation of site (school) based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system.
6. Principals' and teachers' panels agreed on the importance of most factors identified in the literature.
7. Significant differences were evident in the way principals and teachers perceived the importance of several factors identified in the literature.

Implications

There are several implications of this study. Implications have been written in parallel form to the aforementioned conclusions.

First, the literature suggested that the implementation of site based management is an involved process. This study supported that description of

site based management since all factors surveyed (180) were perceived by principals and teachers to be important in the implementation of site based management but to varying degrees.

Second, the literature on site based management suggested that the implementation of site based management is highly contextual and situational. Contrary to this description, the findings of this study show strong commonality of perceptions on the importance of factors fostering the implementation of site based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system. This high level of consensus implied a strong commonality of factors involved in the implementation of site based management which crossed positions, schools, and district types. School personnel should be aware of these factors which could act as a guide to implementation.

Factors considered by principals and teachers to be critically important in fostering the implementation of site based management included such factors as the principal being motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions; encouraging experimentation and risk taking; a sense of trust in the organization; continuous and good communication up and down the organizational structure; teacher ownership through initiating issues for site decisions; active and involved staff at the building level; shared decision making which is demonstrated and promoted; and a collegial atmosphere existing between principal and teachers.

Critically important factors perceived to foster shared decision making included such factors as a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process; training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal setting, problem

solving and decision making; the need for a collaborative climate which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth; and a clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making.

Factors perceived to be critically or very important in fostering the acceptance of accountability included such factors as schools taking a proactive approach to accountability and developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement; commitment to improving school programs; the decision making group using ideas from all members, not just its leaders; a high level of trust; districts using a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system; and training to help accomplish tasks.

The third implication of this study demonstrated common perceptions held by principals and teachers on factors perceived to impede the implementation of site based management, shared decision making, and the acceptance of accountability in a site based system. Their common perceptions were demonstrated by the high level of consensus between the principals' and teachers' panels for the majority of factors surveyed. School personnel implementing site based management should be aware of these common perceptions since they crossed positions, schools, and district types. These factors represent significant impediments in the successful implementation of site based management.

Principals and teachers perceived such factors as lack of trust; poor communication; lack of commitment to site based management; principals not fully understanding the concept of site based management or not supporting it; and administrators continuing to utilize an authoritative

approach as critically or very important impediments to the implementation of site based management.

With respect to impeding the implementation of shared decision making, principals and teachers perceived such factors as administrators not valuing or not perceived to value solicited teacher input; administrators unwilling to relinquish power and authority; central office nullifying shared decisions if it does not agree with the resulting decision made at the building; and poor or closed communication as critically important.

Principals and teachers perceived such factors as lack of training; a school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved; lack of trust; lack of time to implement decisions properly; lack of resources to implement decisions; and lack of commitment to district goals and vision as critically or very important impediments to the acceptance of accountability in a site based system.

The fourth implication of this study comes from the significant differences in consensus reached within the principals' and teachers' panels on impediments to site based management. While the teachers' panel readily came to consensus on 84% of factors and identified 34 of 45 factors as critically or very important, the principals' panel did not reach consensus on the majority of these 45 factors by the close of the study.

Within their panel, principals differed markedly in their opinions on the importance of such factors as time required to implement site based management not being provided; lack of willingness to change; union contract limitations; lack of cooperation from union leadership; restrictive policies and procedures from the central office; middle managers opposed to site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions;

and principals not having sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management.

Between panels, principals and teachers differed markedly in their opinions on such factors as teachers not perceiving principals as effective instructional leaders; middle managers not feeling that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems; lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff; principals who purposefully control the flow of district information to their site; and the time required to implement site based management not being provided. These differences in perception offer school personnel a communications challenge which must be addressed as attempts are made to meet the needs of both groups during the implementation process.

The fifth implication of this study centers around significant variations between principals' and teachers' perceptions on key factors associated with the implementation of site based management. In all cases, teachers perceived the following factors as more important than principals perceived them to be: formal and informal leadership existing within the faculty; salaries matched to increased responsibilities; and the size of the central office being reduced. Impediments to site based management included teachers not perceiving principals as effective instructional leaders; middle managers not feeling that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems; and the time required to implement site based management.

Teachers considered a clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes to be essential. They also perceived lack of clear purpose in decision making process and lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff, and administration as the most important impediments. Additionally, lack of common goals and inadequate resources for shared decision making were all rated higher by teachers than principals. With respect to fostering the acceptance of accountability, teachers considered the superintendent providing training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability as critical. These differences must be recognized and addressed for the successful implementation of site based management in schools.

The sixth implication of this study underscores the importance of the literature on site based management, shared decision making and the acceptance of accountability. Although principals' and teachers' perceptions varied somewhat, they reached consensus on the majority of literature based factors and rated them important, very important, critically important or essential underscoring the accuracy of factors identified in the literature. While the literature has described site based management as situational or contextual, this study has demonstrated that the literature actually offered important recommendations for successful implementation which crossed positions, schools, and district types.

Key factors listed in the literature which foster the implementation of site based management included the principal being motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions; experimentation and risk taking being encouraged; a sense of trust in the organization being established; continuous, good communication up and down the organizational structure existing; and

shared decision making being demonstrated and promoted. Similarly the importance of budget control by central office administrators limiting local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs and principals not fully understanding the concept of site based management or not supporting it were factors on which principals and teachers were in close consensus as being critically or very important.

A high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process; training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making; and time to implement shared decision making were critically or very important to both principals and teachers in fostering the implementation of shared decision making.

With respect to the acceptance of accountability, principals and teachers rated the following literature based factors as very or critically important: new forms of accountability are created with the school staff; districts use a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system; schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement; schools set goals, direct resources and effort towards accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education; and the district must create a system of shared accountability based on shared values. Similarly, this study underscored that teachers feel caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards.

The last conclusion suggests two implications. First, while this study supported much of the literature, the significant differences in perspectives between the principals' and teachers' panels as to the importance of several factors points to the need to recognize these variations in perspective and to deal effectively with them in the implementation process.

Principals and teachers differed in their perceptions on such issues as reducing the size of the central office; salaries matched to increased responsibility; and the existence of formal and informal leadership within the faculty. Principals did not consider these factors to be very important, whereas, teachers rated them significantly higher. Similarly, opinions varied on the importance of teachers not perceiving principals as effective instructional leaders; middle managers not feeling that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems; the time required to implement site based management not being provided; and principals purposefully controlling the flow of district information to the site. Teachers and principals also differed over the need for clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes. While teachers considered this factor essential, principals identified it as very important. Similarly, teachers considered the superintendent providing training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability as critically important while principals identified it as important.

Second, there were four factors derived from the literature which principals and/or teachers simply did not perceive to be important in the implementation of site based management. While this study underscored the accuracy of much of the literature on site based management, it did not

lend support for these factors. Principals perceived sharing accountability in a site based system as being too challenging and salaries matched to increased responsibilities as moderately important. They identified reducing the size of the central office as even less important. Additionally, principals and teachers reached consensus that stress created by decentralization was only of moderate importance as an impediment to site based management. These perceptions, as demonstrated by this study, represent very different views than the current literature.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations are made based on the results of this study:

1. Research should be conducted which focuses on the disparities in perception between principals and teachers to further analyze their views.
2. A similar study should be conducted with panels representing districts that have initiated site based management through negotiated means, legislated means, and through efforts by key individual in districts in order to determine if the same level of commonality of experiences exists in spite of the impetus for site based management.
3. A national study with panelists representing each state should be conducted and compared to the results of this Illinois study.

APPENDIX 1
QUALITATIVE SURVEYS FOR PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS'
PANEL SELECTION

**Qualitative Survey
for Principal Selection**

Name _____

School and District Represented _____

District Type: Elementary Unit High School

Yrs. in Position _____

Yrs. w/ District _____

Telephone Number _____

FAX Number _____

Mailing Address _____

Date of Interview _____

Interview Media: By Phone In Person

VI. Teacher Involvement

1. Which teachers have been involved in your building's site based efforts in budgeting, staffing, or curriculum development during the last two years. How have they been involved?

**Qualitative Survey
for Teacher Selection**

Name _____

Position _____

School and District Represented _____

District Type: Elementary Unit High School

Yrs. in Position _____

Yrs. worked for Current Principal _____

Yrs. w/ District _____

Telephone Number _____

FAX Number _____

Mailing Address _____

Date of Interview _____

Interview Media: By Phone In Person

I. Teacher Involvement

1. Describe your personal involvement in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development activities in the past two years.

II. Budgeting

1. Describe any involvement you've had in the budgeting process used in your district and building.

III. Staffing

1. Describe any involvement you've had in the staffing process used in your district and building.

IV. Curriculum Development

1. Describe any involvement you've had in the curriculum development process in your district and building.

APPENDIX 2
ROUND ONE OF THE DELPHI STUDY

609 N. LaGrange Road
LaGrange Park, IL 60525

Full Name
Organization
Street Address
City, State zip code

Dear name:

Thank you for your willingness to participate in my dissertation study. I appreciate your commitment to helping me in my research, especially during the closing months of your school year!

My study focuses on factors which building principals and teachers perceive to foster or to impede the implementation of site (school) based management, shared decision making and the acceptance of accountability as site based management and shared decision making are implemented in schools.

Participation in this study will take very little of your time - perhaps a total of two hours over a period of weeks. I have already spoken with you via telephone to learn about your experiences with site based management and shared decision making in the areas of budgeting, staffing and curriculum development. Continued participation in my study will involve you in the following four step process:

1. During this first round you are asked to identify factors which you perceive to foster or impede the implementation of site based management, shared decision making and accountability. I will use your round one responses along with factors identified in the body of related literature and research on site based management to construct a survey.
2. During round two, a list of factors will be sent to you by mail. You will be asked to rate each factor for its importance using a scale of zero to ten.
3. During a third round, you will be provided with your responses and the average responses of the panel. You will

be asked to compare and contrast your responses with those of the panel. You will be given the opportunity to adjust your ratings and to provide rationales for responses where your opinions differ from the panel's opinions.

4. During a fourth round, you will be provided with the results of the third survey and asked to evaluate your responses, making changes as you believe necessary.

Through the aforementioned process, panel members will come to consensus on factors which they perceive to foster or impede the implementation of site (school) based management, shared decision making and accountability. This process, known as Delphi Research, is often used to analyze and rate topics without the drawbacks involved in bringing panel members together.

The first round is enclosed. Please return the completed form in the self-addressed, stamped enveloped on or before Friday, April 22nd.

Please be assured that your name and that of your school will not be disclosed in my dissertation or in any publication which might result from this study. I will be happy to make results of the study available to all participants requesting them. If you would like a copy of the results, please complete the enclosed request form and return it with your first round.

I look forward to receiving your first round response. Thank you for your participation in my dissertation study. Your assistance is sincerely appreciated!

Sincerely,

Myra C. Sanders

April 16, 1994

Principal's Panel - Round One

Directions:

1. Complete each of the lists. You may list up to five (5) factors for each statement but should not feel obligated to list any specific number of factors. I am interested in your thoughts regardless of number. If you wish to list more than five factors, feel free to do so.
2. Lengthy answers are not needed. Topical responses are best.
3. Note the attached definitions of terms as defined for this study. Since the meaning of educational terms can vary from individual to individual, please utilize the attached list in order to promote consistency of definitions as used by panel members.
4. Return Round One in the self addressed, stamped envelope by Friday, April 22nd.

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:
 - 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
 - 4.
 - 5.

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:
 - 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
 - 4.
 - 5.

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Shared decision making: the collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of making decisions at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: determining the number of staff positions and the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Other related terms as used in this study are:

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

April 16, 1994

Teacher's Panel - Round One

Directions:

1. Complete each of the lists. You may list up to five (5) factors for each statement but should not feel obligated to list any specific number of factors. I am interested in your thoughts regardless of number. If you wish to list more than five factors, feel free to do so.
2. Lengthy answers are not needed. Topical responses are best.
3. Note the attached definitions of terms as defined for this study. Since the meaning of educational terms can vary from individual to individual, please utilize the attached list in order to promote consistency of definitions as used by panel members.
4. Return Round One in the self addressed, stamped envelope by Friday, April 22nd.

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:
 - 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
 - 4.
 - 5.

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:
 - 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
 - 4.
 - 5.

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Shared decision making: the collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of making decisions at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: determining the number of staff positions and the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Other related terms as used in this study are:

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

APPENDIX 3
ROUND TWO OF THE DELPHI STUDY

609 N. LaGrange Road
LaGrange Park, IL 60525

Name, Principal
School
Address
City, IL Zip Code

April 30, 1994

Dear Name:

Thank you for your response to the first round of my study. Enclosed you will find round two. This round consists of a list of factors identified by panel members and those found in the body of related literature and research on site based management and shared decision making.

In my initial letter, I indicated that participation in my study would take approximately two hours of your time. A significant portion of that time will be used during this round as you consider each factor for its importance and rate it using a scale of 0 to 10.

I appreciate your continued participation in my study. The quality and promptness of panel responses was impressive. I am confident that your shared expertise will contribute significantly to the body of research on this topic.

Please complete the enclosed round two survey and return it in the self addressed envelope on or before Friday, May 6, 1994. Thank you for your continued participation.

Sincerely,

Myra C. Sanders

April 30, 1994

Principals' Panel - Round Two

Directions:

1. Rate each factor for its importance using the scale below. Circle the number that represents your rating.
2. Refer to the enclosed definitions of terms as defined for this study. Since the meaning of educational terms can vary from individual to individual, it is important for panel members to use the attached list in order to promote consistency of definitions as used by panel members.
3. Please return Round Two in the self addressed, stamped envelope on or before Friday, May 6th.

Scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unimportant	somewhat important		moderately important		important		very important		critically important	essential

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site-based management is identified early in its process |

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a credible process is established
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a sense of trust in the organization is established
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 site based management values are espoused by district leaders
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 high degree of support exists for site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 various kinds of support are available to teachers
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 waivers from restrictive rules are provided
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 new roles are created in schools
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 new roles are created in the central office
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the size of the central office is reduced
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 site based management is authorized via school board policy
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 building level staff is active and involved
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 adequate resources are available
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the time required to implement site based management is not provided
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 stress is created by decentralization
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of trust
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 state mandates limit flexibility of schools
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 merit pay
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of school board authorization of site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of commitment to site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of cooperation from union leadership
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administrators with over abundant egos
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 poor communication

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of willingness to change
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 union contract limitations
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 time to implement shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues.

