

University of San Diego

Digital USD

---

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

---

1994

## The Leadership of a Superintendent: Putting the California School Reform Movement to Work

Jennifer L. Jeffries EdD  
*University of San Diego*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

---

### Digital USD Citation

Jeffries, Jennifer L. EdD, "The Leadership of a Superintendent: Putting the California School Reform Movement to Work" (1994). *Dissertations*. 594.  
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/594>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact [digital@sandiego.edu](mailto:digital@sandiego.edu).

**THE LEADERSHIP OF A SUPERINTENDENT: PUTTING THE  
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL REFORM MOVEMENT TO WORK**

by

**Jennifer L. Jeffries**

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of

**Doctor of Education**

**University of San Diego**

**1994**

**Dissertation Committee**

**Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D., Director**

**Mary W. Scherr, Ph.D.**

**Robert L. Infantino, Ed.D.**

**Copyright © 1994**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **THE LEADERSHIP OF A SUPERINTENDENT: PUTTING THE CALIFORNIA SCHOOL REFORM MOVEMENT TO WORK**

**JEFFRIES, JENNIFER L.** University of San Diego, 1994, 288 pp.  
Director: Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D.

Public education has been engulfed in a dramatic and turbulent time. In California, the drive for improvement in public education was codified in Senate Bill 813, passed in 1983. Each school district wrestled with the intent and the mandates of this massive reform document. During the implementation stage of this legislation, the organizational climate in school districts was ripe for leaders and followers to engage each other in dialogue and debate about the direction and form the legislation would take. This dialogue and debate rendered policies in response to the legislative mandates.

Senate Bill 813 provided opportunities to promote and secure change in California's public schools. There are lessons about leadership to be learned through analysis and reflection of this particular change effort. This research centers on the leadership behaviors of one superintendent during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. The superintendent's leadership behaviors are presented in the context of interacting with followers which

include school site administrators, governing board members, and teachers' association members. The study includes observations on how crisis and conflict came into play, as well as the presence or absence of moral and ethical considerations. The development of policies addressing four components of Senate Bill 813 are discussed extensively. The four components are the mentor teacher program, the evaluation of certificated personnel, grade level expectancies, and minimum proficiencies.

Qualitative methodologies were used in this study. The case study involved the review of documents, interviews with district employees, and governing board members, and direct observation of various district meetings. The resulting narrative describes the value-laden interactions of stakeholders as the superintendent engaged followers in a leadership relationship. The research findings verify the presence of the superintendent's behaviors as a leader as well as validate the presence of the leadership relationship.

## DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to all those  
who are committed to the  
inherent justice  
in the notion of public education.  
May they find comfort and courage  
in the tale of leadership  
found in these pages.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the genuine and enthusiastic assistance of the superintendent who was the subject of this study. I have great respect for him. The teachers, administrators, and board members who participated in this study were instrumental in my endeavor. Many thanks.

Gratitude and thanks go to my professional colleagues who consistently advised me that I was capable of completing this undertaking.

To my sisters, Mary and Wicki, who assured me they would love me whether I finished or not.

To Pat and Kathryn who would not let me entertain the possibility of not finishing.

To my mother who always insisted on fairness and to my father who always insisted on achievement.

To Dr. Robert Infantino for putting the finishing touches on my writing style.

To Dr. Mary Scherr for validating my quest to reflect reality.

To Dr. Joseph Rost for never allowing me to settle for fuzzy thinking.

Your insistence on intellectual rigor has greatly contributed to my capacity to learn and to grow as an individual.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication .....	ii
Acknowledgments .....	iii
Table of Contents .....	iv
List of Appendices .....	ix
<b>CHAPTER I. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction .....	1
Leading the Reforming .....	11
Purpose of the Study .....	14
Need for the Study .....	15
Definition of Terms .....	15
Limitations of the Study .....	16
Overview of the Study .....	17
<b>CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Introduction .....	19
Leadership .....	19
The Tools to Build the Relationship .....	35
Organizational Theory and Organizational Change .....	35



<b>Where Politics and Vision Meet: The Policy-making</b>	
<b>Process</b> .....	<b>56</b>
<b>Education Reform</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>How We Do Things</b> .....	<b>68</b>
<b>What Are We Going to Learn Today?</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>Superintendency</b> .....	<b>73</b>
<b>The Survival Agenda</b> .....	<b>73</b>
<b>The Superintendent and the Governing Board: The</b>	
<b>Question of Role and Power</b> .....	<b>79</b>
<b>Which Side Are You On?</b> .....	<b>82</b>
<b>CHAPTER III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>85</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>85</b>
<b>The Research Setting</b> .....	<b>86</b>
<b>Methodological Framework</b> .....	<b>87</b>
<b>Why a Case Study?</b> .....	<b>91</b>
<b>Selection of Subjects</b> .....	<b>93</b>
<b>Collecting Data</b> .....	<b>96</b>
<b>Analysis of Data</b> .....	<b>102</b>
<b>Limitations of the Research Design</b> .....	<b>104</b>
<b>Protection of Human Subjects</b> .....	<b>105</b>

**CHAPTER IV. THE MAN AND THE MANDATE:**

**A SUPERINTENDENT AND CALIFORNIA SCHOOL**

<b>REFORM</b> .....	<b>107</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>107</b>
<b>The Man and the Mandate</b> .....	<b>108</b>
<b>The Nature of the Superintendency and the Nature of the</b>	
<b>Superintendent</b> .....	<b>116</b>
<b>When Man and Mandate Meet: Creating and</b>	
<b>Cultivating the Vision</b> .....	<b>118</b>
<b>Surviving and Engaging Reference Groups</b> .....	<b>122</b>
<b>Perceived Power and Knowledge</b> .....	<b>142</b>
<b>Using the Tools - Forging the Relationship</b> .....	<b>145</b>
<b>Policymaking</b> .....	<b>145</b>
<b>Looking Through the Windows</b> .....	<b>164</b>
<b>Leadership Tasks and Behaviors</b> .....	<b>179</b>

**CHAPTER V. LEADING AND FOLLOWING: PUTTING THE**

<b>CALIFORNIA REFORM MOVEMENT TO WORK</b> .....	<b>186</b>
<b>Leadership Behaviors From the Perspective of Those</b>	
<b>Who Follow</b> .....	<b>187</b>
<b>Leadership Behaviors From the Perspective of One Who</b>	
<b>Chose Not to Follow</b> .....	<b>188</b>

<b>Leadership Behaviors From the Superintendent's</b>	
<b>Perspective</b> .....	189
<b>Speaking on Behalf of All Kids</b> .....	190
<b>Solving Problems</b> .....	190
<b>Mediating Conflict</b> .....	191
<b>Communicating to Show the Connections</b> .....	192
<b>Having A Vision</b> .....	197
<b>Action!</b> .....	201
<b>Crisis and Conflict</b> .....	202
<b>Debate and Dialogue</b> .....	205
<b>Moral and Ethical Considerations</b> .....	214
<b>The Leadership Relationship: Was It Present?</b> .....	219
<b>Embracing Leadership: The Superintendent and</b>	
<b>Teachers' Association</b> .....	220
<b>Embracing Leadership: The Superintendent and</b>	
<b>District Administrators</b> .....	227
<b>Embracing Leadership: The Superintendent and</b>	
<b>the Governing Board</b> .....	229
<b>The Presence of Leadership</b> .....	232
<b>The Magnitude and the Limitations of the</b>	
<b>Leadership Relationship</b> .....	236
<b>Leadership: The Horror and the Hope</b> .....	238

Discussion and Recommendations .....	241
Strengths of the Study .....	241
Weaknesses of the Study .....	242
Future Studies .....	244
Concluding Remarks .....	245
REFERENCE LIST .....	247
APPENDICES .....	259

## APPENDICES

Appendix A.	Interview Guides .....	259
Appendix B.	Consent Form, Committee on Protection of Human Subjects .....	264
Appendix C.	Memo on Change From Superintendent .....	267
Appendix D.	Standards of Proficiency in Basic Skills .....	271
Appendix E.	Education Code 44490-44497 .....	273
Appendix F.	Memos From Assistant Superintendent Regarding Contract Violations: Mentors .....	277
Appendix G.	Teacher Association Contract: Mentor Teacher Program .....	281
Appendix H.	Teachers' Association Contract: Evaluation Procedure .....	287
Appendix I.	Certificated Appraisal Instrument .....	290

## CHAPTER I

### STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

For more than a hundred years much complaint has been made of the unmethodical way in which schools are conducted, but it is only within the last thirty that any serious attempt has been made to find a remedy for this state of things. And with what result? Schools remain exactly as they were. (John Amos Comenius, 1632, *The Great Didactic*)

#### Introduction

There is a great dissatisfaction growing in our communities. It is the dissatisfaction of the public. This howl of dissatisfaction has spiked into anger at more and more frequent intervals; some howl with frustration and panic; yet others howl with puzzlement and fear; a few howl with glee. The object of their emotions is public education. Once trusted and revered by so many, now public schools are often thought of as inhibitors of learning rather than expeditors of learning. Once viewed as the great democratizing force in our society, bringing everyone up to the same level, now public education is viewed as the "mediocratizing" factor in our society, bringing everyone down to the same level.

The emotions generated by these perceptions have coalesced into action on several fronts over the last twenty years. Bending the political process to their will, special interest groups have left their mark on the daily life of schools in the form of legislation such as Public Law 942 which requires schools to meet the needs of disabled children in the least restrictive environment. Joining Public Law 942 are other legislative mandates covering everything from equal opportunity in sports for boys and girls to assuring services to students in migrant families.

During the past twenty years the public generally has been content to take their requests for change to elected representatives at local, state and federal levels. When elected officials did not respond by "doing the right thing," advocacy groups marched into the halls of justice and laid their grievances at the feet of state and federal judges who, in turn, mandated equalized funding formulas and integration. But change has been slow and halting. Not only were average citizens not seeing an improvement in the process and product of public education, but they were also witnessing what was characterized as a dramatic decline in student performance on every level.