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 shared goals
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 plans for implementation of shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 resources available for shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 use of consensus decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 visiting other sites to learn from their experiences
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 changes impact on every level of the school organization

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 openness to change
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 inadequate resources for shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 poor planning in the decision making process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 staff burdened with other tasks
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 time it takes to implement shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of common goals

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of trust
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 poor communication or closed communication
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of training in shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 unwillingness to change
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 risk taking is not fostered
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 failures are not used for growth
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 central office processes for approving site decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 conflicts within the administrative team

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 new forms of accountability are created with the school staff

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 support of administration and staff for ideas implemented

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 enthusiastic and involved parents

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 training to help accomplish tasks

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 commitment to improving school programs

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 proper implementation of decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 site based management processes are revised as needed
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 consensus decision making is used
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 shared goals
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a high level of trust exists
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 adequate resources are available to implement decisions

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of commitment to district goals and vision

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of evaluation procedures

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of time to implement decisions properly

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 fear of repercussions from decisions

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of support for decisions made by others

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of resources to implement decisions

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the need to assign blame if something fails
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 competition between departments and schools
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of trust
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of willingness to change
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of communication to the board of education
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of commitment to the decision
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of training
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what

Please return your survey in the enclosed envelope on or before Friday, May 6th. Thanks for your response and continued participation!

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Shared decision making: the collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of making decisions at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: determining the number of staff positions and the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Other related terms as used in this study are:

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

609 N. LaGrange Road
LaGrange Park, IL 60525

Name, Teacher
School
Address
City, IL Zip Code

Dear Name:

Thank you for your response to the first round of my study. Enclosed you will find round two. This round consists of a list of factors identified by panel members and those found in the body of related literature and research on site based management and shared decision making.

In my initial letter, I indicated that participation in my study would take approximately two hours of your time. A significant portion of that time will be used during this round as you consider each factor for its importance and rate it using a scale of 0 to 10.

I appreciate your continued participation in my study. The quality and promptness of panel responses was impressive. I am confident that your shared expertise will contribute significantly to the body of research on this topic.

Please complete the enclosed round two survey and return it in the self addressed envelope on or before Friday, May 6, 1994. Thank you for your continued participation.

Sincerely,

Myra C. Sanders

April 30, 1994

Teachers' Panel - Round Two

Directions:

1. Rate each factor for its importance using the scale below. Circle the number that represents your rating.
2. Refer to the enclosed definitions of terms as defined for this study. Since the meaning of educational terms can vary from individual to individual, it is important for panel members to use the attached list in order to promote consistency of definitions as used by panel members.
3. Please return Round Two in the self addressed, stamped envelope on or before Friday, May 6th.

Scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unimportant	somewhat important		moderately important		important		very important		critically important	essential

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site-based management is identified early in its process |

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a credible process is established
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a sense of trust in the organization is established
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 site based management values are espoused by district leaders
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 high degree of support exists for site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 various kinds of support are available to teachers
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 waivers from restrictive rules are provided
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 new roles are created in schools
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 new roles are created in the central office
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the size of the central office is reduced
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 site based management is authorized via school board policy
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 building level staff is active and involved
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 adequate resources are available
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the time required to implement site based management is not provided
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 stress is created by decentralization
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of trust
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 state mandates limit flexibility of schools
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 merit pay
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of school board authorization of site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of commitment to site based management
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of cooperation from union leadership
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administrators with over abundant egos
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 poor communication

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of willingness to change
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 union contract limitations
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 time to implement shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues.

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 shared goals
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 plans for implementation of shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 resources available for shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 use of consensus decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 visiting other sites to learn from their experiences
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 changes impact on every level of the school organization

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 openness to change
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 inadequate resources for shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 poor planning in the decision making process
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 staff burdened with other tasks
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 time it takes to implement shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of common goals

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of trust
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 poor communication or closed communication
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of training in shared decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 unwillingness to change
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 risk taking is not fostered
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 failures are not used for growth
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 central office processes for approving site decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 conflicts within the administrative team

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 new forms of accountability are created with the school staff

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 support of administration and staff for ideas implemented

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 enthusiastic and involved parents

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 training to help accomplish tasks

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 commitment to improving school programs

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 proper implementation of decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 site based management processes are revised as needed
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 consensus decision making is used
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 shared goals
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a high level of trust exists
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 adequate resources are available to implement decisions

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of commitment to district goals and vision

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of evaluation procedures

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of time to implement decisions properly

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 fear of repercussions from decisions

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of support for decisions made by others

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of resources to implement decisions

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 the need to assign blame if something fails
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 competition between departments and schools
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of trust
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of willingness to change
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of communication to the board of education
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of commitment to the decision
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of training
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what

Please return your survey in the enclosed envelope on or before Friday, May 6th. Thanks for your response and continued participation!

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Shared decision making: the collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of making decisions at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: determining the number of staff positions and the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Other related terms as used in this study are:

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

APPENDIX 4
ROUND THREE OF THE DELPHI STUDY

609 N. LaGrange Road
LaGrange Park, IL 60525

Name, Principal
School
Address
City, IL Zip Code

May 14, 1994

Dear Name:

Thank you, thank you, thank you! I appreciate your continued participation in my study. Nine of ten principals are still participating, and I hope that you will be able to continue with the last phase of my study.

By now it is more "our" study than "my" study since you have helped generate the factors being surveyed, are engaged in rating the factors, and will be sharing your opinions on why you rated factors as you did. At this point, the Delphi process will turn the principal's panel into a collaborative group engaged in analyzing their opinions on site based management, shared decision making and accountability.

This last phase of "our" study consists of round three and the final round. During these two rounds, feedback is provided and opinions are shared by panel members. Feedback is provided in the form of your rating, the average rating for each listed factor, and the range of ratings for each listed factor. Panel members are asked to compare their ratings with those of the panel as a whole and to provide information on their views if consensus is not evident.

To accomplish these tasks, please review each of your ratings and compare/contrast it to the panel's rating. In most cases, the average rating is useful. However, the range of ratings for a few factors is quite large and will be helpful in your analysis as well. Adjust each rating as you wish after reviewing your response and the panel's response. Write any adjusted rating on the line provided. Write a brief rationale for each rating where you are two (2) or more points above or below the panel rating and you do not elect to change your response.

During the final round, ratings, panel averages, panel ranges, and rationales will be shared so that panelists can gain insight into divergent opinions. Panelists will have the opportunity to adjust their ratings one last time after taking into consideration the opinions of other panel members. Through this process of sharing, reviewing, modifying, and providing rationales for non-consensus ratings, the panel will come to consensus where possible and any clear differences of opinion will also be evident.

Again, thank you for your continued participation! Your time, expertise and opinions are highly valued. Please complete the enclosed round three survey and mail it in the self addressed envelope on or before Friday, May 20, 1994. Responses received by May 27th will be included in round four which I plan to mail on May 28th.

Sincerely,

Myra C. Sanders

Important Addendum

In recognition of the value of your time and the number of factors in this study, I have highlighted factors where your initial rating was 2 or more points above or below the mean. This highlighting has been done solely for your convenience and economy of time so that you are not additionally burdened with the math task of identifying these items.

Please review all of your ratings to ensure your satisfaction that they represent your opinions accurately. However, the highlighted items are those where your answers varied enough from the mean indicating a lack of consensus with the group. I hope the highlighting saves you some time as you review items in this round.

Clarification of two items:

Several panelists indicated that two items were unclear. While most panelists rated these items, some felt unable to rate them because of the lack of clarity. Below you will find information to clarify the meaning of these two items.

Question #2, Item #1 reads "staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways." Staffing refers to the process of determining the number of positions and the ability to hire and place personnel in these positions. This factor means that the school site does not have the power and authority to determine the number of positions needed at the site and therefore cannot make decisions regarding utilization of the largest part of their site budget - salaries.

Question #5, the 7th from the last Item reads "a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior." This factor was listed virtually as it was offered by a panel member. I tried to rewrite it but could not develop a succinct yet better way of saying it. "Call" refers to positive confrontation. This factor means that a climate exists in which teachers use positive confrontation in order to redirect negative behavior of their peers. An example might be a teacher who criticizes another teacher for participating on a committee. If the teacher who was criticized reminded the criticizing teacher that their obligation was to work for the good of students and that professional efforts are important to the school, that teacher is "calling" the criticizing teacher on his/her behavior in an effort to reinforce positive school values.

May 14, 1994

Principals' Panel - Round Three
101

Directions:

1. Review each of your ratings and compare/contrast it to the panel's average rating. Use the range as needed in your analysis.
2. Adjust each of your ratings as you wish. Write your adjusted rating on the line provided. Write only adjusted ratings on the lines provided.
3. Provide a brief rationale in the space to the right of the factor for each rating where you are two (2) or more points above or below the panel rating and you do not elect to change your rating.
2. Refer to the definitions of terms as needed. A copy is enclosed for your convenience.
3. Please mail Round Three in the self addressed, stamped envelope on or before Friday, May 20th. Responses received by May 27th will be included in Round four.

Scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unimportant	somewhat important		moderately important		important		very important		critically important	essential

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
10	8.22	5 to 10	_____	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
10	7.67	4 to 10	_____	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process

10	8.67	5 to 10	-----	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
3	7.22	3 to 10	-----	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
10	6.00	0 to 10	-----	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
10	7.78	6 to 10	-----	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
5	7.22	5 to 10	-----	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
5	5.33	1 to 8	-----	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
5	5.67	0 to 10	-----	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
10	8.44	5 to 10	-----	a credible process is established
10	9.00	5 to 10	-----	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
10	8.78	4 to 10	-----	a sense of trust in the organization is established

10	8.44	5 to 10	-----	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
10	8.44	5 to 10	-----	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
10	7.78	5 to 10	-----	high degree of support exists for site based management
10	7.11	1 to 10	-----	various kinds of support are available to teachers
10	6.89	4 to 10	-----	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
10	7.67	5 to 10	-----	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
10	8.56	6 to 10	-----	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
10	7.67	5 to 10	-----	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
10	7.33	3 to 10	-----	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
10	8.67	6 to 10	-----	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
10	7.89	4 to 10	-----	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
10	9.11	7 to 10	-----	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
5	7.33	4 to 10	-----	new roles are created in schools

5	6.44	3 to 10	-----	new roles are created in the central office
10	8.44	4 to 10	-----	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
10	8.00	5 to 10	-----	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
0	2.22	0 to 7	-----	the size of the central office is reduced
10	5.89	0 to 10	-----	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
5	3.89	0 to 8	-----	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
5	6.78	5 to 10	-----	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
10	8.33	7 to 10	-----	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
10	8.22	6 to 10	-----	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
10	8.89	7 to 10	-----	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers
10	8.67	6 to 10	-----	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
10	8.00	5 to 10	-----	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs

6	7.11	5 to 9	-----	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
10	5.44	0 to 10	-----	parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
10	7.44	3 to 10	-----	site based management is authorized via school board policy
10	7.89	4 to 10	-----	the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
10	8.78	6 to 10	-----	building level staff is active and involved
10	7.89	5 to 10	-----	adequate resources are available
5	7.22	5 to 9	-----	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
6	7.56	4 to 10	-----	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
10	6.88	3 to 10	-----	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways

5	5.44	1 to 8	-----	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
5	5.44	2 to 9	-----	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
10	5.00	1 to 10	-----	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
10	6.89	2 to 10	-----	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
5	3.78	0 to 8	-----	stress is created by decentralization
10	5.89	3 to 10	-----	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
10	6.78	0 to 10	-----	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
10	5.00	1 to 10	-----	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
5	4.89	0 to 8	-----	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
5	5.56	0 to 10	-----	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders

10	7.78	6 to 10	-----	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
10	6.00	2 to 10	-----	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
10	7.56	0 to 10	-----	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
10	6.67	3 to 10	-----	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
10	8.22	6 to 10	-----	lack of trust
10	8.44	5 to 10	-----	administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
10	5.50	2 to 10	-----	state mandates limit flexibility of schools
10	7.56	3 to 10	-----	lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
10	3.78	0 to 10	-----	parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
5	2.56	0 to 8	-----	merit pay
5	5.44	3 to 8	-----	lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
10	7.00	2 to 10	-----	lack of school board authorization of site based management

10	8.00	5 to 10	-----	inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
10	7.00	5 to 10	-----	lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
10	8.56	6 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to site based management
8	7.22	3 to 10	-----	lack of cooperation from union leadership
8	6.56	2 to 9	-----	administrators with over abundant egos
10	8.00	5 to 10	-----	lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
8	7.78	6 to 10	-----	lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
10	8.22	6 to 10	-----	poor communication
10	6.67	2 to 10	-----	lack of willingness to change
10	7.44	2 to 10	-----	restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
10	7.00	3 to 10	-----	union contract limitations
10	6.44	2 to 10	-----	frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
10	5.89	2 to 10	-----	slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation

10	7.44	4 to 10	-----	lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
10	6.44	4 to 10	-----	lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating		Rationale:
10	9.11	6 to 10	-----	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making	
10	8.00	4 to 10	-----	time to implement shared decision making	
10	7.44	6 to 10	-----	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes	
10	8.78	6 to 10	-----	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process	
10	7.33	4 to 10	-----	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues	

10	9.00	7 to 10	-----	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
10	8.11	5 to 10	-----	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
10	7.22	4 to 10	-----	training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
10	7.67	5 to 10	-----	administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
10	8.11	6 to 10	-----	shared goals
10	8.00	6 to 10	-----	cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
10	7.78	5 to 10	-----	plans for implementation of shared decision making
10	7.22	3 to 10	-----	resources available for shared decision making
10	7.89	6 to 10	-----	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
10	7.44	5 to 10	-----	use of consensus decision making

7	4.78	2 to 7	-----	visiting other sites to learn from their experiences
10	8.89	6 to 10	-----	clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
10	7.56	5 to 10	-----	staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
10	6.22	0 to 10	-----	changes impact on every level of the school organization
10	7.33	4 to 10	-----	openness to change
10	8.67	7 to 10	-----	using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
10	8.33	7 to 10	-----	open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
10	7.33	6 to 10	-----	clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
10	8.11	6 to 10	-----	participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
10	7.89	5 to 10	-----	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
10	8.22	5 to 10	-----	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
10	6.56	3 to 10	-----	inadequate resources for shared decision making
10	9.00	7 to 10	-----	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
10	7.44	2 to 10	-----	poor planning in the decision making process
8	7.11	3 to 10	-----	staff burdened with other tasks
8	6.22	3 to 9	-----	time it takes to implement shared decision making
8	6.33	2 to 9	-----	lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
10	7.33	3 to 10	-----	lack of common goals
10	8.11	3 to 10	-----	lack of trust
10	8.56	6 to 10	-----	poor communication or closed communication
10	7.44	6 to 10	-----	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved

10	8.11	6 to 10	-----	lack of training in shared decision making
8	6.67	3 to 9	-----	sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
8	8.67	6 to 10	-----	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
10	7.56	5 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
8	6.78	2 to 10	-----	unwillingness to change
8	8.56	6 to 10	-----	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
8	7.44	4 to 10	-----	perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
8	7.33	6 to 9	-----	perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
10	8.11	6 to 10	-----	risk taking is not fostered
10	7.56	4 to 10	-----	failures are not used for growth
10	7.11	3 to 10	-----	central office processes for approving site decisions
8	5.00	0 to 8	-----	fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff
8	7.00	4 to 10	-----	conflicts within the administrative team

10 6.78 0 to 10 ----- emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
10	6.89	3 to 10	-----	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
10	8.11	7 to 10	-----	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
10	7.88	6 to 10	-----	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
10	8.22	5 to 10	-----	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
10	7.89	3 to 10	-----	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
10	8.33	5 to 10	-----	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
10	8.33	6 to 10	-----	support of administration and staff for ideas implemented

8	6.00	3 to 9	-----	enthusiastic and involved parents
10	8.22	6 to 10	-----	training to help accomplish tasks
10	8.78	6 to 10	-----	commitment to improving school programs
10	7.78	6 to 10	-----	proper implementation of decisions
10	7.78	5 to 10	-----	frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
10	7.67	5 to 10	-----	site based management processes are revised as needed
10	7.78	6 to 10	-----	consensus decision making is used
10	8.11	6 to 10	-----	shared goals
10	8.33	6 to 10	-----	authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
10	8.56	6 to 10	-----	a high level of trust exists
10	8.11	6 to 10	-----	board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
10	7.56	4 to 10	-----	recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
10	8.78	6 to 10	-----	creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated

10	7.56	2 to 10	-----	a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior
10	7.22	4 to 10	-----	the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
10	8.33	6 to 10	-----	decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
10	8.89	7 to 10	-----	the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
10	8.00	4 to 10	-----	adequate resources are available to implement decisions
10	8.44	6 to 10	-----	collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
10	8.11	6 to 10	-----	emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
8	7.56	5 to 10	-----	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
10	4.33	0 to 10	-----	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

10	5.67	1 to 10	-----	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
10	7.33	2 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to district goals and vision
10	7.00	4 to 10	-----	lack of evaluation procedures
10	7.89	6 to 10	-----	lack of time to implement decisions properly
8	6.44	2 to 10	-----	fear of repercussions from decisions
10	5.33	3 to 10	-----	lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making
10	6.44	1 to 10	-----	lack of support for decisions made by others
10	7.56	4 to 10	-----	lack of resources to implement decisions
8	6.67	3 to 10	-----	the need to assign blame if something fails
8	5.78	2 to 9	-----	competition between departments and schools
8	6.44	3 to 8	-----	frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
10	7.89	5 to 10	-----	lack of trust
10	6.89	2 to 10	-----	lack of willingness to change
10	5.67	3 to 10	-----	lack of communication to the board of education

8	6.78	3 to 9	-----	school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
10	7.33	3 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to the decision
10	8.11	6 to 10	-----	lack of training
10	6.00	0 to 10	-----	lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what

**Please return your survey in the enclosed envelope on or before Friday, May 20th.
Thanks for your response and continued participation!**

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Shared decision making: the collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of making decisions at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: determining the number of staff positions and the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Other related terms as used in this study are:

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

609 N. LaGrange Road
LaGrange Park, IL 60525

Name, Teacher
School
Address
City, IL Zip Code

Dear Name:

Thank you, thank you, thank you! I appreciate your continued participation in my study. Six of ten teachers are still participating, and I hope that you will be able to continue with the last phase of my study.

By now it is more "our" study than "my" study since you have helped generate the factors being surveyed, are engaged in rating the factors, and will be sharing your opinions on why you rated factors as you did. At this point, the Delphi process will turn the teacher's panel into a collaborative group engaged in analyzing their opinions on site based management, shared decision making and accountability.

This last phase of "our" study consists of round three and the final round. During these two rounds, feedback is provided and opinions are shared by panel members. Feedback is provided in the form of your rating, the average rating for each listed factor, and the range of ratings for each listed factor. Panel members are asked to compare their ratings with those of the panel as a whole and to provide information on their views if consensus is not evident.

To accomplish these tasks, please review each of your ratings and compare/contrast it to the panel's rating. In most cases, the average rating is useful. However, the range of ratings for a few factors is quite large and will be helpful in your analysis as well. Adjust each rating as you wish after reviewing your response and the panel's response. Write any adjusted rating on the line provided. Write a brief rationale for each rating where you are two (2) or more points above or below the panel rating and you do not elect to change your response.

During the final round, ratings, panel averages, and rationales will be shared so that panelists can gain insight into divergent opinions. Panelists will have the opportunity to adjust their ratings one last time after taking into consideration the opinions of other panel members. Through this process of sharing, reviewing, modifying, and providing rationales for non-consensus ratings, the panel will come to consensus where possible and any clear differences of opinion will also be evident.

Again, thank you for your continued participation! Your time, expertise and opinions are highly valued. Please complete the enclosed round three survey and mail it in the self addressed envelope on or before Friday, May 20, 1994. Responses received by May 27th will be included in round four which I plan to mail on May 28th.

Sincerely,

Myra C. Sanders

Important Addendum

In recognition of the value of your time and the number of factors in this study, I have highlighted factors where your initial rating was 2 or more points above or below the mean. This highlighting has been done solely for your convenience and economy of time so that you are not additionally burdened with the math task of identifying these items.

Please review all of your ratings to ensure your satisfaction that they represent your opinions accurately. However, the highlighted items are those where your answers varied enough from the mean indicating a lack of consensus with the group. I hope the highlighting saves you some time as you review items in this round.

Clarification of two items:

Several panelists indicated that two items were unclear. While most panelists rated these items, some felt unable to rate them because of the lack of clarity. Below you will find information to clarify the meaning of these two items.

Question #2, Item #1 reads "staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways." Staffing refers to the process of determining the number of positions and the ability to hire and place personnel in these positions. This factor means that the school site does not have the power and authority to determine the number of positions needed at the site and therefore cannot make decisions regarding utilization of the largest part of their site budget - salaries.

Question #5, the 7th from the last Item reads "a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior." This factor was listed virtually as it was offered by a panel member. I tried to rewrite it but could not develop a succinct yet better way of saying it. "Call" refers to positive confrontation. This factor means that a climate exists in which teachers use positive confrontation in order to redirect negative behavior of their peers. An example might be a teacher who criticizes another teacher for participating on a committee. If the teacher who was criticized reminded the criticizing teacher that their obligation was to work for the good of students and that professional efforts are important to the school, that teacher is "calling" the criticizing teacher on his/her behavior in an effort to reinforce positive school values.

May 14, 1994

Teachers' Panel - Round Three

113

Directions:

1. Review each of your ratings and compare/contrast it to the panel's average rating. Use the range as needed in your analysis.
2. Adjust each of your ratings as you wish. Write your adjusted rating on the line provided. Write only adjusted ratings on the lines provided.
3. Provide a brief rationale in the space to the right of the factor for each rating where you are two (2) or more points above or below the panel rating and you do not elect to change your rating.
2. Refer to the definitions of terms as needed. A copy is enclosed for your convenience.
3. Please mail Round Three in the self addressed, stamped envelope on or before Friday, May 20th. Responses received by May 27th will be included in Round four.

Scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unimportant	somewhat important		moderately important		important		very important		critically important	essential

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
8	9.00	8 to 10	_____	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process

9	9.50	8 to 10	-----	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process
9	8.83	5 to 10	-----	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
5	6.67	5 to 10	-----	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process
8	8.83	7 to 10	-----	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
9	9.17	8 to 10	-----	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
5	6.67	5 to 9	-----	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
1	6.83	1 to 10	-----	district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
10	8.83	6 to 10	-----	a credible process is established
8	9.67	8 to 10	-----	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
8	9.17	7 to 10	-----	a sense of trust in the organization is established

10	9.17	5 to 10	-----	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
10	9.33	6 to 10	-----	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
10	9.67	8 to 10	-----	high degree of support exists for site based management
9	8.83	7 to 10	-----	various kinds of support are available to teachers
9	8.67	6 to 10	-----	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
9	8.17	5 to 10	-----	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
10	9.67	8 to 10	-----	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
10	9.33	7 to 10	-----	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
10	9.00	7 to 10	-----	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
9	8.67	6 to 10	-----	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
7	7.17	3 to 10	-----	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
10	9.50	7 to 10	-----	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9	8.00	5 to 10	-----	new roles are created in schools

9	7.17	5 to 10	-----	new roles are created in the central office
8	8.33	5 to 10	-----	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided
9	9.83	9 to 10	-----	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
5	5.17	2 to 9	-----	the size of the central office is reduced
8	6.17	1 to 10	-----	the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
8	7.17	3 to 10	-----	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
7	7.33	4 to 10	-----	higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
10	10.00	10 to 10	-----	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
9	9.67	9 to 10	-----	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers
8	9.50	8 to 10	-----	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
9	8.83	6 to 10	-----	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs

9	8.33	5 to 10	-----	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
9	8.33	7 to 9	-----	parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
10	8.67	7 to 10	-----	site based management is authorized via school board policy
9	9.83	9 to 10	-----	the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
10	9.67	9 to 10	-----	building level staff is active and involved
10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	adequate resources are available
8	7.83	6 to 10	-----	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
9	8.50	6 to 10	-----	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
	6.80	4 to 9	-----	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways

10	7.83	5 to 10	-----	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals
8	7.17	2 to 10	-----	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
9	8.17	7 to 9	-----	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	the time required to implement site based management is not provided
7	4.67	2 to 7	-----	stress is created by decentralization
10	8.67	6 to 10	-----	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
8	8.17	6 to 10	-----	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
8	6.50	3 to 10	-----	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
8	7.17	4 to 10	-----	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
10	8.17	3 to 10	-----	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders

10	8.33	6 to 10	-----	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
8	8.50	7 to 10	-----	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
10	9.50	8 to 10	-----	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
10	9.00	7 to 10	-----	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
10	9.50	7 to 10	-----	lack of trust
10	9.67	9 to 10	-----	administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach
7	7.83	7 to 9	-----	state mandates limit flexibility of schools
10	9.00	7 to 10	-----	lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
8	7.83	6 to 9	-----	parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
0	3.83	0 to 10	-----	merit pay
8	8.00	5 to 10	-----	lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
9	9.00	5 to 10	-----	lack of school board authorization of site based management

10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
10	8.00	5 to 10	-----	lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to site based management
8	8.00	7 to 9	-----	lack of cooperation from union leadership
9	8.50	7 to 10	-----	administrators with over abundant egos
10	9.33	7 to 10	-----	lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods
10	9.17	7 to 10	-----	lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
10	9.67	8 to 10	-----	poor communication
9	8.67	7 to 10	-----	lack of willingness to change
9	8.50	7 to 10	-----	restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
8	8.17	7 to 10	-----	union contract limitations
10	7.83	6 to 10	-----	frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level
7	6.17	3 to 8	-----	slowness of change process causes people to withdraw their participation

10	8.83	7 to 10	-----	lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
8	8.33	6 to 10	-----	lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
10	10.00	10 to 10	-----	time to implement shared decision making
10	10.00	10 to 10	-----	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
9	9.33	8 to 10	-----	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9	9.33	8 to 10	-----	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth

9	9.00	6 to 10	-----	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
9	9.83	9 to 10	-----	administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
10	9.50	8 to 10	-----	shared goals
10	9.50	8 to 10	-----	cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
10	9.50	9 to 10	-----	plans for implementation of shared decision making
10	9.33	8 to 10	-----	resources available for shared decision making
9	8.67	7 to 10	-----	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
9	8.50	7 to 10	-----	use of consensus decision making
9	8.00	7 to 9	-----	visiting other sites to learn from their experiences
10	10.00	10 to 10	-----	clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions

9	9.17	7 to 10	-----	staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
9	7.17	3 to 9	-----	changes impact on every level of the school organization
10	9.00	7 to 10	-----	openness to change
9	8.17	7 to 10	-----	using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
10	10.00	10 to 10	-----	open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
8	9.00	7 to 10	-----	clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
9	9.50	9 to 10	-----	participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
10	10.00	10 to 10	_____	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
10	9.50	8 to 10	_____	inadequate resources for shared decision making
10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
10	9.33	8 to 10	_____	poor planning in the decision making process
9	7.50	4 to 10	_____	staff burdened with other tasks
8	7.17	3 to 10	_____	time it takes to implement shared decision making
9	8.00	6 to 10	_____	lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
10	9.00	5 to 10	_____	lack of common goals
10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	lack of trust
10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	poor communication or closed communication
10	9.17	7 to 10	_____	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved

10	9.00	7 to 10	-----	lack of training in shared decision making
8	7.83	5 to 10	-----	sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
9	9.83	9 to 10	-----	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
10	10.00	10 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
7	8.17	7 to 10	-----	unwillingness to change
10	9.50	8 to 10	-----	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
10	8.83	7 to 10	-----	perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
9	9.00	7 to 10	-----	perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
9	8.83	7 to 10	-----	risk taking is not fostered
7	7.83	5 to 10	-----	failures are not used for growth
9	8.50	6 to 10	-----	central office processes for approving site decisions
8	6.67	3 to 9	-----	fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff
9	7.67	5 to 10	-----	conflicts within the administrative team

8 8.00 5 to 10 ----- emphasis is placed on making shared decisions
but not on solving problems

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
10	9.33	6 to 10	-----	superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
9	9.17	7 to 10	-----	schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
9	9.00	8 to 10	-----	the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
9	9.00	7 to 10	-----	district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
9	8.83	7 to 10	-----	new forms of accountability are created with the school staff
10	9.17	7 to 10	-----	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
10	9.50	8 to 10	-----	support of administration and staff for ideas implemented