More recently, the public's dissatisfaction with public education has been visible in several new arenas. Most notably was the effort in California to allow the use of tax revenue to pay for nonpublic schooling. This "Parental Choice in Education," a voucher initiative, appeared on the ballot in

November of 1993. Although the initiative was defeated at the polls, perhaps the most dramatic lesson to be learned from this grass-roots political action can be found by identifying the supporters of the initiative. Ethnic minority groups showed an interest because they felt their kids were getting a raw deal in inner city public schools. Business leaders indicated an interest because they believed competition could make the public schools shape up. Employers rallied around the idea of vouchers because they were frustrated by the lack of skills shown by applicants for jobs. Middle class suburban-dwelling moms and dads were drawn to the choice idea because they were wild-eyed at the increase in violence in their neighborhood schools. Ex-politicians, such as William Bennett, now employed by a conservative think-tank, forged unheard of alliances with traditionally disenfranchised groups by chanting, "Let the parents decide." Certain religious groups showed interest because they believed they could not influence the "godless" public schools on behalf of their children.

These stakeholders found alternative leaders outside the public school sector to pursue their educational agendas for them. This shift in trust has profound implications for those in public education. It makes life for public educators more complex, more emotionally laden, more chaotic and more anxiety ridden.

A less radical reform measure originating from inside the education establishment is the charter school concept which allows increased freedom



from state regulations for teachers who wish to start a charter school within the public school system. Two years into the process of applying for a charter school, the California State Department of Education verified that a total of forty-four applications have been approved.

Those pursuing the answers of effective reform will not find them solely by immersing themselves in the controversies of current reform efforts. The passage of time can give the perspective needed to judge the impact of such efforts. One helpful way to gain this much needed perspective is to look at previous reform efforts in order to reflect on the process of reform itself.

Since 1983, sixteen national reports on education have been issued. Without exception these reports have called for significant reforms in virtually every area of education--curriculum, administration, teacher education and school accountability. As these reports appeared on the front covers of professional journals and in the headlines of newspapers, the call for reform grew louder and louder. Parents, students, business executives, university and college officials, as well as elementary and secondary educators, acknowledged the need for change.

In the wake of these reports, educators have experienced varying degrees of success in bringing about change. In some states reform has taken the form of a decentralized approach where rethinking the nature of educating students is focused at the local and school site level. These efforts include ideas such as the use of lead teachers in place of administrators, a longer

school year, increased teacher contact with students, and more teacher involvement in the management of schools.

In California, the national reports, combined with the growing support of interest groups, have resulted in legislation and numerous other initiatives developed by the State Superintendent, the State Board of Education, and key legislators. Just over a decade ago, State Senators Theresa Hughes and Gary Hart took their cue from the public at large and special interest groups and developed a comprehensive reform act which was passed by the legislature in 1983. In this particular reform legislation and its subsequent implementation, the seeds of salvation or destruction for future reform efforts may be found.

The Hughes-Hart Educational Reform Act of 1983, Senate Bill 813, was a far-reaching legislative mandate for significant and, to a certain degree, radical change in the educational system of California public schools. The content of the act tackled every facet of the educational process, including the most important aspect, student learning.

The bill literally landed in the laps of superintendents throughout the state. The fate of the reform effort rested in their hands. Nothing mattered unless the spirit of the law became a reality in classrooms. It is in this nexus of mandate and leadership that the future of public education lies.

Senate Bill 813 included provisions which were both required and permissive. The content of the provisions ranged from the mundane to the

provocative. Upon review of the provisions some might say that many are just common sense ( i. e., notification of parents of failing students) and should be viewed as exactly what should have been in effect within public schools all along. Other provisions (i. e., mentor teaching training; increased graduation requirements) evoked quite an outcry from entrenched special interest groups because those provisions called for a significant change in the status quo. As a paradoxical example of this phenomenon, some math teachers resisted the additional required year of math because "some students just couldn't pass it."

The scope of the reforms included in Senate Bill 813 reached from teacher training to increased graduation requirements; from policy content to the number of instructional minutes in a school day. Those provisions pertinent to the kindergarten through eighth grade setting, where the subject of this study served as a superintendent, included the following:

Certificated evaluation and assessment

Minimum instructional minutes

Pupil promotion and retention

Parent notification of truancy and failing students

Suspension and expulsion

Elementary course of study

Duties of school site council

California Assessment Program testing program

Professional growth requirements for teachers and others

Model curriculum standards

Mentor teacher program

School improvement program

Classroom teacher instructional improvement

As the list reflects, the provisions of Senate Bill 813 were, in a sense, disparate and loosely connected. The meaningful implementation of Senate Bill 813 was dependent on the leadership of local district personnel. Failure to genuinely implement the reform provisions would result in a litany of policies or procedures with no substantial translation into the daily life of staff and students.

The direction for reform was laid before public school leaders. Their job was to use their knowledge, skills and energy to transform the linear directions provided in the legislation into a multi-dimensional journey and to reach the desired destination of increased student learning.

Senate Bill 813 confronted individuals and institutions with their shortcomings. By simply including the requirement to systematically report student failure to parents, the law was demanding, "Why haven't you people been doing this all along? It's so basic to your job! We can't believe we had to say it so plainly to get you to do it!"

Senate Bill 813 also inspired individuals and institutions to seek excellence. The mentor teacher program hooked money and teacher

excellence together and dared to encourage the overt acknowledgment that at any given time there are teachers who are qualitatively better than their peers.

As Senate Bill 813 entered the consciousness and daily lives of superintendents, administrators and teachers, there were both cerebral and emotional responses. Many began to think about the possibilities; an equal or greater number began to think about how to resist the coming changes at all costs. For some it was a time of great excitement; for others the mandates were a negative comment on a lifetime of contribution. Shame, anger, hostility, and defensiveness ruled many conversations on the subject of implementing the mandated reforms.

The job of the superintendent in the implementation process put him/her right in the middle of great organizational chaos. Teachers' associations fought on many fronts to block or neutralize the implementation of certain aspects of the reform act. They found the increased attention to the evaluation of teachers and the mentor teacher program to be particularly threatening. Higher accountability for student progress also raised the hackles of represented labor. Unintended effects of the reform act, such as the reduction in the number of electives due to an increase in academic graduation requirements, were a particularly painful and bloody journey for many secondary superintendents. It would be difficult to find even one

aspect of Senate Bill 813 that did not hit a raw nerve within at least one stakeholder group.

This whole notion of systemic and comprehensive reform was, after all, relatively revolutionary. Up until 1983 the public schools of California were virtually left to their own devices. Local governing boards set local policies and local programs were designed to reflect those policies. The resulting disparity in programs and student success from district to district drove the legislature to declare common standards through Senate Bill 813. The sanctity of "local control" lost significant ground.

Along with less local control came the rise of parochial interests on the part of key stakeholders. Principals were now required to evaluate effective teaching practices. Nice bulletin boards and keeping the kids quiet were no longer enough. Learning the effective elements of instruction and being able to talk about them became the new standard for administrative excellence. Superintendents were faced with principals who possessed varying degrees of willingness and ability to take on the intellectual rigor needed to learn about learning and teaching.

Teachers were also required to gain a sophisticated knowledge of the teaching-learning interaction with their students. Some took to it like a duck to water. Others spit in its eye, demeaning the notion of clinical instruction as a way to pigeon hole teachers and take all the fun out of teaching. These reactions were based upon many genuine emotions such as fear and

embarrassment. Sometimes the reaction was based upon a misplaced rugged individualism which translated out to say, "No administrator is going to tell me how to do my job!"

Superintendents found themselves in the unenviable position of sending reluctant administrators into classrooms to apply rigorous standards of evaluation on distrustful, anxious employees. This combination of factors and the deadlines imposed by the legislation put superintendents on the tip of the sword when it came to the change process. The superintendents' partners in this effort were the lay boards of education elected by the community at large.

The nature of governance changed for governing board members. Suddenly meeting agendas were filled with policies describing extensive due process rights for students, setting proficiency standards in reading, writing, and math and increasing the instructional day. More new policies popped up during the implementation of Senate Bill 813 than most veteran governing board members had ever seen during their terms of office.

Inevitably, the sheer number of policy topics forced into the light of day put some new twists into the relationship between the superintendents and board members. At the very least, the amount of information flowing from one to the other picked up dramatic speed; at the most, in some district, board-superintendent relationships were stressed by the intense discussions associated with the core values of the organization and how Senate Bill 813

affected those core values. The health of the relationship was dependent upon how the onslaught of change was handled by all parties concerned. A mutual responsibility resided at the heart of the interaction, but it was surrounded by the "push-me-pull-me" dynamics of influence and, in some cases, coercive behaviors, which are frequently present in highly charged political settings.

Senate Bill 813 shouted the "what" of educational reform. The "how" resided in the leadership relationship between superintendents and key players in the districts.

#### Leading the Reforming

With so much chaos and emotion both inside and outside the public school system, are school systems capable of healing themselves? Is there light at the end of the tunnel? Will public education as it is known have to be destroyed in order to be saved? Can attempts to reform public education really make a difference?

Changing public education requires more than knowing what one wants to do. Many people know what they want, but they fail to get it into place. The study of leadership and how it came into play during the implementation of Senate Bill 813 may provide some insights into the possibilities of real reform of public education. Although some quantitative evaluations of Senate Bill 813 have been completed, very little has been done to study the leadership relationship of district superintendents and their followers as the



reform process moved forward. Based upon my experience, these are the very factors which hold the greatest lessons for reform. It is in these relationships that an understanding of how change actually occurs in the educational setting is found.

This quest starts with a bit of a knowledge deficit. Leadership as a discipline frequently suffers from a simplistic analysis most often based upon an individual's background or circumstance. An individual's personality, charisma or good fortune become the factors which explain whether leadership is present.

These less-than-rigorous explanations do not assist educators in the attempt to understand how leadership works , nor do they help to bring that understanding to bear on the critical educational issues of our times. Because so much hangs in the balance of successful reform, a conscious evaluation and acknowledgment of leadership is the greatest hope for educational reform.

Part of understanding leadership lies in what Burns (1978) called the intellectual crisis in leadership. He maintained that the problem is that the nature of leadership is not understood. He challenged his readers to understand the subtle and not so subtle qualities of leadership, to master those understandings, and to apply them to the settings in which an intended change is so desperately needed.

While Burns gives us the blinking cursor as a starting place in our inquiry, his notion of developing a sophisticated understanding of leadership has been pursued and further developed by academicians and practitioners alike. Rost's (1991) description of leadership as an "influence relationship" captures the interrelatedness of leaders and followers in an on-going process. Foster (1989) further describes leadership as taking place in a community where interaction and search for meaning take place with the consent of those involved.