8	8.50	6 to 10	_____	enthusiastic and involved parents
10	9.33	6 to 10	_____	training to help accomplish tasks
10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	commitment to improving school programs
10	9.50	8 to 10	_____	proper implementation of decisions
9	9.00	7 to 10	_____	frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
9	9.17	7 to 10	_____	site based management processes are revised as needed
9	8.83	7 to 10	_____	consensus decision making is used
10	9.17	8 to 10	_____	shared goals
10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
10	9.50	8 to 10	_____	a high level of trust exists
10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
8	7.50	6 to 9	_____	recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
10	8.83	6 to 10	_____	creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated

	4.60	2 to 9	-----	a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior
8	8.17	6 to 10	-----	the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
10	9.50	8 to 10	-----	decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
10	9.67	8 to 10	-----	the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
10	9.50	9 to 10	-----	adequate resources are available to implement decisions
10	9.60	8 to 10	-----	collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
9	9.20	7 to 10	-----	emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

Your Rating	Ave. Rating	Range	Adjusted Rating	Rationale:
9	8.40	6 to 10	-----	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
8	6.00	4 to 8	-----	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

8	7.40	4 to 10	-----	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions
10	9.60	8 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to district goals and vision
8	9.00	8 to 10	-----	lack of evaluation procedures
10	9.40	7 to 10	-----	lack of time to implement decisions properly
10	9.00	6 to 10	-----	fear of repercussions from decisions
9	9.00	8 to 10	-----	lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making
10	9.40	9 to 10	-----	lack of support for decisions made by others
10	9.60	9 to 10	-----	lack of resources to implement decisions
9	7.00	2 to 10	-----	the need to assign blame if something fails
8	6.50	4 to 8	-----	competition between departments and schools
7	6.33	4 to 8	-----	frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
10	9.17	6 to 10	-----	lack of trust
8	8.33	6 to 10	-----	lack of willingness to change
9	8.17	7 to 9	-----	lack of communication to the board of education

10	8.67	7 to 10	-----	school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
10	9.67	9 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to the decision
10	9.17	7 to 10	-----	lack of training
10	9.50	9 to 10	-----	lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what

**Please return your survey in the enclosed envelope on or before Friday, May 20th.
Thanks for your response and continued participation!**

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Shared decision making: the collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of making decisions at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: determining the number of staff positions and the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Other related terms as used in this study are:

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

APPENDIX 5
ROUND FOUR OF THE DELPHI STUDY

609 N. LaGrange Road
LaGrange Park, IL 60525

Name, Principal
School
Address
City, IL Zip Code

Dear Name:

Enclosed is the last survey! I'm not sure who is happiest to hear that - you or I. I do know that I am looking forward to finalizing the results of this rather involved study. Nine of ten principals are still participating. Thank you for your continued participation, Name.

During this last round, consensus has been reached on many of the factors. Divergent ratings and rationales are shared to provide panel members with insights into the thinking of other panelists. All ratings have been provided along with the average rating for each listed factor, and the range of ratings. Your ratings have been highlighted for your convenience.

Panel members are asked to review the divergent ratings and rationales of non-consensus factors. In many cases only one or two panel members hold divergent opinions; in a few there is still wide disagreement among panelists. After reviewing the rationales and comparing/contrasting your thinking on each of these items, you have one last opportunity to adjust your ratings as you wish. Write any adjusted rating on the line provided. Write an explanation of your reasoning for each rating where you continue to be two (2) or more points above or below the average rating.

In addition to the non-consensus items, I have enclosed a second form of consensus items. You also have a last opportunity to adjust ratings on consensus items if you wish.

Again, thank you for your continued participation! Please complete and mail both surveys in the self addressed envelope on or before Monday, June 6, 1994. Responses received by June 14th will be included in the final results. Those respondents who requested study results should receive them in the fall.

Appreciatively,

Myra C. Sanders

May 28, 1994

**Principals' Panel - Round Four
Non-Consensus Factors**

Directions:

1. Review the divergent ratings/rationales where consensus has not been reached. Compare/contrast your thinking on each of these factors.
2. Adjust any of your ratings as you wish. Write your adjusted rating on the line provided. Write only adjusted ratings on the lines provided.
3. Provide a brief rationale for each rating where you are two (2) or more points above or below the panel rating and you still do not elect to change your rating.
4. Refer to the definitions of terms as needed. A copy is enclosed for your convenience.
5. Please mail both parts of Round Four in the self addressed, stamped envelope on or before Monday, June 6th. Responses received by June 14th will be used to generate final panel results.

Scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unimportant	somewhat		moderately		important		very		critically	essential
	important		important				important		important	

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	------	-------	--------

10	8	9	6	8	6	8	8	10	8.11	6 to 10	_____ district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	------	---------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 6 The point I'm making here is that a school staff should take responsibility for involving the staff in consensus - even if the district isn't there - we can't wait for the district to "define its position," although it would be better to have them do so. My 6 relates to not shrugging the responsibility & "blaming" the higher administration.
- 6 In my experience schools sometimes form these definitions ... and it's still successful

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

10 8 8 8 9 6 9 10 10 8.67 6 to 10 ----- parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

6 schools may set these expectations (not district)

8 7 8 7 7 6 8 8 10 7.67 6 to 10 ----- district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 The knowledge is essential as frustration + lack of progress might force abandonment of site-based [management].

8 0 6 4 5 6 6 9 7 5.67 0 to 9 ----- district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

0 I saw as not important. XX School does not have any accommodations for our low income, highly transient, bilingual population. We do as well in terms of student success as high SES Caucasian schools by using SBM & Effective Schools approach.

4 once again, can't use the excuse of waiting for the central adm[inistration] to support the notion.

9 School improvement is only a reality on a school by school basis. People must know early in the process what will be allowed.

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
8	8	6	7	8	7	7	7	10	7.56	6 to 10	_____ district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
none offered

5	5	8	5	8	3	4	7	10	6.11	3 to 10	_____ district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	------	---------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 5 I see no connection between unions and site-based!! Our union is strong; they've supported site based without district pressure or facilitation. However, if they were opposed, it could be a problem. I adjusted [from a 0].
- 8 Depending on this organization is important to cause change in this district.
- 8 alliance = shared trust respect for one another and collaborative problem-solving model established/ integrity, fairness, honesty - belief system in place that creates a "we" solve problems, create environments for student learning
- 3 Unions are a burden, not worth alliance.
- 10 If it isn't a joint effort, one group or the other may sabotage the process.

10	9	8	9	9	6	7	10	9	8.56	6 to 10	_____ a credible process is established
----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	------	---------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
6 Processes evolve.

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust
 10 9 10 9 10 6 8 10 10 9.11 6 to 10 _____ continuous, good communication up and down the organizational structure exists

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 6 I've seen dynamite site b[ased] man[agement] that does not need central office.

10 10 9 9 9 6 7 10 10 8.89 6 to 10 _____ a sense of trust in the organization is established

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 6 Trust is a result, not a precondition.

10 10 9 6 10 6 8 10 8 8.56 6 to 10 _____ district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 6 same issue [can't use the excuse of waiting for the central adm[inistration] to support the notion]
 6 Again, vision often evolves.

10 8 6 7 8 7 7 9 9 7.89 6 to 10 _____ high degree of support exists for site based management

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 10 Absolutely needed for Board & Central Office.

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

10 5 9 7 7 7 5 8 8 7.33 5 to 10 ----- various kinds of support are available to teachers

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Ditto - Absolutely needed from Board & Central Office.

5 [adjusted from a 1] I interpreted this as district support in \$, aides, etc...I'd agree building support needed in terms of time, staff development, goal setting, etc.

5 The type of support needs to be clarified.

10 9 6 7 8 6 6 8 10 7.78 6 to 10 ----- authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Absolutely needed

10 If not, what is site-based?

8 7 8 6 10 7 7 8 8 7.67 6 to 10 ----- goals, guiding images, and information are communicated

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 important to reaffirm & maintain focus and as needed, to share adjustments, changes - this is an ongoing process

8 7 6 9 9 3 5 7 10 7.11 3 to 10 ----- direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 I am derailed by this word [direct]. It may lead to end-runs.

5 I feel it is not critical to involve central office

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

10 7 10 9 8 7 4 8 9 8.00 4 to 10 _____ waivers from restrictive rules are provided

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Absolutely needed

10 State/union "rules" can cause change to be restricted.

4 Site-based management must work within some established guidelines

8 9 6 9 8 7 6 10 8 7.89 6 to 10 _____ new roles are created in schools

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

9 [adjusted from a 10] I believe the new roles in the school means change, risk-taking, autonomy. This is crucial to successful SBM.

10 This must occur if site based management has a chance.

5 8 6 6 8 6 3 7 8 6.33 3 to 8 _____ new roles are created in the central office

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

8 [adjusted from a 10] I see this as central office supporting buildings instead of dictating. If roles change in buildings, must central...

3 A move away from the central office is preferred.

10 8 10 7 9 9 4 10 9 8.44 4 to 10 _____ a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

4 I did not feel a broad range of opportunities was necessary.

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

2 2 3 3 2 0 4 1 2 2.11 0 to 4 _____ the size of the central office is reduced

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 [adjusted from a 0] I can only relate to our central office ...Superintendent and 2 assistant superintendents for 3300 kids not too big!!.

10 5 8 7 2 5 4 4 7 5.78 2 to 10 _____ the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 definitely new roles for central office & this must be understood

2 [adjusted from a 0] should occur at site - not deferred elsewhere - this strikes me as contradictory to the notion of site-based management; CO can be supportive + serve as resource; responsibility for success should be at site

4 3 5 8 0 3 3 4 5 3.89 0 to 8 _____ salaries are matched to increased responsibilities

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 [adjusted from a 0] Some districts may have extra staff, extra money, extra resources ... we implemented without extras.

8 probably pie in the sky thinking - but shouldn't salaries reflect broader vision + action on the job?

0 I do not understand this as stated - if participation in decision-making process is construed as increased responsibilities - it's still a 0

5 8 5 8 7 5 6 7 10 6.78 5 to 10 _____ higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Essential as leadership must be provided to facilitate the change process and implement site based

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

10 5 6 5 7 5 6 5 5 6.00 5 to 10 _____ parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 National goal #8 - schools represent community

5 [adjusted from a 0] Amazing! 0-10. Actually - we're discouraged from using parent input process ...but I could agree the input would be valuable.

10 9 10 8 7 7 7 5 7 7.78 5 to 10 _____ site based management is authorized via school board policy

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Absolutely!

10 Must be endorsed by the Board.

10 9 8 8 9 7 6 7 9 8.11 6 to 10 _____ the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Absolutely

10 8 10 5 8 7 6 9 8 7.89 5 to 10 _____ adequate resources are available

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Absolutely

10 Operative word - "adequate" - question did not indicate "extras"

5 even if they are not - it the responsibility of the admin[istrator]/principal to go find adequate resources - I'm just saying in all of these that - you can have site based management with or without district support, knowledge, understanding - it just makes it easier to have it.

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

7 8 7 4 ___ 3 4 8 8 6.12 3 to 8 _____ staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 We don't have this but we don't feel impeded.

4 Contractual agreements may impede this.

5 7 7 7 1 5 4 7 5 5.33 1 to 7 _____ opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

1 resistance occurs in all situations - more critical is who (perceived power + influence) is opposed

5 5 7 6 2 5 4 7 8 5.44 2 to 8 _____ retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 initially - changes create retrenchment activities

8 Retrenchment will happen but can be overcome with training & information.

10 6 6 5 1 5 4 4 7 5.33 1 to 10 _____ flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 This is a concern for me because it is an impediment.

7 Inflexibility will hinder the process.

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

10 5 7 7 2 7 5 7 8 6.44 2 to 10 _____ the time required to implement site based management is not provided

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Ditto - This is a concern for me because it is an impediment.

2 people find/create time to do what is important to them; may reallocate time

8 Moving from authoritative leadership & decision making to site based requires a time commitment

5 2 5 3 1 3 3 5 2 3.22 1 to 5 _____ stress is created by decentralization

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

1 stress accompanies change - need to focus on what we're trying to accomplish and why, create ownership across groups

7 4 5 8 7 5 4 10 4 6.00 4 to 10 _____ principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

8 probably true - but recognizing best, go get it - all sorts of training programs available

10 Without a strong leader, site based management is doomed.

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

10 2 7 8 8 6 6 8 8 7.00 2 to 10 ----- middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 This would definitely be an impediment.

2 [adjusted from a 0] It would impede if true but I can only relate to my experience in 2 districts. Middle managers who are leaders provide vision, use process and empower others. I can't go up to # [number] higher than 2.

5 0 3 4 6 5 3 6 6 4.22 0 to 6 ----- middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

0 I repeat above [It would impede if true but I can only relate to my experience in 2 districts. Middle managers who are leaders provide vision, use process and empower others.] and add that I question staffing in these buildings

5 4 4 8 5 5 6 10 7 6.00 4 to 10 ----- teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

4 [adjusted from a 0] Yes, could impede but I must have wonderful colleagues - respected by teachers & each other.

8 It's a problem because frequently teachers (even the best ones) have a narrow focus (understanding) of all the issues facing a principal + sometimes "don't get it" about leadership

10 Trust is imperative and perception is real.

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

8 7 9 7 7 6 7 7 10 7.56 6 to 10 _____

budget control by central office
administrators limits local discretion to
utilize funds to respond to local needs

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 The budget dictates therefore to have control & produce change, budget control must exist at [the building level

10 7 7 8 8 7 6 9 10 8.00 6 to 10 _____

principals do not fully understand the
concept of site based management or do
not support it

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Acceptance and support essential or transitional implementation will be sabotaged. ["do not support it" was underlined in the factor for emphasis]

7 5 5 6 7 7 5 10 8 6.67 5 to 10 _____

principals purposefully control the flow
of district information to their site

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Information and communication or lack of it is critical.

10 10 7 7 10 7 5 10 10 8.44 5 to 10 _____

administration continues to utilize an
authoritative approach

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

none offered

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
6	7	7	2		5	4	4	8	5.38	2 to 8	_____ state mandates limit flexibility of schools

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 2 sounds like an excuse -

10	7	3	9	9	6	7	8	8	7.44	3 to 10	_____ lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	---------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 10 This can be a great problem!