The observations of Burns, Rost and Foster about leadership have enormous significance when applied to educational settings. As Herriott and Green (1979) found, those in charge of innovation or change in an educational setting had virtually no preparation for their demanding duties. They also found that generally these ill-prepared but well-intentioned people were to work in a context of crisis where time and resources were in short supply.

Boyer (1981) identified inertia, caution, and convention as the greatest impediments to the educational leader. These impediments often cause the leader to embrace less controversial issues in order to get the movement started. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to maintain any momentum because of the formidable and forbidding structure found in educational settings (Sizer, 1984).

Overcoming the impediments to change is one of the most daunting tasks faced by a leader. Taylor (1984) found that the very slowness with which public schools have responded to the changes in society make public education vulnerable to the harsh judgment of those who are affected by those very societal changes. As an example, white middle class parents are getting nervous about the number of limited-English speaking students in the classroom. The sluggish California economy has resulted in tighter school budgets. Californians now want greater accountability for those scarce dollars. In another example, the re-emergence of the religious right has placed the separation of church and state in the in-basket of every superintendent in the state. The need for understanding leadership increases as the dissatisfaction of the followers grows.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine what leadership behaviors were manifested by a school district superintendent given the opportunities created by Senate Bill 813 to promote educational reform in school districts. As the case study unfolds, the leadership behaviors of one superintendent are analyzed in such a way as to address the following objectives:

1. To delineate and investigate the superintendent's leadership behaviors which produced changes as Senate Bill 813 was implemented.
2. To describe the interactions of the superintendent and followers in the relationships established in response to Senate Bill 813. In particular, the

study considers such interactive processes as how crisis and conflict came into play; how debate and dialogue were manifested; and the presence or absence of moral/ethical considerations.

3. To analyze actions and interactions to determine whether or not a leadership relationship was present in implementing Senate Bill 813.

### Need for the Study

The very survival of public education is at stake in the success or failure of the reform movement. The leadership manifested in future reform efforts will determine the substance and the process found in the schools for decades to come. A misstep now could result in a retrenchment into the industrial model of education where students and staff are viewed as objects to be controlled and measured.

The superintendent in this study is the entry point through which the reform movement can be analyzed in a practical, real world setting. The relationship among leaders and followers and the changes generated by these relationships can then be studied. This study will assist educators in putting the reform movement to work by describing actions, interactions, dialogue, and debate which promoted or discouraged change in a public school system.

### Definition of Terms

The following terms as defined below are used in this study.

Leadership: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (Rost,

1991, p. 102). Leadership takes place in the context of a community, as observed by Foster (1989).

**Culture:** "The pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems" (Schein, 1984, p. 3).

**Leaders and Followers:** Individuals in an organization who are defined as a "leader" or "follower" based upon the degree of influence they possess at a given time on a given issue. They are bonded to each other based on mutual goals, not by force.

**Community:** The geographic and psychological boundaries within which the leader-follower relationship is played out.

### Limitations of the Study

There are three significant limitations to this study. The first revolves around the narrow slice of evidence provided through the study of just one superintendent, one district, and one major change event. One needs to measure the capacity to generalize from these observations against the broader landscape of other school districts and change efforts.

The second limitation is rooted in the time lapse between the passage and implementation of Senate Bill 813 and the conclusion of this study.

While this time lapse may bring perspective to the observations of the participants, it may also dull the memories of those interviewed.

The third limitation to the study is based on the personal experiences of the researcher. I was an assistant principal during the time that Senate Bill 813 was passed and implementation was begun. My first-hand familiarity with this particular change effort from the site administrator perspective serves to deepen my understanding; however, I must guard against inserting my own interpretation on the findings of this study. A final confounding factor is the fact that I became a superintendent while completing this study. The natural inclination to overlay the experience of this position on the observations of this dissertation must be monitored closely.

### Overview of the Study

This dissertation is presented in five chapters. Chapter One includes the purpose of the study which is to describe the leadership behaviors of a school superintendent which produced changes during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. The three objectives which guide this inquiry are presented in this chapter. Chapter Two contains a review of literature in the areas of leadership, organizational theory and change, policy-making process, educational reform, and the superintendency. The components of this literature review were selected in order to further the researcher's understanding of the leadership relationship and the multiple processes which coalesce during a change effort in public education. Chapter Three

contains the rationale for a case study and the procedures which were used to gather and analyze the data in this qualitative study. Chapter Four presents the data gathered from interviews, documents, and observations. The data is organized to reflect the review of the literature. The research data provided examples of many of the concepts discussed in the review of the literature, including the nature of the superintendency, policymaking, organizational theory and change, and leadership. Four major policy outcomes of Senate Bill 813 are central to this chapter. Chapter Five culminates the dissertation by offering some conclusions regarding the purpose of the study and the three objectives stated in Chapter One. The leadership behaviors of the superintendent are analyzed from several perspectives, including those of teachers, principals, and board members. The presence of dialogue, debate, conflict and crisis, as well as the moral/ethical dimensions of the relationship are discussed. Observations are made about the magnitude and limitations of the leadership relationship.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This review of the literature embraces an interdisciplinary approach to studying the superintendent as a transforming leader. This phenomenon will be viewed through the window of educational reform.

Exploring the concept of leadership as a relationship, along with a study of the nature of the superintendency, provides a theoretical framework and a practical perspective for this inquiry into how educational reform is actually carried out. The major topics included in the review are leadership, organizational theory and change, policy-making, the superintendency and educational reform.

#### Leadership

In his seminal work, *Leadership*, James MacGregor Burns (1978) called upon students of leadership to cast aside the traditional models of leadership that have influenced civilizations for centuries. As thoroughly discussed by Rost (1991), humankind has been foundering for decades trying to put words to the leadership phenomenon. Leadership has been described in terms of personality, power, and charisma. It has been equated with "good



management" and confused with power wielding. It has been tied to the historical time in which it was manifested and ascribed to virtually every human act.

These simplistic notions of leadership are to be set aside as inadequate in a complicated, ambiguous, contemporary world (Dilenschneider, 1992; Kanter, 1983; Maccoby, 1981; Morrison, 1992 ). Burns (1978) challenged his readers to understand a leadership which transforms followers and society in the pursuit of mutual purposes. This process of transformation, he maintained, takes place in a competitive environment where leaders and followers are committed to a vision which honors the mutual wants, needs, desires, and values of both the leaders and followers.

While Burns' concept of transformational leadership certainly gives a foothold when discussing leadership, the postindustrial leadership defined by Rost (1991) is an updated and powerful one: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real change that reflect their mutual purpose" (p. 102).

Rost's in-depth discussion of this definition confronts the slippery issue of raising followers to a higher moral plane as required by Burns' definition. Rost maintained that the ethical element of leadership is found within the relationship rather than as a necessary product of the relationship.

Rost also drove the definition forward when he spoke of leadership as intending real change rather than measuring leadership by real intended

changes. This subtle shift in meaning makes the theory accessible to practitioners on a moment-to-moment basis because the process is as important as the product. The product or change is not always evident immediately, but the leadership relationship is constantly available . Foster (1989) described a context in which the leadership relationship is played out in a community where the interactive process of leaders and followers is a consensual task, where there is a sharing of ideas and responsibilities, where a "leader" is a leader for the moment only, where leadership experienced must be validated by the consent of followers, and where leadership lies in the struggles of a community to find meaning for itself (p. 61). The nexus of Burns' seminal leadership definition and the essential elements described by Rost (1991) and Foster (1989) provide the context and process of the leadership relationship. The content of the leadership relationship is the mutual purpose of leaders and followers.

The development of mutuality in the leadership-followership relationship is partially driven by changes in the world and in individuals. The members of an organization bring a new perspective of who they are and what they want to be. No longer are position, authority, and power viewed as legitimating a given person as a leader. Leaders can no longer dictate what is best. Kinsman (1986) identified this shift from paternalism to "fraternalism." He described the new way as "leadership from alongside" (p.

1). This new positional understanding of how leadership is manifested presents many new considerations for leaders.

One significant consideration is the mutuality of vision. Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton (1985) summarize this notion of mutuality by stating:

The transformation of our culture and our society would have to happen at a number of levels. If it occurred only in the minds of individuals (as to some degree it already has), it would be powerless. If it came only from the initiative of the state, it would be tyrannical. Personal transformation among large numbers is essential, and it must also involve individual action. But individuals need the nurture of groups that carry a moral tradition reinforcing their own aspirations. (p.286)

This observation supports Hooks (1953) in his discussion of "authority" versus "authoritarian" in the specific context of education. He noted that without authority there would be chaos. However, he went on to list the ideals which are endangered when the authority of tyranny is present in the educational setting.

The development of intellectual and emotional maturity.

The readiness to meet the challenge of new experiences on the basis of relevant knowledge.

The acquisition of techniques and values that are themselves tested in present experience.

The deepening of moral awareness and responsibility.

The cultivation of intelligent loyalty to the underlying values of the democratic community as distinct from any particular political expression of these values. (p. 124)

The importance of discriminating among the sources of power (i. e., position, resources, moral/ethical imperative, etc.) is essential to the discussion of leadership. It has everything to do with leaders and followers building common purpose (Greenleaf, 1977). While the use of power is necessary, it is in and of itself not enough to bring about change. Rather, as Nair (1990) stated, one should "create commitment. It is more efficient in influencing people than commanded obedience. Commitment enables individuals to work to their full potential; the obedient do only what is necessary" (p. 34).

#### What Place Vision?

One cannot escape addressing the part vision has in the leader-follower relationship. Indeed, Greenleaf (1977) would say there is nothing more important for leaders to do than to define the organization since all other efforts rest on this essential act. Bennis (1989) and Schlechty (1990) see it as the first basic ingredient of leadership. The leadership literature is replete with interpretations of the nature of vision, purpose, and mission. In the final analysis there is probably not much benefit to practitioners to split hairs over the nuances of these different terms. It is more helpful to hone in

on the heart of the issue which is what gives meaning to the quest for excellence in any organization.