4	2	3	4	4	3	6	2	2	3.33	2 to 6	_____ parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 none offered

3	1	3	6	3	3	1	1	2	2.56	1 to 6	_____ merit pay
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	-----------------

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 6 [adjusted from an 8] Why not? actually, though I'm ambivalent on the issue.

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	8	7	2	8	7	4	6	9	6.78	2 to 10	----- lack of school board authorization of site based management

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Definitely

5 Do we have to have it? same issue or mentality before - let's not use them or an excuse for not proceeding with site based management.

4 I believe it is possible for site-based management to exist without the blessing of the Board.

7	7	7	5	7	7	6	7	8	6.78	5 to 8	----- lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

6 same issue [let's not use them or an excuse for not proceeding with site based management.]

10	10	9	6	9	7	7	9	10	8.56	6 to 10	----- lack of commitment to site based management
----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	------	---------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 same issue [let's not use them or an excuse for not proceeding with site based management.]

8	6	9	9	9	5	3	7	10	7.33	3 to 10	----- lack of cooperation from union leadership
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	------	---------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

5 Phooey on unions [sic.]

3 Union leadership has not been a barrier to SBM.

10 Sabotage

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

8 8 5 7 8 5 3 8 8 6.67 3 to 8 ----- administrators with over abundant egos

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 Admin[istrators] should re-evaluate their role

8 7 8 9 9 5 7 8 9 7.78 5 to 9 ----- lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

5 Not a death blow - they learn quickly

7 8 5 7 2 6 6 8 8 6.33 2 to 8 ----- lack of willingness to change

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 change occurs whether one is willing or not willing - participants may not have understood basis for change process

8 9 7 2 8 6 7 8 9 7.11 2 to 9 ----- restrictive policies and procedures from the central office

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 same issue [let's not use them or an excuse for not proceeding with site based management.] maybe my experiences are different - our administration supports varying approaches with staff

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

8 6 9 7 7 4 3 8 10 6.89 3 to 10 _____ union contract limitations

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

9 Could be major impediment with strong union. major change of working conditions

4 Unions again. They are a waste of energy and only commit to ideas which eventually self-serve.

3 SBM should not be dictated by contract limitations.

10 Provisions essential for the variations from contract language

8 5 7 7 2 5 5 9 5 5.89 2 to 9 _____ slowness of change process causes people
to withdraw their participation

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 this is symptomatic of a culture built on "instant" or "quick-fix" solutions; if focus is maintained +
goals established and communicated + periodic 'updates' occur - this is minimized

9 If change does [not] occur fast enough, some will withdraw.

10 8 9 4 9 7 6 6 8 7.44 4 to 10 _____ lack of a district statement clearly
identifying decisions which will be made
at the site

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 This remains very important.

4 Do we really want this? I'd rather have gray area + be able to defend alternative approaches.

8 Parameters essential

7 5 5 4 8 7 5 8 6 6.11 4 to 8 _____ lack of information and data about how
well the school site is performing as an
organization and in meeting student
needs

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

4 I think we know it - just don't take the time to gather it - its more interesting to use our time to
plan new ideas + programs.

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

10 10 10 8 9 7 5 8 7 8.22 5 to 10 _____ teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

5 Teachers should be encouraged to do this in spite of shared decision making.

9 7 9 3 8 7 4 8 9 7.11 3 to 9 _____ resources available for shared decision making

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 I think of them [resources] as people - and we have them + can get them to "think" - not a high problem as far as I'm concerned.

4 If you want it to happen, you will find a way.

9 8 7 7 9 7 6 5 10 7.56 5 to 10 _____ use of consensus decision making

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Must be able to reach agreements all can support so that some don't sabotage

6 5 6 2 4 6 3 5 5 4.67 2 to 6 _____ visiting other sites to learn from their experiences

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 That's OK - but in my experience the best plans come out of "our heads"

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
8	5	7	3	5	7	3	8	8	6.00	3 to 8	_____ inadequate resources for shared decision making

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 3 I think of them [resources] as people - and we have them + can get them to "think" - not a high problem as far as I'm concerned.
- 3 If you want it to happen, you will find a way.

8	6	8	8	6	7	3	9	9	7.11	3 to 9	_____ staff burdened with other tasks
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	---------------------------------------

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 3 There will always be other tasks.

8	5	8	8	5	6	3	8	5	6.22	3 to 8	_____ time it takes to implement shared decision making
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 3 Implementing shared decision making should not take an inordinate amount of time.

8	8	7	9	2	6	5	8	8	6.78	2 to 9	_____ lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 9 Big one - we all need to walk our talk.
- 2 need to re-evaluate your monitoring system - what you pay attention to is what gets done - I don't see this as a failure of teacher follow-through

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

8 7 7 9 5 6 3 7 8 6.67 3 to 9 ----- sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

9 These are insecure people (not many) whose egos can sway people away from group mission - one of the Iran hostages said, "Sincerity does not work with insincere people."

3 Press on in spite of them.

8 9 8 5 8 7 7 7 9 7.56 5 to 9 ----- lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

none offered

8 8 10 6 2 6 6 7 8 6.78 2 to 10 ----- unwillingness to change

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 few are willing to or seek change - clarity of vision/goals is more important

8 8 8 9 7 7 4 10 7 7.56 4 to 10 ----- perception that shared decisions will not be carried out

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

none offered

8 8 8 3 7 7 6 8 8 7.00 3 to 8 ----- central office processes for approving site decisions

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

none given

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

8 0 5 6 6 6 4 6 6 5.22 0 to 8 ----- fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

0 This doesn't make sense. When process is used there is consensus (of staff). How could this be used to intimidate the same staff.[?]

8 8 6 6 8 6 6 10 8 7.33 6 to 10 ----- conflicts within the administrative team

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Team must be together.

8 0 10 7 8 6 6 7 7 6.56 0 to 10 ----- emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

0 In my experience the staff set expectations, measured success, identified problems or reasons for low degree of success, prioritized, developed plans, implemented, measured again, etc! I could move up to a 1 or 2 ... not a 6 or 7.

10 Purpose must be to problem solve.

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

8 5 9 7 8 6 5 5 8 6.78 5 to 9 ----- superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

9 Brd. must be brought along in understanding.

8 9 9 9 7 7 3 9 9 7.78 3 to 9 ----- new forms of accountability are created with the school staff

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 Re-inventing the wheel is not necessary.

8 7 6 5 5 5 6 5 6 5.89 5 to 8 ----- enthusiastic and involved parents

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

8 Required

8 9 8 5 8 7 7 8 8 7.56 5 to 9 ----- frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

none given

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
8	9	8	6	8	6	6	7	10	7.56	6 to 10	_____ consensus decision making is used

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
none given

8	9	7	4	7	6	6	6	8	6.78	4 to 9	_____ the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
none given

10	9	9	6	9	7	8	8	10	8.44	6 to 10	_____ authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	------	---------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
6 If we have to "clearly delineate" something - is that shared decision making? Sounds like a bureaucracy to me!

10	10	10	6	8	7	7	10	10	8.67	6 to 10	_____ a high level of trust exists
----	----	----	---	---	---	---	----	----	------	---------	------------------------------------

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
6 Yes this is desired, but shouldn't keep you from moving ahead - also it's easier to trust on no-brainer, low level issues - much harder, however, when the stakes get high.

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

8 8 7 10 9 6 6 8 8 7.78 6 to 10 _____ a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Not common, I know, and very difficult - but isn't this a higher level of commitment to each other[?]

10 8 10 4 8 7 7 8 10 8.00 4 to 10 _____ adequate resources are available to implement decisions

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

4 Of course, but how hard does the group "go after" the resources - nobody said it was easy.

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

5 3 4 5 3 5 3 8 3 4.33 3 to 8 _____ sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

8 Sharing authority and responsibility is critical.

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
6	7	5	6	4	5	6	8	7	6.00	4 to 8	-----	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
8 delegation vs empowerment

8	8	6	4	7	7	5	6	8	6.56	4 to 8	-----	fear of repercussions from decisions
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	-------	--------------------------------------

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
4 [adjusted from a 3] sure, no one wants to be second guessed - but we have the responsibility to stick our necks out once in a while - this "fear of repercussions" should not keep people from acting

7	8	7	5	5	6	5	7	9	6.56	5 to 9	-----	lack of support for decisions made by others
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	-------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
none offered

8	8	8	5	6	7	6	8	10	7.33	5 to 10	-----	lack of resources to implement decisions
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	------	---------	-------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
10 If the decisions are reality based, resources are essential.

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
8	7	5	3	8	7	5	6	5	6.00	3 to 8	_____ the need to assign blame if something fails

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 3 why? It's usually apparent.

9	9	5	4	6	7	2	8	5	6.11	2 to 9	_____ competition between departments and schools
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 2 Departments should work toward common goals + objectives.

8	9	6	6	8	7	6	9	10	7.67	6 to 10	_____ lack of trust
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	------	---------	---------------------

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 none offered

8	8	5	6	2	7	7	8	8	6.56	2 to 8	_____ lack of willingness to change
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	-------------------------------------

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 2 few are willing to or seek change - clarity of vision/goals is more important

8	5	5	4	6	6	6	4	7	5.67	4 to 8	_____ lack of communication to the board of education
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
 none offered

P1 P2 P3 P4 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 Ave. Range Adjust

8 8 6 6 8 6 5 8 9 7.11 5 to 9 ----- school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
none offered

8 9 6 7 8 6 6 7 10 7.44 6 to 10 ----- lack of commitment to the decision

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
10 Follow through & commitment essential

8 8 7 2 5 5 6 5 6 5.78 2 to 8 ----- lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

2 Do people want this? Sure, it's great to have them with us - but do we want "clear directives" I don't think so - feeds into the "just tell me how you want me to handle it" mentality - That takes the responsibility off of the person who is responsible for implementation because then if it doesn't work - "hey, I'm just doing what you told me" - do we want a climate like that?

Please return this portion along with the consensus survey in the enclosed envelope on or before Monday June 6th. Thanks for your response and final participation!

May 28, 1994

**Principals' Panel - Round Four
Consensus Factors**

Directions:

1. Review the ratings where consensus has been reached.
2. Adjust any of your ratings as you wish. Write your adjusted rating on the line provided. Write only adjusted ratings on the lines provided.
3. Refer to the definitions of terms as needed. A copy is enclosed for your convenience.
4. Please mail both parts of Round Four in the self addressed, stamped envelope on or before Monday, June 6th. Responses received by June 14th will be used to generate final panel results.

Scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unimportant	somewhat important		moderately important		important		very important		critically important	essential

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
8	9	7	7	7	6	7	8	8	7.44	6 to 9	_____	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
8	7	9	8	7	7	6	7	9	7.56	6 to 9	_____	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
5	5	7	4	5	7	5	4	7	5.44	4 to 7	_____	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
10	10	8	8	8	7	8	10	10	8.78	7 to 10*	_____	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
7	5	8	6	8	6	5	7	8	6.67	5 to 8	_____	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
10	9	10	7	9	8	7	9	10	8.78	7 to 10	_____	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
10	7	10	9	10	7	7	10	10	8.89	7 to 10	_____	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
10	10	10	7	10	8	8	10	10	9.22	7 to 10	_____	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
10	8	10	8	8	7	7	9	9	8.44	7 to 10	_____	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
10	8	10	9	8	7	7	9	7	8.33	7 to 10	_____	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
10	10	8	7	9	7	8	8	8	8.33	7 to 10	_____	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
10	10	10	7	9	7	8	10	9	8.89	7 to 10	_____	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	8	10	8	10	7	7	9	10	8.78	7 to 10	-----	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
10	8	8	9	8	7	7	7	10	8.22	7 to 10	-----	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
6	7	8	9	8	7	6	8	7	7.33	6 to 9	-----	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
10	10	10	9	9	7	7	10	8	8.89	7 to 10	-----	building level staff is active and involved
7	9	8	8	9	7	6	7	8	7.67	6 to 9	-----	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus
6	9	8	8	9	6	6	7	9	7.56	6 to 9	-----	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
5	6	4	4	5	4	4	6	6	4.89	4 to 6	-----	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
6	5	5	5	7	7	5	7	8	6.11	5 to 8	-----	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	7	8	7	10	7	7	10	10	8.44	7 to 10	_____ lack of trust
5	5	4	6	7	4	4	7	7	5.44	4 to 7	_____ lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
8	8	5	7	9	7	7	9	10	7.78	5 to 10	_____ inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
10	7	9	7	9	7	7	10	9	8.33	7 to 10	_____ poor communication
7	7	6	5	7	6	5	8	8	6.56	5 to 8	_____ frequent changes in leadership at the building or district level

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	10	10	10	10	8	8	8	10	9.33	8 to 10	_____ training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
9	9	8	8	7	7	7	8	10	8.11	7 to 10	_____ time to implement shared decision making
9	8	6	6	8	6	6	8	8	7.22	6 to 9	_____ clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	10	8	9	9	7	7	10	10	8.89	7 to 10	_____ a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9	7	8	6	8	7	6	7	8	7.33	6 to 9	_____ teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
10	10	10	8	10	8	8	9	10	9.22	8 to 10	_____ a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9	7	8	8	7	6	7	8	8	7.56	6 to 9	_____ training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
9	8	9	6	8	6	7	7	9	7.67	6 to 9	_____ administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
10	8	10	8	9	7	7	7	8	8.22	7 to 10	_____ shared goals
10	8	8	7	8	7	8	7	9	8.00	7 to 10	_____ cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process
9	8	8	7	9	7	6	8	9	7.89	6 to 9	_____ plans for implementation of shared decision making
9	7	9	8	9	7	6	7	9	7.89	6 to 9	_____ ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	9	10	9	10	8	7	9	10	9.11	7 to 10	_____ clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
8	7	9	6	7	7	7	8	8	7.44	6 to 9	_____ staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
8	7	8	6	7	5	5	8	8	6.89	5 to 8	_____ changes impact on every level of the school organization
8	8	9	7	6	6	6	9	7	7.33	6 to 9	_____ openness to change
10	7	10	9	8	7	7	10	10	8.67	7 to 10	_____ using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
10	8	10	8	8	7	7	7	10	8.33	7 to 10	_____ open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes
8	7	8	6	8	8	6	7	8	7.33	6 to 8	_____ clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
10	7	10	7	9	7	7	8	9	8.22	7 to 10	_____ participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
8	7	9	8	9	7	6	7	8	7.67	6 to 9	_____	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
10	9	8	8	9	7	7	9	10	8.56	7 to 10	_____	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
10	10	10	8	9	9	8	10	10	9.33	8 to 10	_____	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
8	8	7	8	9	7	6	8	9	7.78	6 to 9	_____	poor planning in the decision making process
8	7	6	8	7	7	7	9	9	7.56	6 to 9	_____	lack of common goals
10	10	7	7	9	8	7	10	10	8.67	7 to 10	_____	lack of trust
10	9	10	6	9	7	7	10	10	8.67	6 to 10	_____	poor communication or closed communication
8	8	8	7	6	7	6	8	8	7.33	6 to 8	_____	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved
10	7	10	9	8	7	7	8	8	8.22	7 to 10	_____	lack of training in shared decision making
8	10	10	7	10	8	7	10	10	8.89	7 to 10	_____	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
8	10	10	8	8	8	7	10	10	8.78	7 to 10	_____	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
8	7	8	9	6	7	7	8	7	7.44	6 to 9	_____ perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
10	7	9	9	7	7	7	10	9	8.33	7 to 10	_____ risk taking is not fostered
8	6	9	8	9	7	6	8	9	7.78	6 to 9	_____ failures are not used for growth