"Where are we going?" is probably the most direct linguistic description of vision. But language is so limiting in its ability to communicate the multiple dimensions of a concept. The vision dimension of leadership uses emotional, spiritual, and psychological telescopes and microscopes to probe the micro and macro areas of an organization's potential. Vision takes long-term rather than short-term snapshots of the future and frames them for the organization. Vision assumes aspiration and inspiration in capturing the vision and presenting it to those who care about the organization. Vision elevates the motivation for caring about the organization from enlightened self-interest to emblazoned whole-interest.

Gardner (1990) asserted that there is a "visible future." He goes on to say that

the future announces itself from afar. But most people are not listening. The noisy clatter of the present drowns out the tentative sounds of things to come. The sound of the new does not fit old perpetual patterns and goes unnoticed by most people. . . . Leaders who have the wit to perceive and the courage to act will be credited with a gift of prophecy that they do not necessarily have. (p. 131)

Nanus (1989) identified the qualities of vision as being "credible, easily understood, optimistic, and ennobling" (p. 107). A leader who inspires

followers to see themselves in the vision has provided the spark that ignites their energies.

Vaile (1984) described what leaders do in high performing organizations as *purposing*. In his study, he identified time-feeling-focus as the investments a leader makes in order to have a *purposing* organization. Leaders in high-performing systems expend incredible amounts of time, they have strong feelings about attaining the organization's purpose, and they focus on key issues and variables. In his description, it appears that *purposing* distills the diverse and ambiguous interests of followers and leaders. In that sense Vaile's *purposing* is akin to vision because it is a "continuous stream of actions by an organization's formal leadership which has the effect of inducing clarity, consensus, and commitment regarding the organization's basic purpose" (p.91).

Badaracco and Ellsworth (1989) present a case for the leader to be the exemplar of the vision of the organization. Without congruency between the stated vision and the actions of the leader, followers will not feel committed to their own actions. This is a particularly important observation about leaders because, "humans do not behave but act. Actions differ from behavior in that they are born of preconceptions, assumptions, and motives, and these are imbedded with meanings" (Sergiovanni, 1984, p. 106).

In a loosely coupled system such as a school district, Weick (1982) suggested that a leader brings about change by assuming the role of a

therapist who builds conceptual frameworks for the members of the organization. To further explain this metaphor, Weick described the conceptual therapist as one who "articulates confusion and acts like a grammarian who gives people rules for tying together and labeling parts of their experience" (p. 404). Weick's description is very helpful when thinking about what place vision has in a leadership-followership relationship. A leader becomes the conceptual therapist as she or he articulates the vision of the organization. The therapist notion implies a give and take, a discovery, among all parties (pp. 404-405). Bass (1985) supported this notion by pointing out that a compelling vision "helps followers to see the real conflict between competing values, the inconsistencies between espoused values and behavior, the need for realignments in values, and the need for changes in behavior" (pp. 38-39).

Both the development and the embracing of a vision bond leaders and followers to each other. In their comments regarding the importance of followership to leadership, Litzinger and Schaefer (1984) call attention to the necessity of leaders being good followers. Leaders must be obedient to the group's values or, in other words, the vision. This is the iterative quality of leadership and followership. The actions played out between individual followers and leaders as well as within the leader's psyche and soul either strengthen the given authority of the leader or break the link between leader and follower. In contemporary times there is a list of broken relationships

between leader and followers from which to draw this lesson. Jimmy Swaggert, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon are some examples.

In the field of education there is a danger in confusing mandates with vision. As described by Sergiovanni (1989), "Those who evaluate the efficacy of school reform initiatives need to be concerned not only with what people seem to be doing but also what is actually happening" (p. 1). To his thinking, vision in the educational arena requires that it be close to the classroom and reflect the importance of student learning.

Just as a law or regulation does not a vision make, neither is vision merely an idea. Senge (1990) maintained that vision "is a force in people's hearts, a force of impressive powers" (p. 206). As big as vision is, Harrison (1985) cautioned that the vision must be supported by several "small wins" on the way to the big game. He acknowledged the place intuition and thought have in individual and organizational change efforts. Leaders need to pay attention to the "self-talk" in an organization as they build, modify, and renew the vision of the organization.

The impediments to leaders and followers arriving at a mutual vision are many. Reinhold Neibuhr (1932) explained that

Educators, as well as other middle class moralists, underestimate the conflict of interest in political and economic relations, and attribute to disinterested ignorance what ought to be attributed to interested intelligence. . . . There is no educational process which can place any



class in possession of all the facts or cause it to appreciate all the feelings which activate another class. (p. 215 )

This eloquent alternative to "you can't walk a mile in my shoes," and "every man for himself" is an important caution for those striving to find common ground.

### Leadership as an Expression of Culture

When a leader steps into an organization, she or he is surrounded by the culture of that organization. It is palpable because it embraces "the shared patterns of thought, belief, feelings, and values that result from shared experience and common learning" (Schein, 1985, p. 50). It surpasses the mission statement, the budget, past practices and all other singular, material manifestations of the organization. It is the whole. It is the sound an organization makes. "Organizations are therefore cultural artifacts: they are systems of meaning that can be understood only through the interpretation of meaning" (Greenfield, 1984, p.15).

All organizations are susceptible to outside forces. In fact, many contemporary organizations are plainly threatened by external forces. Education, medicine, and law are all in periods of great scrutiny and arousal. The continued existence of these institutions in their current form is severely in doubt. One counterforce to this threat is the culture of the organization.

Within the organization, culture solves two basic problems: (a) how to survive and adapt to the external environment, and (b) how to integrate

internal processes in order to continue to survive and adapt (Merton, 1957; Parsons, 1951). Survivability is a requirement of change since the leader has to have something to change. The culture of the organization can be used to preserve those attributes which support the vision and therefore strengthen the survivability of the organization.

To understand the organization and therefore to be able to lead, the leader must pay attention to the "visible" and "feelable" culture; in order to understand the actions and feelings of the people in the organization, he or she must understand the culture and must sort through the subsets of culture such as philosophy, technique, and style in order to get to the heart of the organization's culture (Schein, 1985).

Generalizing the observations of Taylor (1984) in the university community, all organizations have a "material culture" and a "symbolic culture." Both are real and an understanding of each is required of effective leadership. Leadership in the context of organizational culture must use the material culture found in "space and time" as well as the symbolic culture found in "language, ritual, ideology, myth and belief" (p. 127).

In order to understand the culture of their organizations, educational leaders must recognize organizations as "nonnatural order." To mistake the nature of organizations as "natural order" tricks leaders into assuming too much logic is at play in the interaction within the organization. This can lead to underestimating the importance of certain rituals, practices, and

traditions which on face value do not seem to be important or to make sense (Greenfield, 1984). The need for reform is to respond to the crisis which Purpel (1989) would describe as a crisis in meaning rather than "problems of techniques, organization, and funding" (p. 27).

By recognizing the nonnatural order of organizations, leaders can carefully approach the analysis of organizational culture without relying too heavily or unilaterally on "brute data." As noted by Sergiovanni (1984) in the 10-P model of leadership, there are both tactical and strategic requirements for quality leadership. The actual tactical requirements for quality leadership are found in what Sergiovanni calls *prerequisites*. Included in prerequisites are "such skills as mastering and using various contingency leadership theories, conflict management tactics, team management principles. . . and group process techniques" (p. 107-108). The strategic requirements for leadership are found in nine principles which include *perspective, planning, persisting, and patriotism* (p. 108). While the tactical aspect can be somewhat served by using brute data, the leadership described by Rost (1991) and Foster (1989) and in the strategic principles contained in the 10-P model of leadership can actually be sabotaged by reliance on facts and figures to the exclusion of meaning, motivation and social reality.

Adams and Spencer (1986) share some of the elements included in both the tactical and strategic leader described by Sergiovanni (1984). Their idea of the strategic leader is described by five premises:

Leadership is a state of consciousness rather than a personality trait or skill.

A primary role of the leader is to activate, establish, and nurture a focus on the vision, purpose and outcomes.

It is cost effective to focus attention on empowering the workforce.

A systems perspective is necessary to avoid emphasis on alleviating symptoms.

Attention to needed support systems is essential to achieving the vision. (pp. 9-11)

Applying these premises can guide a leader in understanding the culture of an organization and in promoting the reinventing of meaning within the organization.

Since the culture of an organization determines what it is, leaders must pay attention to the molding and shaping of that culture. No organization, even a new organization, starts from scratch in the culture department. Founding members bring experiences with them. Established organizations have significant histories from which the current culture has been derived. Embedding and transmitting culture is one of the most important endeavors a leader must pursue.

Schein (1985) noted five mechanisms for impacting the culture of an organization. They are all action based and require the active participation of the leader.

What leaders pay attention to, measure and control;

Leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises;

Deliberate role modeling, teaching, coaching;

Criteria for allocation of rewards and status;

Criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement and excommunication. (pp. 224-225)

By utilizing these embedding mechanisms, a leader can come to know the culture of an organization while influencing it. The mechanisms become a call and response from the leader to the followers and from the followers to the leader. This allows the leader to interpret and have interpreted the culture within the organization.

In analyzing the cultural content of an organization with change in mind, the leader must also take into account the growth stage of the organization. Schein's (1985) discussion of growth stages is quite comprehensive. Perhaps most applicable to this study of public school districts is "organizational maturity." Organizations in this stage of growth have cultures which put the lid on innovation and hearken to the good old days when things were peachy keen. The organization stagnates due to a lack of motivation to change. The entrenched nature of the culture of a

mature organization requires change mechanisms which are characterized by Schein as "coercion," "persuasion," "turnaround," and "reorganization, destruction, rebirth" (pp. 271-272). This is a tricky piece of business for a leader because the organization could die from the treatment for what ails it.

The culture of an organization is shaped by the interaction among and between leader and followers and followers and followers. As Sergiovanni (1984) observed,

Leadership as cultural expression seeks to build unity and order within an organization by giving attention to purposes, historical and philosophical tradition, and ideals and norms which define the way of life within an organization and which provide the basis for socializing members and obtaining their compliance. (p. 106)

In the building of unity and order the leader communicates a common purpose and, if successful, gains the voluntary loyalty of those in the organization. Greenfield (1984) described the life of the organization as arising "from a web of cross-connected wills as active agents live their lives and strive to make the world as they know it to be" (p. 152). These agents search for congruity in the organization with their personal beliefs and social constructs. The nature of willfulness is critical to understanding the nature of leadership because what opposes the willfulness of the leader is of course the will of other people. This, then, is the leadership dialogue.

Greenfield's (1984) theory of organizations as will and imagination rejected group mind, rejected a social reality beyond human control and acknowledged the "tumult and irrationality of thought itself" (p. 152). By recognizing the non-rationality of organizations, Greenfield laid a significant challenge in front of leaders and followers alike by declaring individual responsibility and individual power as inherent qualities of organizations. Sergiovanni (1984) gave added credence to this by declaring:

humans do not behave but act. Actions differ from behavior in that they are born of preconceptions, assumptions, and motives, and these are imbedded with meanings. . . . Over time, compatibility increases as center and periphery values each take on characteristics of each other.  
(pp. 105 and 113)

Meanings bind leaders and followers together or explode them apart.

The assertion of one's will generally causes conflict. For leaders who understand the nonrationality of organizations, this conflict will not be perceived as a threatening situation. Indeed, to view opposition as a maladjustment rather than a normal reaction in the dialogue of change, and therefore to react to it as unacceptable, sows the seeds of resentment, distrust, and disaster.

## The Tools to Build the Relationship

### Organizational Theory and Organizational Change

Impediments to change and the manifestation of leadership come in many forms, including organizational structures. Educational settings are marked by power struggles and realignments. Institutional structures further inoculate participants against real and intended change because interest groups cling tenaciously to the form of education rather than addressing the substance of education (Boyer, 1981; Sizer, 1985).

By definition, those in a leadership relationship intend real change. The context in which that change takes place is an organization. Therefore, understanding how organizations function and how they change is essential to the understanding of leadership. The four major perspectives of organizational change theory, as identified by Bolman and Deal (1985), are: (a) structural, (b) human resource, (c) political, and (d) symbolic,

These perspectives provide a window on the world and can be used to order the world so decisions can be made. As is true with the windows of a house, these windows of perspective prevent the viewer from seeing the entire picture. While this narrower view provides a focus for an analysis of a given situation from a given perspective, leaders must keep in mind that what they may gain in clarity by studying a small piece of the picture, they may lose to simplicity in their response if that response is based on too narrow a perspective.



Both leaders and followers would benefit from the analytical opportunities offered by single window observation, but not to the neglect of synthesizing multiple window observations. It is through the synthesizing of multiple window observations that the greatest potential for realizing mutuality and inclusiveness can be achieved.

How Organizations Learn: Structures Which Promote and Inhibit Learning. The discussion of organizations as structures includes some discussion of roles, policies, procedures, information analysis and systems. The structural window into organizational change theory has been described and embraced by many students of organizational change.

Weick (1982) provided a theoretical model which offers the practitioner an opportunity to begin a change process. Weick's notion of a loosely coupled system describes an organization with elements which have distinct identities and boundaries and are responsive to the forces within and without. While it is true that the internal dynamics of a loosely coupled organization could work against change, it is equally true that it could foster change through its natural elasticity. This elasticity enables the organization to withstand the shockwaves which can accompany change.

Loosely coupled systems often manifest a learning mechanism called double-loop learning (Argyris & Schon, 1978). Double-loop learning occurs when individuals in an organization challenge and examine the ideas and rules which govern the organization. In the process of doing so, the

individuals inject new ways of thinking and acting within the organization. Once these new ways of thinking and doing are institutionalized, double-loop learning has taken place. This structural mechanism allows the organization to adapt and therefore survive. While the loosely coupled feature of an organization can provide an entry point for the leader to initiate a change process, double-loop learning is the doorway to teaching new ways of thinking and doing. Leaders use double-loop learning to pursue the mission of the organization rather than allowing the organization to perpetuate its myths.

The context in which double-loop learning takes place must be understood by the transforming leader if the leader is to truly understand the nature of the organization. A metaphor which is particularly applicable to the educational setting is that of an organized anarchy (Cohen & March, 1983).

This metaphor predominantly describes a structural phenomenon although it does have some application to the political perspective as well. This metaphor for an organization calls attention to the ambiguity of purpose so often present in complex organizations. This ambiguity, which foils any attempt to change an organization in a linear, rational manner, calls upon leaders to leverage the diversity within the organization to bring about the intended change.

Just as is true with the loosely coupled organization, organized anarchy has many points of entry which allow the leader to challenge or reinforce the core values of an organization. The task of a leader in an organized anarchy requires the leader to spend time, persist, exchange status for substance, facilitate participation of the opposition, diversify goals, manage unobtrusively, and interpret history.

There are two additional structural metaphors which defy the linear, rational approach to understanding organizations. The garbage can (Cohen, March, & Olsen 1972), represents the intermingling of loosely connected problems and participants. The unpredictable selection of priorities and solutions in the garbage can results in problems being solved in unexpected ways.

Just as the garbage can metaphor defies the rational perspective of change, the lawn party metaphor gives legitimacy to the unpredictable nature of change. In measuring the success of federal projects at the local level, Farrar, De Sanctis and Cohen (1980) found that the terms of success varies from participant to participant. Guests do not attend this party for the same reasons. In fact, guests create their own party. The only way to declare a success is to acknowledge the diversity of outcomes as evidence of a successful process rather than bemoaning the absence of a singular product.

Part of a leader's job is to cope with the internal and external changes that constantly buffet an organization. Joiner (1986) offered three working

principles for organizational learning. A leader can use these principles to counteract the ebb and flow of cooperation and disruption. *Shared purpose* calls for clarity of values and results. *Active experimentation* calls for the conscious testing of results on an on-going basis. This has also been called *reflection-in-action* by Schon (1984). Finally, the third principle calls for *open integrity*. In this principle, leaders maintain an open mind to the opposition which inevitably accompanies change. Conflict is used to learn new ways of doing things. Conflict can modify structures which inhibit change by shifting the perceptions of followers and leaders alike (p.53).

Evaluating organizational structures to determine how they promote or impede the attainment of goals is a leadership task. Shandler (1986) suggested that leaders use four questions to evaluate the structures in their organizations: (a) Do the structures either accelerate or inhibit purpose? (b) Do unspoken rules take priority over spoken rules? (c) Do symptoms point to structural weakness? (d) Do all structures have their own payoff (p. 124)?

The application of these principles in the educational setting by a superintendent can help to pinpoint structures which need attention in his or her quest to bring change to the organization. In some instances just aligning the day-to-day structures with the stated purpose of the organization can open up opportunities for change.

Inevitably, in analyzing an organization, the leader will find strongly held core values which, if left unchallenged, will inhibit change. These core

values are reflected in organizational structures which are resistant to change because they are often shrouded in a logic of confidence which protects the organization from falling prey to doubt and possible extinction (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). The failure to let go of core values which no longer serve the purpose of the organization can have drastic consequences. As Senge (1990) stated, "Learning disabilities are tragic in a child, but they are fatal to organizations" (p. 18). Challenging strongly held beliefs must be done when the goal is to attain real change (Alderfer, 1977; Senge, 1990; Weick, 1982).

Challenging core values is not the only organizational icon a leader must confront. Argyris and Schon (1974) pointed out that organizations lie to themselves by simultaneously holding an espoused theory in mind while playing out a theory-in-use in the workplace. This is a special form of organizational dysfunction which must be handled with care and consideration as the aligning of belief and action takes place.

Change literature which emphasizes the structural aspects of organizations includes observations regarding roles. Fritz (1986) described four roles which individuals might assume in an organization where the leader is pressing for change. The "collaborator" magnifies the scope of the vision and the "amplifier" expands the magnitude of the vision. The collaborator and the amplifier are deeply connected and committed to the vision. "Technicians" provide the nitty-gritty services necessary to push

toward the vision and "supporters" are benign participants who do nothing to harm progress but may do little to nurture it. Technicians and supporters find compatibility with the leader's vision, but do not necessarily invest as much energy as collaborators and amplifiers.

Lion-Berger (1961) called attention to the roles individuals play in the stages of adoption of new ideas. The key players are innovators, early adopters, and early majority. The innovators, who make up 2.5% of those involved in any given change effort, are creative but may also be isolated. Their power lies in being open to the new idea, but they may have little influence with other followers. The early adopters, 13.5% of those involved, will venture into something new, but they will demand a price for their effort. The early majority, 34% of those involved, look to the early adopters for signals of success. Participation of this segment is essential because it fulfills a political role by legitimizing the new idea. The late majority and the late adopters, 34% and 16% respectively of those in the organization, are not key players in the initial change effort, and Lion-Berger cautioned against investing resources in them.

Change agents can take on different roles within an organization. Depending on the stage of change and the need of followers, a change agent might be a catalyst, a solution giver, a process helper, or a resource linker (Havelock, 1973).

Another role which emerges during times of change is that of the defender. Klein (1985) holds the defender in high esteem. He encourages leaders and change agents to view the defender, not as the rabble-rousing obstructionist, but instead to consider

the costs of ignoring, overriding, or dismissing as irrational those who emerge as their opponents. To ignore that which is being defended may mean that the planned change itself is flawed; it may also mean that the process of change becomes transformed into a conflict situation in which forces struggle in opposition and in which energies become increasingly devoted to winning rather than to solving the original problem. (p. 103)

In Staw's (1982) comments about counterforces to change, there is a particular lesson for those who work in a bureaucracy such as public schools. The formidable structure of a bureaucracy can thwart any change effort. Staw spoke of the disaster which often accompanies the organization's inability or unwillingness to let go of behaviors which used to work well under circumstances which no longer exist. Two counterforces to change are escalation situations and commitment. A leader who is looking for change opportunities in the organization would do well to pay attention to the motivations of "staying the course." Staw observed that members of an organization will pour resources into a project or program even when there are clear indicators of failure. This escalation situation comes about through a combination of factors including commitment to the idea being pursued.

Staw noted that a leader must be able to perform "acts that are highly binding and at the same time keep the flexibility of good administration" (pp. 109-110). The flexibility factor balances the commitment factor.

The notion of moving an organization from one point to another point has been described by Lewin (1951) as freezing, moving and refreezing. Peters and Waterman (1982) echo this idea by identifying a structural condition called "breaking old habits."