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	7	8	7	9	8	7	8	10	8.22	7 to 10	_____ schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
10	7	8	7	9	8	7	8	10	8.22	7 to 10	_____ schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
8	8	8	7		7	6	8	9	7.62	6 to 9	_____ the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
10	8	8	9	9	8	7	9	10	8.67	7 to 10	_____ district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	10	9	9	8	7	7	9	8	8.56	7 to 10	_____ schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
10	9	9	7	7	7	7	10	10	8.44	7 to 10	_____ support of administration and staff for ideas implemented
10	8	10	8	8	7	7	8	9	8.33	7 to 10	_____ training to help accomplish tasks
10	9	10	8	9	7	7	10	10	8.89	7 to 10	_____ commitment to improving school programs
8	7	8	6	8	7	7	8	9	7.56	6 to 9	_____ proper implementation of decisions
8	7	8	7	8	6	6	8	9	7.44	6 to 9	_____ site based management processes are revised as needed
10	8	8	7	9	7	7	8	10	8.22	7 to 10	_____ shared goals
10	8	10	7	9	7	7	7	10	8.33	7 to 10	_____ board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner
8	9	9	7	8	7	6	6	9	7.67	6 to 9	_____ recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
10	10	10	9	8	7	7	10	10	9.00	7 to 10	_____ creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated
10	9	10	7	8	7	7	8	10	8.44	7 to 10	_____ decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	9	10	9	10	7	7	8	10	8.89	7 to 10	_____ the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
10	9	10	8	9	7	7	8	10	8.67	7 to 10	_____ collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
10	9	10	7	8	7	7	9	10	8.56	7 to 10	_____ emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
8	9	6	8	7	6	7	9	8	7.56	6 to 9	_____ teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
8	7	6	7	9	6	6	9	8	7.33	6 to 9	_____ lack of commitment to district goals and vision
8	7	6	6	8	6	6	8	8	7.00	6 to 8	_____ lack of evaluation procedures
8	7	9	7	9	6	7	8	8	7.67	6 to 9	_____ lack of time to implement decisions properly

P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	Ave.	Range	Adjust
7	7	5	5	4	6	4	4	6	5.33	4 to 7	_____ lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making
8	7	6	6	7	7	5	8	8	6.89	5 to 8	_____ frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
10	8	10	8	8	7	7	8	8	8.22	7 to 10	_____ lack of training

Please return this form along with the non-consensus survey in the enclosed envelope on or before Monday June 6th. Thanks for your response and final participation!

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Shared decision making: the collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of making decisions at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: determining the number of staff positions and the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Other related terms as used in this study are:

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

609 N. LaGrange Road
LaGrange Park, IL 60525

Name, Teacher
School
Address
City, IL Zip code

Dear Name:

Enclosed is the last survey! I'm not sure who is happiest to hear that - you or I. I do know that I am looking forward to finalizing the results of this rather involved study. Six of ten teachers are still participating. Thank you for your continued participation. Name.

During this last round, consensus has been reached on many of the factors. Divergent ratings and rationales are shared to provide panel members with insights into the thinking of other panelists. All ratings have been provided along with the average rating for each listed factor, and the range of ratings. Your ratings have been highlighted for your convenience.

Panel members are asked to review the divergent ratings and rationales of non-consensus factors. In many cases only one or two panel members hold divergent opinions; in a few there is still wide disagreement among panelists. After reviewing the rationales and comparing/contrasting your thinking on each of these items, you have one last opportunity to adjust your ratings as you wish. Write any adjusted rating on the line provided. Write an explanation of your reasoning for each rating where you continue to be two (2) or more points above or below the average rating.

In addition to the non-consensus items, I have enclosed a second form of consensus items. You also have a last opportunity to adjust ratings on consensus items if you wish.

Again, thank you for your continued participation! Please complete and mail both surveys in the self addressed envelope on or before Monday, June 6, 1994. Responses received by June 14th will be included in the final results. Those respondents who requested study results should receive them in the fall.

Appreciatively,

Myra C. Sanders

May 28, 1994

Teachers' Panel - Round Four
Non-Consensus Factors

Directions:

1. Review the divergent ratings/rationales where consensus has not been reached. Compare/contrast your thinking on each of these factors.
2. Adjust any of your ratings as you wish. Write your adjusted rating on the line provided. Write only adjusted ratings on the lines provided.
3. Provide a brief rationale for each rating where you are two (2) or more points above or below the panel rating and you still do not elect to change your rating.
4. Refer to the definitions of terms as needed. A copy is enclosed for your convenience.
5. Please mail both parts of Round Four in the self addressed, stamped envelope on or before Monday, June 6th. Responses received by June 14th will be used to generate final panel results.

Scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unimportant	somewhat important		moderately important		important		very important		critically important	essential

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
5	7	10	7	5	6	6.67	5 to 10	_____	district defines the degree to which variations and differences among schools in a district will be accommodated early in the process

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 10 In a large district this is essential to make sure each school feels empowered & will continue the process in good faith.

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust
1	8	8	8	5	5	5.83	1 to 8	_____ district has a strong alliance with its teachers' union/association

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 1 I don't feel this is a factor. I have worked in school districts where unions are almost non-existent - things still get done.
- 8 don't you need the support of the union to make site-based effective?

5	5	7	5	7	2	5.17	2 to 7	_____ the size of the central office is reduced
---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 2 There is always enough to do so reducing office staff does not seem necessary.

8	5	10	5	8	1	6.17	1 to 10	_____ the role of central office as facilitator and coordinator of school change is promoted
---	---	----	---	---	---	------	---------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 10 This shows they are working together to make changes.
- 1 This is a shared experience so it is not necessary to have central office control the process.

7	6	8	10	9	4	7.33	4 to 10	_____ higher quality of leadership is needed in site based districts
---	---	---	----	---	---	------	---------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

- 10 I still believe you need quality leadership in the initial stages.
- 4 This will be necessary if there is a lack of leadership. In my school it is not a problem.

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
9	10	9	10	7	6	8.50	6 to 10	_____	sense of interdependence (as opposed to dependence) exists in the district

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
none offered

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	7	8	7	10	5	7.83	5 to 10	_____	opposition to site based management is voiced by groups and individuals

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
5 The chance to voice the opinions should be there.

7	5	3	6	3	3	4.50	3 to 7	_____	stress is created by decentralization
---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	-------	---------------------------------------

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
7 Stress is always created by a new endeavor.

8	8	6	8	7	4	6.83	4 to 8	_____	central administrators doubt the willingness of principals to involve teachers in decision making
---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	-------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
none offered

T3 T5 T6 T7 T8 T20 Ave. Range Adjust
10 10 10 10 10 7 9.50 7 to 10 _____ lack of trust

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

7 Trust will be established when goals and roles are clear..

0 5 4 7 4 0 3.33 0 to 7 _____ merit pay

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

0 These are 2 separate issues.

7 I feel that merit pay negatively effects collaboration & a detriment to a positive team atmosphere.

0 You earn this no matter what you do so I can not see why this would impede the process.

10 7 9 8 7 6 7.83 6 to 10 _____ frequent changes in leadership at the
building or district level

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

10 Again, anytime there is change, there is stress. Less gets done if there is a change impeding.
People want to see what the change will mean.

7 7 8 6 6 3 6.17 3 to 8 _____ slowness of change process causes people to
withdraw their participation

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 Unless the goal is to hurry and get it done. I feel that time is not a factor as long as you can
accomplish the goal.

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust
9	7	8	8	7	4	7.17	4 to 9	_____ staff burdened with other tasks

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

4 We will always have other tasks. As long as the work is spread out it should not be a problem.

8	7	9	8	7	3	7.00	3 to 9	_____ time it takes to implement shared decision making
---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	---

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 If you rush things too much you will not develop a good program.

8	7	9	10	7	5	7.67	5 to 10	_____ sabotage by those who are unhappy, unskilled or not involved
---	---	---	----	---	---	------	---------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

5 This does not seem like it would be a problem in my school.

8	7	8	8	5	3	6.50	3 to 8	_____ fear that group decisions will be used to intimidate staff
---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

3 If this fear existed in the district it would be more important to me.

9	7	9	10	8	5	8.00	5 to 10	_____ conflicts within the administrative team
---	---	---	----	---	---	------	---------	--

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

5 We all need to be professional and work through conflicts.

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
4	5	9	5	4	3	5.00	3 to 9	_____	a climate exists in which teachers "call" each other on their behavior

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
none offered

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
8	8	8	7	8	4	7.17	4 to 8	_____	teachers do not want to be held accountable because district and state staff create conditions which affect them but they have no control over these conditions

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
4 If the teachers are involved in the process then they should have effect on their conditions.

10 10 9 10 9 6 9.00 6 to 10 _____ fear of repercussions from decisions

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:
6 If the decisions are shared there should be no repercussions.

T3 T5 T6 T7 T8 T20 Ave. Range Adjust

9 7 9 10 8 2 7.50 2 to 10 _____ the need to assign blame if something fails

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

9 "Risk taking" must be promoted - assigning blame can curtail this.

10 10 10 10 9 6 9.17 6 to 10 _____ lack of trust

Divergent Ratings/Rationales:

6 Trust will come with the sharing of responsibilities.

Please return this portion along with the consensus survey in the enclosed envelope on or before Monday, June 6th. Thanks for your response and continued participation!

May 28, 1994

**Teachers' Panel - Round Four
Consensus Factors**

Directions:

1. Review the ratings where consensus has been reached.
2. Adjust any of your ratings as you wish. Write your adjusted rating on the line provided. Write only adjusted ratings on the lines provided.
3. Refer to the definitions of terms as needed. A copy is enclosed for your convenience.
4. Please mail both parts of Round Four in the self addressed, stamped envelope on or before Monday, June 6th. Responses received by June 14th will be used to generate final panel results.

Scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unimportant	somewhat important		moderately important		important		very important		critically important	essential

1. Factors which foster the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	10	8	10	10	10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	district clearly defines its definition of site based management early in its change process
8	10	8	9	9	10	9.00	8 to 10	_____	district identifies and redefines roles which will change early in its change process
9	10	9	10	10	10	9.67	9 to 10	_____	parameters, expectations and limitations of building level decision-making are identified early in the change process

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
9	10	10	8	9	10	9.33	8 to 10	_____	district's understanding of the change process and how it applies to the district's implementation of site based management is identified early in its process
8	10	10	10	7	8	8.83	7 to 10	_____	district identifies underlying conditions which must be present for site based management to work
9	10	10	10	8	8	9.17	8 to 10	_____	district clarifies and communicates needed underlying conditions for site based management to work
5	7	8	8	5	6	6.50	5 to 8	_____	district identifies what it can learn from other public and private sectors about making the transition to site based management
10	10	10	10	7	8	9.17	7 to 10	_____	a credible process is established
8	10	10	10	10	10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	continuous, good communications up and down the organizational structure exists
8	10	10	10	10	7	9.17	7 to 10	_____	a sense of trust in the organization is established
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	district has a vision of what it wants to accomplish
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	site based management values are espoused by district leaders
10	10	10	10	8	10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	high degree of support exists for site based management

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
9	10	10	10	7	7	8.83	7 to 10	_____	various kinds of support are available to teachers
9	10	10	10	7	8	9.00	7 to 10	_____	formal and informal leadership exists within the faculty
9	10	10	10	9	7	9.17	7 to 10	_____	authority is delegated to schools to create new learning environments
10	10	10	10	8	10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	shared decision making is demonstrated and promoted
10	8	10	10	9	10	9.50	8 to 10	_____	goals, guiding images, and information are communicated
10	9	10	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____	direct communication links between school staff and top leaders are created
9	10	10	10	7	8	9.00	7 to 10	_____	experimentation and risk taking are encouraged
7	8	9	9	8	6	7.83	6 to 9	_____	waivers from restrictive rules are provided
10	10	10	10	10	7	9.50	7 to 10	_____	principals are motivated to involve teachers in school site decisions
9	7	9	9	9	7	8.33	7 to 9	_____	new roles are created in schools
9	6	9	7	8	6	7.50	6 to 9	_____	new roles are created in the central office
8	10	10	10	8	7	8.83	7 to 10	_____	a broad range of opportunities for professional development is provided

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
9	10	10	10	10	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	time is provided for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities
8	6	8	7	9	6	7.33	6 to 9	_____	salaries are matched to increased responsibilities
10	10	10	10	10	10	10.00	10 to 10	_____	training is provided for all participants in site based management concept and methods
9	10	10	10	9	10	9.67	9 to 10	_____	staff and administrators are dedicated to a common vision and goals
10	10	9	10	10	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	a collegial atmosphere exists between principal and teachers
8	10	10	10	9	10	9.50	8 to 10	_____	teachers have ownership through initiating issues for site decisions
9	10	10	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____	each site has the flexibility to respond to perceived staffing needs
9	7	9	10	7	10	8.67	7 to 10	_____	well organized administrators and staff are needed to handle the demands of site based management
9	7	9	9	8	8	8.33	7 to 9	_____	parental input is sought and used to determine how the school will best meet student needs
10	7	10	10	7	8	8.67	7 to 10	_____	site based management is authorized via school board policy

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
9	10	10	10	10	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	the district has a high level of commitment to site based management as the preferred management method
10	10	9	10	9	10	9.67	9 to 10	_____	building level staff is active and involved
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	adequate resources are available
8	7	9	9	7	6	7.67	6 to 9	_____	ability to view the school from different perspectives while maintaining a student centered focus