Goodman and Dean (1982) have amplified the refreezing concept in a study of long-term organizational change. Specifically they defined the degree to which change has been institutionalized by using five facets as measures. The five facets are knowledge of behavior, performance of behaviors, preferences for behavior, normative consensus, and shared values as demonstrated through behavior. Those who would intend real change need to pay attention to the outward clues which signal inward acceptance of the change. These five facets are one way to measure the degree of commitment to the status quo or the vision. Schein (1985) would say that refreezing is the ultimate measure of success when "new cultural elements solve problems and reduce anxiety" (p. 296).

Clark and Meloy (1989) have identified six traditional assumptions about structures in schools. The central assumption is that "the basic bureaucratic form is the only way in which school systems and schools can be organized" (p. 279). They believed that the antidote to this archaic assumption is a



structure marked by: (a) democracy, (b) group authority and accountability, (c) variability, generality, and interactivity in work assignments, (d) self-discipline and control exercised individually and collectively, and (e) group commitment to and consensus about organizational goals and means (p. 292). In their summation, Clark and Meloy counseled patience in moving toward new structures, structures which reflect the core values of a free people.

Wise (1983) would applaud this effort to free the schools of what he called the hyperrationalization of the organization. He observed that external forces such as courts, legislatures, and private business force excessive prescriptions, procedural complexity, and inappropriate solutions on schools in an effort to fix them. These interventions are superficially reasonable and valid, but do little to bring about real change. This hyperrationalization underscores the need for a new paradigm as the reforming of schools is studied.

How leaders and followers experience the quality of the change process can greatly influence the reactions to the process. Goodman and Associates (1982) have divided change into two mega-types, adaptive and planned.

Planned organizational change refers to a set of activities and processes designed to change individuals, groups and organization structures and processes. . . . Planned organizational change emphasizes managerial choice. Adaptation concerns modification of an organization or its parts

to fit or be adjusted with its environment. . . . Adaptation emphasizes externally induced changes. (p. 4)

The qualitative difference between these two types of change processes is powerful. A leader must be keenly aware of which type of process is in play in order to encourage the productive participation of followers.

Bolman and Deal (1985) advise students of organizational change to value the structural truths to be found in every organization. The structural aspect of an organization often influences the political, symbolic, and human resources models which are frequently viewed as more sophisticated models than the structural perspective. The admonishments of Bolman and Deal are echoed by Weick and McDaniel (1989) in their detailed analysis of how professional organizations work and the implications for schools. In their deliberations, Weick and McDaniel focused on the collision of the tasks in schools which are "mechanistic" or routine and those which are "organic" or nonroutine.

The implications of this balancing act for school leaders is that the structures in the organization must be able to simultaneously handle the diametrically opposed characteristics of routine and nonroutine tasks. Weick and McDaniel's conclusion is that the structure of schools must "aid the articulation and development of professional values, since these values are sources of guidance when people process nonroutine information" (p.350). In this day and age, most school staff members would attest to the increase in

nonroutine information needing their attention. Thus the importance of structures which allow for handling it well.

People, People, People. The human resources perspective of organizations has a long history. It centers around human needs and the nature of human beings once they are in the nonnatural order of an organization. This perspective also offers the potential that human needs and organizational needs do not have to be mutually exclusive. For educational leaders the human resource perspective has embedded itself in the presence of represented labor which forces the organization to recognize the rights of individuals within the organization.

This perspective of organizational theory has a great deal to do with Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs. His conclusions relative to human development are key considerations for leaders in how they structure organizations, how they frame priorities, and how they allocate resources. The five basic categories, beginning with the first are: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs.

In this frame, meeting the needs of the people is a precursor to the people serving the goals of the organization. Perhaps the greatest challenge for leaders is determining when the needs of the people have been met to an acceptable degree. In an age when escalating expectations are used to determine the acceptability of working conditions, health coverage and

compensation, it can be difficult to separate need from desire. But that may be a moot point since need is in the eye of the beholder anyway.

McGregor's (1960) observations of the way managers view their employees gives insight into basic assumptions about the nature of human beings in an organization. Using two categories which he labeled as Theory X and Theory Y, McGregor provided a thumbnail sketch of two types of workers.

Those workers in Theory X present a recalcitrant attitude toward their work, and the management approach needed to make them productive is coercive, punitive, and authoritarian. McGregor's Theory Y gives an entirely different picture of employees. These workers are active and motivated employees who can direct their behavior in an independent way towards attaining the goals of the organization.

It is obvious that the description of Theory Y employees carries a greater probability of a learning organization being in place than that of a Theory X approach to management. As noted by Joiner (1986), there is a match between the qualities of Theory Y workers and nontraditional management philosophy.

Hersey, Blanchard, and Nateman (1979) expanded McGregor's two category view of employee behaviors, and attempted to match the maturation level of followers with their relationship and task behavior. This is a more

complex model of behavior and can be helpful as a first step in analyzing the possible assignment of tasks in the organization.

A student of leadership will be enlightened by the growing research consensus that "human behavior is always the result of an interaction between heredity and environment" (Bolman and Deal, 1985, p. 68). When analyzing the nature of a given organization, this observation gives two reference points. The one, heredity, which no one can do anything about; the other, environment, which one can change in many ways. This is perhaps why enthusiasm for Theory Z quality of the workplace, discussed below, took root in minds and companies.

Ouchi (1981) asked, "What does all this emphasis on people mean for the lifeline of any company?" (p. 177). The answer is a quality product rather than an efficient process. The manager of a Type Z company "is clearly dedicated not to brainwashing employees but to setting objectives that permit every individual to satisfy their own self-interest while simultaneously serving the corporate interest. They seek an integrated social structure" (p. 177).

The integrated social structure is taking form in the current wave of interest-based bargaining approaches. Fisher and Ury (1985) set forward a way to talk about issues in a manner that does not pit individuals or groups against each other, but still allows the subgroups of an organization to maintain their identity. Known as "Getting to Yes" or "interest-based"

bargaining, this approach is marked by honoring multiple and often conflicting perspectives of the same issues, the generating of several options which address the issues, and coming to consensus on those options which are mutually acceptable to all parties. The process acknowledges that there will be times when a consensus is not reachable and it allows for each party to act on the best alternative to a negotiated agreement.

The human resources perspective has been given specific voice in the educational community. Boyer (1985) stated that "renewal must start in the minds and hearts of people. And while we tighten procedures, we must also find ways to give more participation and more empowerment to those who do the work" (p. 11). Specific to teachers, Menges (1977) found that people do what they know, what they like, what they can, what they must, and what they intend. Combs (1988) made the same observation regarding the unsuccessful attempts at reform by saying, "It's time we begin focusing on people, not methods" (p. 38).

The Sound of Symbols. Focus on the symbolic perspective centers around the shared meaning or culture of an organization and how that shared meaning is communicated. The rituals, myths and heroes of an organization become extremely important in this discussion. In terms of leadership, the symbolic perspective of organizational theory is part and parcel of Foster's (1989) observation that the leadership relationship is played out in a

community, or a shared context. This shared context holds the culture of the organization.

As noted by Baldrige and Deal (1983) the symbolic perspective of organizational theory focuses on the beliefs and faith of the participants and observers of the organization. In the symbolic life of organizations the meaning attached to events is the issue, not the events themselves. The meaning of an event is subject to human interpretation, and therefore the meaning can be ambiguous. Ambiguity triggers a need to increase predictability; therefore the organization embraces symbols which help give order (Edelman, 1965). These symbols come in the form of myths (Cohen, 1969), and scenarios, and metaphors (Ortner, 1973). This is a far cry from the cause-and-effect scenario often present in the rational interpretation of organizational theory.

The symbolic content in the leader-follower relationship is full of drama, emotion and lofty aspirations. Clark (1983) described one part of the symbolic life of an organization as the "saga." This narrative of heroic exploits, he goes on to say, "becomes a definition full of pride and identity for the group. (p. 373).

It should be noted that the saga building in an organization is not linear and can be contradictory. Take, for example, the victory of the teachers' association to insert contract language which limits after school duties. Hailed as a victory by one stakeholder group, other stakeholders such as

parents, students, and administrators might view it as a dark day for the good of the children. Building sagas calls for forethought and sensitivity to the political climate along the way.

Waterman (1987) reminds us that the symbolic content of our organizations comes in many forms. There are the verbal and written. There are also the artifacts and the attitudinal forms. The verbal and written are heavily used in the form of routine correspondence such as letters of condolence when an employee experiences a loss. There is the predictable and expected yearly address by the official leader of the organization. The attitudinal symbolic content of an organization can be picked up in listening to the stories which are told throughout the organization. Various artifacts such as informal social get-togethers or holiday toy drives among employees all reflect the inner feelings and beliefs which underlie the work behaviors of members of the organization.

Who Gets What, When, and How? Study of the political perspective centers on how the distribution of resources is determined by power and influence. Lasswell (1936) succinctly defined politics as who gets what, when, and how. In the structural perspective, position in the organization generally is viewed as having power. However, in the political perspective, power and the ability to influence are not necessarily found in the organizational chart. Bolman and Deal (1985), Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1978), French and Raven (1959), and Kanter (1977) identified five



forms of power: authority, expertise, control over rewards, coercive power, and personal power. Depending upon the talents and sophistication of the members of the organization, any number of individuals or groups could vie for influence roles in any given debate.

It is in this vying for influence that Bennis (1984) identified three components of transformative power which help us reach a new understanding about the political role of the organizational leader. Success lies in "the ability of the leader to reach the souls of others in a fashion which raises human consciousness, builds meanings, and inspires human intent" (p. 70). The three components of transformative power are the leader, the intention, and the organization. The leadership that knows what it wants and then declares what it wants with clear intent in a vision for the organization can blend "each individual's uniqueness into collective action" (p. 68).

The ability to exert power and influence is key to forming and shaping the debate in an organization. It is through the debate that policies, goals, and structures emerge. Negotiating and bargaining are the processes which deliver the goods in the political perspective (Bolman and Deal, 1985). Using the political model as a guide to change can be dangerous because it is so powerful. In his discussion of the barriers to democracy in public administration Smith (1976) cautioned that

with the stakes of failure high, but the anticipated benefits great--that is, the realization of each person's full capacity to act as a responsible moral agent--the cost of any political strategy must be carefully weighed. . . .

The human consequences of mistaken political judgments must be consciously considered. To fail to act is to surrender to the present. To act carelessly is to misshape the future. (p. 317)

In the educational arena, understanding the nature of the political perspective is incredibly important (Wiles, Wiles, & Bondi, 1981). As noted by Rost (1981), there are myths abounding regarding the sacredness of education and the dirtiness of politics. This duality of thought requires that education and politics be kept separate, that educational policy should be left to the professionals, that education is too valuable to be based on anything other than the rational, and that politicians should be kept away from the process.

This ostrich approach to the very real presence of politics in the educational arena promotes the status quo and thwarts change initiatives. Politics is the fuel of change. Politics is about involvement and dialogue. Schattshneider (1960) wrote:

The outcome of every conflict is determined by the scope of its contagion. The number of people involved in any conflict determines what happens; every change in the number of participants. . . affects the results. . . . The

moral of this is: If a fight starts, watch the crowd, because the crowd plays the decisive role. (p. 3)

In this arena the politics of symbols and rituals becomes a deciding factor in how the crowd views the fight. Symbols and rituals can privatize the deliberative process (i. e., players are players by position rather than interest; importance of issue is downplayed; tight control of information in and out of process). Edelman (1965) would characterize this as promoting quiescence. On the other hand, he would also note that symbols and myths which socialize the deliberative process (i. e., open participation, implications of issue are clearly stated, free flow of communication) can promote arousal. Knowing about and mastering the use of rituals and symbols can empower those who want to bring about change.

Education is political for many reasons. It is value laden, it involves finite resources, and multiple stakes, and is dependent upon decisionmaking processes which take place in an arena with many players (Allison, 1971; Blumberg & Blumberg, 1985; Wiles, Wiles & Bondi, 1981). The context in which the politics of education is played out has moved from private meeting rooms to the halls of public dialogue at a quickening pace over the last twenty years.

There have been many catalysts in the politicization of education. The unionization of teachers has brought a strong and determined player into the arena. In response, reform efforts have called for reallocation of resources

and accountability models at the local and state levels. The judicial, legislative, and referendum decisions such as the Serrano-Priest case, Proposition 13, Proposition 98, and desegregation battles have all mobilized the public. The demands for tuition tax credits and voucher systems have provided fuel to the political fire (Commission on Public School Administration and Leadership, 1988).

The superintendent who is politically savvy has a fighting chance to bring about change. Since school cultures are steeped in rituals and myths, it is important for superintendents to be knowledgeable about basic political concepts. These concepts can be used to cue new perspectives and behaviors on the part of potential followers, thus impacting rituals and myths (Edelman, 1965). Edelman also suggested that leaders have a potent political resource in the policy-making process where rituals and myths are often evident.

The political context of a superintendent is one that moves from arousal to quiescence depending upon the issue at hand. It is during these times of transition that the leader can gain or lose followers. The element of competition is highly political and requires that the superintendent be ready to connect the wants and needs of the followers with the vision of the organization in order to gain their willing participation (Blumberg & Blumberg, 1985; Edelman, 1965).

The nature of the political process is anything but linear and orderly. The ambiguous, risky, and messy nature of the political arena gives the leaders a chance to compete for followers, put forth new ideas and draw the crowd into the dialogue. This, in turn, allows the followers to cue the leaders and vice versa until the dynamic process yields real and intended change (Allison, 1971; Bacharach and Lawler, 1981; Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley, 1978; Lindblom, 1980).

Although a traditional understanding of politics and education would have the two clearly separated in order to preserve the virtue of education, the leader committed to a vision of a better education must skillfully be able to employ any appropriate political model to shape change. It is not an arena for the faint hearted or unsure. It takes courage to be in this competition.

#### Where Politics and Vision Meet: The Policy-making Process

Perhaps the most political of all leadership activities is policy-making. As mentioned in several sections above, the life of an organization is inherently chaotic and restless. Resources are limited and need and desire are unlimited. The ambiguity of relationships and goals further blurs the organizational landscape, making it more difficult for a leader to grasp and influence the pace and direction of the corporate dance. Injecting some rationality into the process becomes a leadership task. One form this can take is the policy-making process.

Lindblom (1980) concluded that policymaking has two genuine and legitimate sources of direction and content: the analytical and the political. "On the one hand, people want policy to be informed and well analyzed. On the other hand, they want policymaking to be democratic, hence necessarily political" (p. 12).

In the world of education, participants in policymaking have ample opportunity to see how the analytical and the political collide on such topics as bilingual education, year round education and open enrollment. The ability to thoroughly think through implications of proposed policies while still making room for the political dialogue is a monumental and essential task for the educational community.

The classic policy-making ladder suggested by Lindblom (1968) gives a metaphorical representation of the policy-making process. Using Lindblom's federal model, the president of the United States is on top of the ladder with the nonvoters at the bottom. In between are layers of players including elected representatives, bureaucrats and voters. While this model may seem too linear for practical application, Lindblom described the two-way process as more dynamic than the two-dimensional representation would indicate. It is through the interaction of those positioned at different levels that "the process pushes people toward agreement because preferences are re-formed by information about what is possible, feasible, and because. . . the most active participants recognize the need for agreement" (p. 105).

Reconstructing preferences through policymaking is a leadership task. As amplified by Rost (1985), the policy-making ladder is a multi-sided step ladder which allows for much more interaction among and between participants, allows for quiescence and arousal simultaneously in different arenas, and gives credence to the notion that leaders change. Since both of these metaphorical representations embrace the notion that leadership takes place in a community and is based upon relationships, they fit very well with the definition of leadership being used in this particular study.

In the policy-making process, the leader has to make some conscious decisions about the scope and depth of his or her involvement. All issues are not equal in importance, and there are only twenty-four hours in a day. The literature presents three distinct models of the policy-making process. They are the rational or systems model, the group or bureaucratic model, and the political or leadership model. Choosing the model to be used on a given issue is the business of leadership. The selection of a given model should be based on the importance of the issue to the vision of the organization, the complexity of the issue, and the constraints of time and energy.

Allison (1971), Dye (1984), and Easton (1965) have described various aspects of the rational/systems model by asking questions such as "What happens in the black box?" "Why do systems persist?" and "What is the cost to benefit ratio?" Policymaking in the rational/systems perspective is driven by stress on the organization. It is propelled by questions asked and answers

given by those is authority, generally a unitary actor. The rational model assumes that the policies made are consistent ones. This assumption builds confidence in those who must follow the policy.

The advantages of the rational model include its simplicity and understandability. Its focus is on the key issue, and it is quantifiable and inexpensive. The disadvantages of this model include its inflexibility, its being driven by a unitary actor, its offering of suspect data due to narrowness of perspective, and its exclusion of key players who are not in the elitist's group.

The group/bureaucratic model is thoroughly described by Allison (1971). When a loosely-coupled organization must address an issue, there is a high probability that multiple policies will be operating simultaneously. Standard operating procedures are in place to avoid uncertainty, but this does not guarantee consistency. Because the process is compartmentalized, there can be procedures in place which function simultaneously but which are not coordinated. These organizational mismatches of intention and process give an opportunity for parochial interests to be manifested under cover of standard operating procedures which are not in sync. The group/bureaucratic perspective is alive and well in organizations which are centrally coordinated but decentrally operated. Due to this decentralization the impact of an individual leader is minimal.



The advantages of this model are stability through standardized behaviors, checks and balances between the decentralized divisions, and the availability of multiple sources of data which give a more realistic picture. Policymaking in this model can also point the leader to suborganizations which are open to change or those which are entrenched. This is key to building the leader-follower relationship because there may be slack resources available for mobilization (Dahl, 1961). This model produces decisions at a slow pace while using significant resources and time. Consequently the results are very incremental in nature.

The third model of policymaking has been described by Allison (1971), Dahl (1961), Lindblom (1968), Neustadt (1980), and Rost (1985). Dahl's question "Who governs?" is answered by Schattschneider's (1960), "Everyone governs but. . . ." It is in the "but. . ." that the third model becomes so important to the organization.

In this model leaders make a difference. But they make a difference only if there is cooperation among the followers. Here the rule of dialogue and discussion is compromise and consensus. The key question is the same for all three models: "Who gets what, when, and how?" But, the road leading to the destination is significantly different in the third model. The third model is made up of stakeholders who have parochial priorities. The dialogue is twisted and turned as various actors put a new face on the issue.

Relationships can often be initiated, terminated and reconstituted based upon the power of the symbols used in the debate (Edelman, 1965).

This model brings with it a broad and expansive playing field which can accommodate as many voices as wish to be heard. However, speaking does not guarantee being heard. The cacophony will drown out those not able to establish a voice of urgency and legitimacy. As Dahl (1961) noted there is no doubt that the power elite maintain key roles in this model; but the power elite remains there only through the consent of the followers. That consent is given through active support or passive response. This is different from the first and second models where those in authority are protected by structure and process. Therefore, this third model, which includes the politics of policy-making, gives an added dimension to the policy-making process.

The compromise, conflict, and confusion inherent in the third model is what allows for new entry points into the fight. Unlike the first and second models where the actions of participants, as well as leaders, are reined in with structure and process, the third model blows out many of these inhibiting factors (Easton, 1965; Iannacone, 1990; Truman, 1971).

These three models give leaders and followers three separate ways to view the policy-making process. Articulated models of interaction and dynamics provide leaders and followers with a way to analyze the process of persuasion. At times, the process of persuasion can be shaped by the

participants and at other times the process can shape the participants. All three models offer varying degrees of influence potential.

The first model, rational/systems, can be a good first take on an issue. It is a lean and mean model which takes the least amount of resources. In this complicated world, however, leaders and followers must be careful not to underrespond to issues by relying too heavily on the rational model. Signs and symptoms of hyperrationality are found in such a practice as creating California School Boards Association sample policy packets which are prepared each time a new law or regulation is handed down from "on high." While it is true that many of the policies are routine in nature and probably not of much interest, a leader and those who follow must be alert to unintended effects of a seemingly innocuous policy and make sure it gets the level of discussion and debate needed before it goes into effect.

Depending on the scope and degree of importance the issue has, using the additional two models may serve the process well in the long run. A leader can cue followers to one or the other of the models. By their sheer numbers, followers can drag the issue to the model which they feel would further the dialogue in their direction. The political process of policymaking brings the vision closer to leaders and followers alike.