2. Factors which impede the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
6	7	8	7	7	5	6.67	5 to 8	_____	staffing is not transferred to the school site where staff may elect to hire staff or utilize their funds in other ways
8	7	9	7	6	7	7.33	6 to 9	_____	retrenchment makes change to decentralization difficult
9	7	8	9	8	8	8.17	7 to 9	_____	flexibility is limited by external constraints imposed on schools
10	10	10	10	10	9	9.83	9 to 10	_____	the time required to implement site based management is not provided

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	10	7	10	9	7	8.83	7 to 10	_____	principals do not have sufficient training in budgeting, planning, curriculum and instruction in order to be prepared to implement site based management
8	10	8	10	9	7	8.67	7 to 10	_____	middle managers oppose site based management because they will lose authority to make decisions
8	9	6	8	6	6	7.17	6 to 9	_____	middle managers do not feel that the schools' personnel are the individuals best qualified to develop responsive instructional delivery systems
10	10	10	8	7	8	8.83	7 to 10	_____	teachers do not perceive principals as effective instructional leaders
10	7	10	9	8	8	8.67	7 to 10	_____	budget control by central office administrators limits local discretion to utilize funds to respond to local needs
8	10	9	10	7	7	8.50	7 to 10	_____	instructional and curricular flexibility is restricted by middle managers' control of the curriculum
10	10	10	10	9	8	9.50	8 to 10	_____	principals do not fully understand the concept of site based management or do not support it
10	10	9	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____	principals purposefully control the flow of district information to their site
10	10	10	10	9	9	9.67	9 to 10	_____	administration continues to utilize an authoritative approach

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
7	7	9	9	7	8	7.83	7 to 9	-----	state mandates limit flexibility of schools
10	7	9	10	8	10	9.00	7 to 10	-----	lack of shared vision held by administrators and teachers
8	7	9	9	8	6	7.83	6 to 9	-----	parent community is not knowledgeable of district curriculum and goals
8	7	9	9	8	10	8.50	7 to 10	-----	lack of organizational skills on the part of administrators and staff
9	10	10	10	9	10	9.67	9 to 10	-----	lack of school board authorization of site based management
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	inability of a principal and his/her teachers to work together in a site based management style
8	7	9	9	7	8	8.00	7 to 9	-----	lack of central office assistance to buildings when needed
10	10	9	10	10	10	9.83	9 to 10	-----	lack of commitment to site based management
8	7	9	9	7	8	8.00	7 to 9	-----	lack of cooperation from union leadership
9	7	9	10	8	8	8.50	7 to 10	-----	administrators with over abundant egos
10	7	10	10	9	10	9.33	7 to 10	-----	lack of understanding, training and skills on the part of all participants in site based management concepts and methods

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	7	9	10	9	10	9.17	7 to 10	_____	lack of effort on the part of teachers and administrators
10	10	8	10	10	10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	poor communication
9	10	10	8	7	8	8.67	7 to 10	_____	lack of willingness to change
9	7	9	10	8	8	8.50	7 to 10	_____	restrictive policies and procedures from the central office
8	7	9	10	7	8	8.17	7 to 10	_____	union contract limitations
10	7	10	8	8	10	8.83	7 to 10	_____	lack of a district statement clearly identifying decisions which will be made at the site
8	7	9	10	9	10	8.83	7 to 10	_____	lack of information and data about how well the school site is performing as an organization and in meeting student needs

3. Factors which foster shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	10	9	10	10	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	training of participants in collegial team building, effective communication, conflict resolution, goal establishing, problem solving, and decision making
10	10	10	10	10	10	10.00	10 to 10	_____	time to implement shared decision making

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	10	10	10	10	10	10.00	10 to 10	_____	clear understanding of team roles in decision making processes
9	10	10	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____	a high level of trust by constituents involved in the shared decision making process
9	10	10	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____	teachers are given the authority to examine their work schedules and conditions and make changes which facilitate collaboration with their colleagues
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	a collaborative climate exists which encourages teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth
9	10	10	10	9	9	9.50	9 to 10	_____	teachers are encouraged to consider instructional techniques, collaborative partnerships and other ways of delivering instructional services which break with traditional methods
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	training in budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development for all involved in shared decision making processes
9	10	10	10	10	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	administrative, staff, and parent support for shared decision making
10	10	9	10	8	10	9.50	8 to 10	_____	shared goals
10	10	9	10	8	10	9.50	8 to 10	_____	cooperation and collegiality of constituents involved in decision making process

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	10	9	10	9	9	9.50	9 to 10	_____	plans for implementation of shared decision making
10	10	9	10	8	9	9.33	8 to 10	_____	resources available for shared decision making
9	7	9	10	9	8	8.67	7 to 10	_____	ongoing evaluation of the results of shared decision making
9	7	10	8	8	9	8.50	7 to 10	_____	use of consensus decision making
9	7	9	8	7	8	8.00	7 to 9	_____	visiting other sites to learn from their experiences
10	10	10	10	10	10	10.00	10 to 10	_____	clear understanding of which issues are open to shared decision making and which are considered administrative decisions
9	10	10	9	9	10	9.50	9 to 10	_____	staff involvement in shared decision making leads to results which promote desire for more staff involvement
9	7	8	6	8	8	7.67	6 to 9	_____	changes impact on every level of the school organization
10	10	9	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____	openness to change
9	7	10	7	8	8	8.17	7 to 10	_____	using shared decision making with significant issues not minor ones
10	10	10	10	10	10	10.00	10 to 10	_____	open communication among parties involved in shared decision making processes

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
8	8	10	10	9	10	9.17	8 to 10	_____	clear, reliable data about how well the school site is performing
9	10	9	10	9	10	9.50	9 to 10	_____	participants involved in a decision support, implement and monitor the success of their decision

4. Factors which impede shared decision making in the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	10	10	10	10	10	10.00	10 to 10	_____	lack of a clear purpose in decision making process
10	10	10	10	10	9	9.83	9 to 10	_____	lack of cooperation and collaboration at the building level
10	10	10	10	8	9	9.50	8 to 10	_____	inadequate resources for shared decision making
10	10	10	10	10	8	9.67	8 to 10	_____	administration does not value or is not perceived to value solicited teacher input
10	10	9	10	8	9	9.33	8 to 10	_____	poor planning in the decision making process
9	7	8	8	9	8	8.17	7 to 9	_____	lack of follow-through by teachers after shared decisions are made
10	10	9	10	9	10	9.67	9 to 10	_____	lack of common goals

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	10	10	10	10	8	9.67	8 to 10	_____	lack of trust
10	10	9	10	10	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	poor communication or closed communication
10	8	8	10	10	10	9.33	8 to 10	_____	lack of knowledge about shared decision making among all parties involved
10	8	8	10	9	10	9.17	8 to 10	_____	lack of training in shared decision making
9	10	10	10	10	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	central office nullifies shared decisions if it disagrees with the resulting decisions made at the building level
10	10	10	10	10	10	10.00	10 to 10	_____	lack of commitment to shared decision making by parents, staff and administration
7	10	9	9	7	7	8.17	7 to 10	_____	unwillingness to change
10	10	9	10	10	8	9.50	8 to 10	_____	administrators are unwilling to relinquish power and authority
10	10	10	9	7	7	8.83	7 to 10	_____	perception that shared decisions will not be carried out
9	10	10	10	8	7	9.00	7 to 10	_____	perception that shared decision making will not be used in important matters
9	10	9	10	7	8	8.83	7 to 10	_____	risk taking is not fostered
7	9	9	10	8	6	8.17	6 to 10	_____	failures are not used for growth
9	10	9	10	7	7	8.67	7 to 10	_____	central office processes for approving site decisions

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust
8	9	9	8	8	7	8.17	7 to 9	_____ emphasis is placed on making shared decisions but not on solving problems

5. Factors which foster accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust
10	10	10	10	10	8	9.67	8 to 10	_____ superintendent provides training for the board of education on policy issues of site based management and accountability
9	10	10	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____ schools set goals, direct resources and effort toward accomplishing the goals, and report their progress to the public and board of education
9	10	9	10	8	8	9.00	8 to 10	_____ the district must create a system of shared accountability based on valued goals
9	10	10	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____ district uses a variety of measures such as student testing, opinion polls, and program evaluations to measure accountability in a site based system
9	10	9	10	8	7	8.83	7 to 10	_____ new forms of accountability are created with the school staff

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
10	10	10	10	8	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____	schools take a pro-active approach to accountability developing their own systems of quality control and public announcement
10	10	10	10	8	9	9.50	8 to 10	_____	support of administration and staff for ideas implemented
8	10	9	10	9	8	9.00	8 to 10	_____	enthusiastic and involved parents
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	training to help accomplish tasks
10	10	10	10	8	10	9.67	8 to 10	_____	commitment to improving school programs
10	10	9	10	10	8	9.50	8 to 10	_____	proper implementation of decisions
9	10	9	9	10	8	9.17	8 to 10	_____	frequent monitoring and systematic evaluation are used
9	10	10	10	9	8	9.33	8 to 10	_____	site based management processes are revised as needed
9	10	10	8	9	7	8.83	7 to 10	_____	consensus decision making is used
10	10	9	10	8	8	9.17	8 to 10	_____	shared goals
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	authority and responsibility are clearly delineated to parties involved in sharing in the decision making
10	10	10	10	9	8	9.50	8 to 10	_____	a high level of trust exists
10	10	10	10	9	10	9.83	9 to 10	_____	board of education, administration and faculty are committed to decisions made in a site based manner

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
8	7	8	9	6	7	7.50	6 to 9	_____	recognition of staff, administration and parents for their efforts
10	10	10	10	6	7	8.83	6 to 10	_____	creating an environment where risk taking is encouraged, shared and celebrated
8	7	10	9	9	9	8.67	7 to 10	_____	the board of education provides clear direction to schools identifying what they are accountable for
10	10	10	10	8	9	9.50	8 to 10	_____	decision makers have adequate information about the topic of a decision
10	10	10	10	10	8	9.67	8 to 10	_____	the decision making group uses ideas from all members, not just its leaders
10	10	9	10	9	9	9.50	9 to 10	_____	adequate resources are available to implement decisions
10	10	10	10	10	8	9.67	8 to 10	_____	collaborative environment where an "us" not a "them" orientation exists
9	10	10	10	10	8	9.50	8 to 10	_____	emphasis is placed on the value of decisions and outcomes not on failure

6. Factors which impede accepting accountability in conjunction with the implementation of site based management in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and curriculum development are:

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
9	10	7	10	9	7	8.67	7 to 10	_____	teachers are caught in a "time warp" between old and new accountability measures - while they are asked to be creative, they are judged by traditional standards
8	5	7	5	7	4	6.00	4 to 8	_____	sharing accountability in a site based system is too challenging
10	10	10	10	9	8	9.50	8 to 10	_____	lack of commitment to district goals and vision
8	10	9	10	9	8	9.00	8 to 10	_____	lack of evaluation procedures
10	10	10	10	9	8	9.50	8 to 10	_____	lack of time to implement decisions properly
9	10	9	9	9	8	9.00	8 to 10	_____	lack of community and parent support for involvement in decision making
10	10	9	9	9	9	9.33	9 to 10	_____	lack of support for decisions made by others
10	10	9	10	9	9	9.50	9 to 10	_____	lack of resources to implement decisions
8	7	8	8	7	5	7.17	5 to 8	_____	competition between departments and schools
7	7	8	8	7	5	7.00	5 to 8	_____	frustration with the inability to accomplish desired goals leads to the acceptance of the status quo
8	10	10	10	9	7	9.00	7 to 10	_____	lack of willingness to change

T3	T5	T6	T7	T8	T20	Ave.	Range	Adjust	
9	7	8	9	7	9	8.17	7 to 9	_____	lack of communication to the board of education
10	10	10	8	7	7	8.67	7 to 10	_____	school climate in which negativism is allowed to undermine those who become involved
10	10	10	10	9	9	9.67	9 to 10	_____	lack of commitment to the decision
10	8	9	10	9	10	9.33	8 to 10	_____	lack of training
10	10	9	9	9	10	9.50	9 to 10	_____	lack of a clear directive from the board of education identifying who is accountable for what

Please return this form along with the non-consensus survey in the enclosed envelope on or before Monday, June 6th. Thanks for your response and continued participation!

Definition of Terms

Listed below are definitions for significant terms as used in this study.

Accountability: responsibility for decisions made and the resulting impact on the system following implementation.

Budgeting: the process of allocating monetary resources toward educational programs.

Curriculum Development: the process of identifying and developing instructional goals and selecting and/or creating instructional materials used to accomplish instructional goals.

Factor which Fosters: something that promotes and encourages.

Factor which Impedes: something that interferes and discourages.

Shared decision making: the collaborative process of decision making in which those affected by the decision have a role in making the decision. The role may range from being consulted to making the decision.

Site (school) based management: the management concept and practice of making decisions at levels closest to that where the decisions will be implemented, in essence the school. Site (school) based management is synonymous with site based management, school based management and decentralized system.

Staffing: determining the number of staff positions and the selection of personnel and their assignment to educational program positions.

Other related terms as used in this study are:

Centralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the top management level and communicated to others for implementation, synonymous with bureaucracy.

Collaboration: working jointly with others in a professional manner toward accomplishing a shared vision or goal.

Consensus: general agreement by all working jointly on the decision. A consensus process requires open and free exchange of ideas until mutual agreement is reached and no member of the decision making group has a deep concern about the final decision.

Cooperation: working companionably but not necessarily sharing a vision or goal.

Decentralized System: a system in which decisions are made at the level closest to where they are implemented. Decentralized system is synonymous with site (school) based management, site based management, and school based management.

Decision Making Process: the procedure used by a group or an individual to reach a decision. The process is usually characterized by an analysis of a problem, analysis of possible solutions, and the selection of a probable solution for implementation.

Restructuring: a large scale change in the formal, organizational plan of a system. Site (school) based management may be one part of such a sweeping change in organizational design.

Team building: the process of developing collaborative relationships among staff members who work as a unit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Research References

Articles

- Cyphert, Frederick R. and Walter L. Gant. "The Delphi Technique: A Tool for Collecting Opinions in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education 21, no. 3 (Fall 1970): 417-425.
- _____. "The Delphi Technique: A Case Study." Phi Delta Kappan 52, no. 5 (January 1971): 272-73.
- Dodge, Bernard J. and Richard E. Clark. "Research Briefing: Research on the Delphi Technique." Educational Technology 17, no. 4 (April 1977): 58-59.
- Hartman, Arlene. "Reaching Consensus Using the Delphi Technique." Educational Leadership 38, no. 6 (March 1981): 495-97.
- Preble, John F. "The Selection of Delphi Panels for Strategic Planning Purposes." Strategic Management Journal 5, no. 2 (April-June 1984): 157-70.
- Weaver, W. Timothy. "The Delphi Forecasting Method." Phi Delta Kappan 52, no. 5 (January 1971): 267-71.

Books

- Borg, Walter R. and Meredith Damian Gall. "Qualitative Research, " In Educational Research, 5th ed., 379-412. New York: Longman, Inc., 1989.
- Einser, Elliot W. and Alan Peshkin, ed. Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate. New York: Teachers College Press, 1990.
- Linstone, Harold A. and Murray Turoff, ed. The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications, With a Foreword by Olaf Helmer. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975.

- Sherman, Robert R. and Rodman B. Webb, ed. Qualitative Research in Education: Focus and Methods, Explorations in Ethnography Series, ed. Stephen J. Ball and Ivor Goodson. London: The Falmer Press, 1988.
- Slavin, Robert E. "Qualitative Research," In Research Methods in Education, 65-74. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1992.

Site Based Management References

Articles

- Ambrosie, Frank. "The Case for Collaborative, Versus Negotiated, Decision Making." NASSP Bulletin 73, no. 518 (September 1989): 56-60.
- Aronstein, Laurence W., Marcia Marlow, and Brendan Desilets. "Detours on the Road to Site-Based Management." Educational Leadership 47, no 7 (April 1990): 61-63.
- Bacharach, Samuel B., Joseph B. Shedd, and Sharon C. Conley. "School Management and Teacher Unions: The Capacity for Cooperation in an Age of Reform." Teachers College Record 91, no. 1 (Fall 1989): 97-105.
- Bergman, Abby Barry. "Lessons for Principals From Site-Based Management." Educational Leadership 50, no. 1 (September 1992): 48-51.
- Bostingl, John Jay. "The Quality Revolution in Education." Educational Leadership 50, no. 3 (November 1992): 4-9.
- Brandt, Ron. "On Deming and School Quality: A Conversation with Enid Brown." Educational Leadership 50, no. 3 (November 1992): 28-31.
- Cawelti, Gordon. "Key Elements of Site-based Management." Educational Leadership 46, no. 8 (May 1989): 46-53.
- _____. "Will Site-Based Management Improve Productivity?" ASCD Update 31, no. 1 (January 1989): 2.
- Conley, Sharon C. "Reforming Paper Pushers and Avoiding Free Agents: The Teacher as a Constrained Decision Maker." Educational Administration Quarterly 24, no. 4 (November 1988): 393-404.

- Conley, Sharon C. and Samuel B. Bacharach. "From School-Site Management To Participatory School-Site Management." Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 7 (March 1990): 539-44.
- Cox, Marguerite V., and Robert C. Stevens. "Here's Why We No Longer Dread Contract Negotiations." The American School Board Journal 175, no. 2 (February 1988): 26.
- David, Jane L. "Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management." Educational Leadership 46, no. 8 (May 1989): 45-53.
- _____. "What It Takes to Restructure Education." Educational Leadership 48, no. 8 (May 1991): 11-15.
- Duke, Daniel L. and Bruce Gansneder. "Teacher Empowerment: The View from the Classroom." Educational Policy 4, no. 2 (June 1990): 145-60.
- Erickson, Lawrence G. "Negotiating School Improvements." The Journal of Staff Development 9, no. 2 (Spring 1988): 30-34.
- Fuchs, Gordon E. and Louise P. Moore. "Collaboration for Understanding and Effectiveness." The Clearing House 61, no. 9 (May 1988): 410-13.
- Fullan, Michael G. and Mathew B. Miles. "Getting Reform Right: What Works and What Doesn't." Phi Delta Kappan 73, no. 10 (June 1992): 744-52.
- Glathorn, Allan A. "Cooperative Professional Development: Peer-Centered Options for Teacher Growth." Educational Leadership 45, no. 3 (November 1987): 31-35.
- Goldschmidt, Steven M. and Suzanne R. Painter. "Collective Bargaining: A Review of the Literature." Educational Research Quarterly 12, no. 1 (1987-1988): 10-24.
- Hansen, Robert A. "Good-bye Adversarial Negotiations - We've Found a Better Way to Bargain." The American School Board Journal 176, no. 8 (August 1989): 23-24.
- Harrington-Lueker, Donna. "Some Labor Relations Specialists Urge Caution." The American School Board Journal 177, no. 7 (July 1990): 29.
- Harrison, Cynthia R., Joellen P. Killion, and James E. Mitchell. "Site-Based Management: The Realities of Implementation." Educational Leadership 46, no. 8 (May 1989): 55-60.

- Heller, Robert W., Beth E. Woodworth, Stephen L. Jacobson, and James A. Conway. "Administrator Opinions on School-Based Management." The Executive Educator 11, no. 11 (November 1989): 15-18.
- Holt, Maurice. "The Educational Consequences of W. Edwards Deming." Phi Delta Kappan 74, no. 5 (January 1993): 382-88.
- Hord, Shirley M. "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration." Educational Leadership 43, no. 5 (February 1986): 22-27.
- Huszczo, Gregory E. "Training for Team Building." Training & Development Journal 4, no. 2 (February 1990): 37-43.
- Johnson, David W. and Roger T. Johnson. "Research Shows the Benefits of Adult Cooperation." Educational Leadership 45, no. 3 (November 1987): 27-30.
- Johnson, Susan Moore. "Can Schools Be Reformed at the Bargaining Table?" Teachers College Record 89, no. 2 (Winter 1987): 269-80.
- Kanpol, Barry. "Empowerment: The Institutional and Cultural Aspects for Teachers and Principals." NASSP Bulletin 74, no. 528 (October 1990): 104-7.
- Kent, Karen M. "Conditions for Collaboration Among Colleagues: Is Your District Ready?" Teacher Education Quarterly 14, no. 3 (1987): 50-58.
- Kessler, Robert. "Shared Decision Making Works!" Educational Leadership 50, no. 1 (September 1992): 36-38.
- Kretovics, Joseph, Kathleen Farber, and William Armaline. "Reform from the Bottom Up: Empowering Teachers to Transform Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 73, no. 4 (December 1991): 295-99.
- Lagana, Joseph F. "Managing Change and School Improvement Effectively." NASSP Bulletin 73, no. 518 (September 1989): 52-55.
- Lieberman, Ann and Lynn Miller. "Restructuring School: What Matters and What Works." Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 10 (June 1990): 759-64.
- Lieberman, Ann. "Collaborative Work." Educational Leadership 43, no. 5 (February 1986): 4-8.
- _____. "Collaborative Research: Working With, Not Working On." Educational Leadership 43, no. 5 (February 1986): 28-33.

- Lezotte, Lawrence W. "Base School Improvement on What We Know About Effective Schools." The American School Board Journal 176, no. 8 (August 1989): 18-20.
- Maeroff, Gene I. "Building Teams to Rebuild Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 74, no. 7 (March 1993): 512-19.
- Little, Judith Warren. "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success." American Education Research Journal 19, no. 3 (Fall 1982): 325-40.
- McGinnis, Iris. "Board Members Should Give the Bargaining Table a Wide Berth." The American School Board Journal 176, no. 8 (August 1989): 22-23.
- McInerny, George F. "The Academic Tradition and Collective Bargaining." Journal of Law & Education 16, no. 4 (Fall 1987): 467-79.
- Meadows, B. J. "The Rewards and Risks of Shared Leadership." Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 7 (March 1990): 545-48.
- Pajak, Edward F. and Carl D. Glickman. "Dimensions of School District Improvement." Educational Leadership 46, no. 8 (May 1989): 61-64.
- Peck, Louis. "Today's Teacher Unions Are Looking Well Beyond Collective Bargaining." The American School Board Journal 175, no. 7 (July 1988): 32-36.
- Rauth, Marilyn. "Exploring Heresy in Collective Bargaining and School Restructuring." Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 10 (June 1990): 781-90.
- Reitzug, Ulrich C. "Principal-Teacher Interactions in Instructionally Effective and Ordinary Elementary Schools." Urban Education 24, no. 1 (April 1989): 38-58.
- Shedd, Joseph B. "Collective Bargaining, School Reform, and the Management of School Systems." Educational Administration Quarterly 24, no. 4 (November 1988): 405-15.
- Smith, Stuart C. "The Collaborative School Takes Shape." Educational Leadership 45, no. 3 (November 1987): 4-6.
- "Struggling with Decentralization." ASCD Update 35, no. 2 (February 1993): 3.

- Timar, Thomas. "The Politics of School Restructuring." Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 4 (December 1989): 265-75.
- Tye, Kenneth A. "Restructuring Our Schools: Beyond the Rhetoric." Phi Delta Kappan 74, no. 1 (September 1992): 8-14.
- Tyler-Wood, Irma., C. Mark Smith, and Charles L. Barker. "Adversary Into Ally." The American School Board Journal 177, no. 7 (July 1990): 26-28.
- Watts, Gary D. and Robert M. McClure. "Expanding the Contract to Revolutionize School Renewal." Phi Delta Kappan 71, no. 10 (June 1990): 765-74.
- Wohlstetter, Priscilla and Karen McCurdy. "The Link Between School Decentralization and School Politics." Urban Education 25, no. 4 (January 1991): 391-414.

Books

- Bailey, William J. School-Site Management Applied. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc., 1991.
- Bostingl, John Jay. Schools of Quality: An Introduction to Total Quality Management in Education. United States: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1992.
- Brown, Daniel J. Decentralization: the Administrator's guidebook to School District Change. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc., 1991.
- _____. Decentralization and School-Based Management. London: The Falmer Press, 1990.
- Caldwell, Brian J. and Jim M. Spinks. The Self-managing School, with a foreword by David Reynolds. London: The Falmer Press, 1988.
- Chapman, Judith D., ed. School-based Decision-making and Management, with a foreword by D. N. Aspin. London: The Falmer Press, 1990.
- David, Jane L. "Restructuring in Progress: Lessons from Pioneering Districts," In Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform, ed. Richard F. Elmore, 209-50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1990.

- Epps, Edgar G. "School-Based Management: Implications for Minority Parents," In Restructuring Schools: Problems and Prospects, ed. John J. Lane and Edgar G. Epps, 143-63. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1992.
- Hartman, William T. School District Budgeting. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1988.
- Johnson, David W., Roger T. Johnson, Edythe Johnson Holubec, and Patricia Roy. Circles of Learning. United States: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1984.
- Larson, Carl E. and Frank M. J. LaFasto. TeamWork: What Must Go Right/What Can Go Wrong. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1989.
- Lunenburg, Fred C. and Allan C. Ornstein. Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1991.
- Odden, Allan R. and Lawrence O. Picus. School Finance: A Policy Perspective. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1992.
- Walton, Mary. The Deming Management Method, with a foreword by W. Edwards Deming. New York: The Putnam Publishing Group, 1986.

Dissertations

- Alexander, Gary Curn. "The Transformation of the Principal in a Metropolitan District: Uncertain Times, Uncertain Roles." Ph. D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1991.
- Anderson, Robert A. "Perceptions of Educational Leaders and Classroom Teachers in Macomb County, Michigan, of the Role Change Components of School Restructuring." Ed. D. diss., Wayne State University, 1991.
- James, T. Kenneth. "The Factors Affecting the Implementation of Site-Based Management and the Role of the Principal (California)." Ed. D. diss., United States International University, 1992.
- Lopez, Jose A. "Barriers to Curriculum Decentralization of an Urban School System: A Process Model for the Implementation of Site Based Management." Ph. D. diss., North Texas State University, 1983.

- Mack, Paul Jeffrey. "The Leadership Styles of Selected Wisconsin Elementary Principals." Ed. D. diss., Loyola University of Chicago, 1993.
- Meshanko, Edward J. "Teacher Decision-Making: An Analysis of Teachers', Principals' and School Board Members' Perspectives." Ed. D. diss., Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1990.
- Stellon, Kenneth D. "An Examination of the Principal's Role in the Implementation of the Concept of Shared Decision-Making and the Extent of Implementation of the Concept at Selected Junior High/Middle Level Schools in Illinois." Ed. D. diss., Loyola University of Chicago, 1992.
- Walkington, Barbara A. "Strategies Principals Use to Implement Shared Decision-Making." Ed. D. diss., University of LaVerne, CA, 1991.

VITA

The author, Myra C. (Kessel) Sanders, is the daughter of Walter F. Kessel and Colette M. (Brumleve) Kessel. She was born in Shelbyville, Illinois, on July 24, 1953. She has two older brothers, Michael A. Kessel and Dr. Stephen L. Kessel.

Mrs. Sanders obtained her elementary and secondary education in Shelbyville, Illinois, where she graduated valedictorian from Shelbyville High School in May 1971.

Mrs. Sanders earned a Bachelor of Arts from Eastern Illinois University in January 1975, graduating with Honors. During her junior and senior years, she was a member of Kappa Delta Pi (National Education Honor Society) and Sigma Tau Delta (National English Honor Society). During her senior year, Mrs. Sanders served as Treasurer of the university's chapter of Sigma Tau Delta and served as the student representative to the faculty's English Undergraduate Studies Committee and English Department Executive Consultative Council.

Mrs. Sanders earned a Master of Science in Education from Eastern Illinois University in August 1978, graduating with High Honors. Mrs. Sanders was inducted into the Eastern Illinois University chapter of Phi Delta Kappa in 1978.

In 1985, the National Council of Teachers of English designated the Reading Lab which Mrs. Sanders directed at Oak Lawn Community High

School a National Center of Excellence in English/Language Arts in the United States and Canada.

For the last five years, Mrs. Sanders has been employed by the Westchester Public Schools, District 92.5. From 1989 until 1992 she served as Director of Curriculum, and from 1992 to 1994, she was the principal of the Westchester Elementary School. Currently, she is the principal of the Westchester Intermediate School.

Mrs. Sanders resides in LaGrange Park, Illinois, with her husband of twenty years, Dr. Theodore L. Sanders, and her daughter, Alison Leigh Sanders.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Myra C. Sanders has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. L. Arthur Safer
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Janis Fine
Visiting Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

November 9, 1994
Date

Max A. Bailey
Director's Signature