### Education Reform

The efforts to reform how and what is taught in public schools are as old as the institution itself. In recent times, reform has been engendered by a

perceived threat to national security when Sputnik spun around the earth after the Soviets beat the Americans to the punch. Through the eighties, the reform documents carried titles such as "Who Will Teach Our Children?" "What Works? Research About Teaching and Learning" and "First Lessons: A Report on Elementary Education in America." In compiling the common messages found in nine of these national reports, Green (1987) concluded the following:

[1] Progress has been made in improving education, but a second round of reforms is needed to prepare students better for a changing society and to address omissions in initial reform efforts.

[2] Teaching should become a profession, or at least more like a profession.

[3] Education policy must enable learning to occur by improving the conditions for learning and teaching.

[4] There is a cause for optimism that education can be improved because educators know what needs to be done.

[5] Other things--attitudes, climate, relationships, community support--are as important as money.

[6] Real reform is local, because the act of learning is ultimately an individual act.

[7] More collaboration is needed, both within the education establishment and beyond to include parents, legislators, governors, and the community as a whole.

[8] Education must take new steps to address the unique needs of minorities. (pp. 1-2)

Green also noted some conflicting messages in the reports which have not been reconciled:

[1] Many reform studies call for confidence in teachers, principals, schools and districts, but recommend that states be ready to intervene when efforts miss the mark.

[2] Educators need assistance in doing things in new ways that take time to show results; at the same time, they call for immediate assessment and fail to delineate who should judge the results or how and when they should be measured.

[3] Calls for leadership by governors, boards, legislators, or others create questions of who should do what and conflict with the desire for more collaboration among education's constituents and groups outside education. (p. 2)

While these reports circulated through appropriate agencies, nearly every state proceeded with a reform agenda in response to *A Nation at Risk* (1983). Firestone, Fuhrman, & Kirst (1989) concluded that there were seven common characteristics to these state-level reform efforts:

1. The highest level of state activity has been in mandating more academic courses and upgrading teaching through changes in certification and compensation.
2. In spite of the national press for reform, state and political culture impact the passing of legislation, the kind of reforms adopted, and ways reforms were initiated.
3. States tended to reject complicated reform recommendations in favor of more manageable ones.
4. Most state reform packages lacked coherence.
5. States are exhibiting no clear shift in direction from the first wave of reform to the second.
6. The easy reforms that were adopted have stayed in place.
7. Expansion of the economy, although crucial to reform, was not the complete cause of it. (pp. 8-14)

Their study further identified three district-level actions in response to state initiatives:

1. There was very little resistance to reforms that involved increasing academic content. In fact, in some cases, district requirements exceeded state requirements.
2. Much of the progress on the restructuring agenda resulted from district initiatives.

3. Some districts are actively using state policies to promote local priorities. (pp. 14-15)

These observations support the idea that reform of any publicly held entity takes place in the context of contemporary society and local culture. The forces at play in society and at the local level must be part of the reform game plan. Part and parcel of the effort to reform public education is a mass of diametrically opposed societal values which grow everyday. Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton (1985) and Purpel (1989) identified the culture of individual well-being as ruling the day. This has been an important social development which can cause a significant amount of grief to those who strive to reform education. While followers are adhering to a credo of personal response, leaders are calling for a communal response.

Commager (1984) poses some questions for our time: "Do we have the ingenuity to adapt to the realities of a global economy? Do we have the common sense to adjust our nationalism to a world of technology and science that is totally indifferent to national frontiers? Do we have the wisdom to realize our fate is inextricably bound up with the fate of all the people of the globe? Can we practice a self-interest that is enlightened?" (p.70). On both the macro and micro levels of education reform, these questions are certainly present. But it is the last question on the list which draws the most immediate attention because finding the answers to the other questions depend upon the ability to answer that one.

While self-interest is a universal motivator needing no one but the individual to determine it, enlightened self-interest becomes essential to the debate about public education because the problems and the solutions are so complex. The problems and solutions cut across ethnic, economic, religious, and political lines. This traversing of the social landscape places us at the service or the disservice of each other. Enlightened self-interest requires the moderation of voices in order to find common ground.

Since the business of education reform continues to be the hot topic of debate among policy-makers, business people, parents, and educators, the voices of reform have continued to multiply and some have become more strident and rigid. Everyone is in on the act because everyone has a stake in the outcomes of the educational process. This intense interest generates an incessant flow of ideas and criticism. Motion is not movement, however. It seems as if for each step forward, there are internal and external forces which beat back the effort by at least two steps. Leadership which cues enlightened self-interest is critical to focusing the dialogue on mutual purposes (Bullard & Taylor, 1993; Commager, 1984; Elam, 1993; Gross & Gross, 1985; Presseisen, 1985).

The following is a discussion of education reform as it plays out in the efforts to change how things are done, or the structure of education, and the efforts to change what is done, or the content of education.



### How We Do Things

As has been discussed previously, structure can impede or enhance the vision of the organization. Schools stay in the industrial paradigm because the structure encourages a hierarchy of authority. Moving to a postindustrial paradigm requires a change in structure which is built upon the attributes identified by Geiger (1993): teacher collaboration, site-based decisionmaking inclusive of faculty and staff; parents, business people and others are partners and decisionmakers; internal shared professional development; teacher role expanded to include planning, decisionmaking and other professional duties. Just as Geiger provides the vision for a new structure, Dutweiler and Mutchler's (1990) observations on the efforts to restructure schools reveal the impediments. They conducted a nationwide survey which yielded the following results: 51% of respondents resisted changing roles and responsibilities, 38% feared losing power; 38% saw a lack of definition and clarity, 38% believed that resources were inadequate or inappropriate, 30% acknowledged a lack of skills, 27% bemoaned the dearth of hierarchical support, and 19% feared taking risks.

These are disheartening signals. Many educators who can make the greatest impact and benefit the most from reform efforts are disengaged from the process. Firestone, Fuhrman & Kirst (1989) concluded that reform will not be successful unless participation "gives teachers real influence over issues important to them with a minimum of time expenditure" (p. 161). This

notion of real influence is important because followers can smell a ruse a mile away. Real influence can be facilitated by giving adequate time, reducing existing conflict among key players, and balancing central office control with site control. Changes in the structures which encourage these activities is needed. Success in facilitating real influence is essential to avoid lethal resentment toward the change process (Corbett, Dawson, and Firestone, 1984; Firestone, 1980; Gross, Giaquinta, and Bernstein, 1971).

But resistance to structural changes is not peculiar to teachers. Administrators also exhibit apprehension regarding the move to shared decisionmaking which is one of the more visible alternatives to hierarchical modes of operation. In recounting their initial skepticism toward shared decisionmaking, two principals, Meyers (1989) and Rowley (1989), identified their concerns about lack of time, the level of willingness on the part of teachers to really participate, and whether the process would produce results which mattered to students. Although both principals ultimately felt that the move to site-based management and shared decisionmaking made a positive difference to the schools, their anecdotal experiences are reflective of a general distrust of new ways of doing things.

Cuban (1988) would say that there is a confusion about the type of change which is needed in education reform. He noted that efforts to make the existing structures more efficient and more productive actually may ultimately reinforce the dysfunctional qualities of the existing institution.

These first-order changes, as he called them, are present in procedural and legal changes such as Americans with Disabilities Act, classification systems designed to monitor categories of students, and expanded efforts to assess students. Second-order changes, on the other hand, introduce new goals, structures, and roles. The result is that new ways of resolving problems emerge. While one type of reform is not better than the other, educators would maximize their efforts by assuring that the desired reform is matched with the correct type of change.

As the reform movement calls for an analysis of the "how" we educate, a parallel inquiry is going on relative to the "what" of education.

#### What Are We Going to Learn Today?

The content of the school day is at the mercy of the State Department of Education, the Office of Civil Rights, the local water district, and the PTA sponsored assembly. The State Department issues advisories relative to steroid use warnings for junior high age children; the Office of Civil Rights enforces the use of primary language instruction for limited-English speaking students and simultaneously requires ethnically balanced classes; the President of the local Rotary, who is on the board of the local water district, stops by to pick up essays on water conservation; and the second grade teacher receives a mini-lesson from the puppeteer performing in honor of President's Day.

In 1983 the State of California required each district to declare grade level curriculum experiences. In the ensuing years, new state curriculum frameworks described the subject matter content for each grade level. In addition, sophisticated assessment plans moved the statewide testing program away from multiple choice test toward performance-based assessment.

The reform of curriculum content is driven by intellectual and political imperatives which direct the process. Intellectual rigor requires that the teaching profession respond to research-based practices. As an example, the heavy emphasis on whole language instruction in the English-Language Arts Framework (California State Department of Education, 1987) guided administrators and teachers to review the manner in which English language instruction was being conducted. Currently, California schools are gearing up to implement the Science Framework (California State Department of Education, 1992) which emphasizes the need for hands-on science instruction and de-emphasizes the use of a textbook. Political pressure requires that community standards be observed. A highly acrimonious and visible debate occurred when the State Board of Education collided with the religious right on the issue of evolution. The adoption of textbooks for social studies and history triggered a far-reaching and heated exchange among and between ethnic and religious groups. Another battle has erupted over the new California Language Assessment System (CLAS) in

which students are required to work in cooperative groups to prepare for the writing activity. Not only is the methodology being challenged, but the content of the literature prompts is being described as "anti-parent" by some in the fundamentalist camp.

Searching for the core curriculum in a diverse society is the opposite of looking for a needle in a haystack. Far from being hidden, the challenge is that the options are so numerous that it is daunting to match the multiple political, aesthetic, and intellectual perspectives with book titles and units of study. Curricular reform has one foot in the past which calls for back-to-basics and one foot in the future as schools look toward the information superhighway. The shrinking world and blending of economic philosophies present the challenge of second language acquisition to Americans who have previously insisted that English be the language of international trade (Adler, 1982; Finn & Ravitch, 1985; Garcia, 1985; Kohl, 1985; Ravitch, 1985).

Circumscribing the entire debate on curriculum is the call for standards and excellence. There is a school of thought that curriculum is "skills-heavy" and "knowledge-light" (Rothman, 1989). Critics in this camp believe that critical thinking and knowledge of concepts is being sacrificed to a minutia driven curriculum. Those who champion a detail-dense curriculum believe that literacy includes the ability to recall facts which reflect the common core of knowledge. As noted by McDonnell (1989), "despite their differing

emphases, each of these approaches advocates curricula that move beyond an emphasis on basic skills and routine abilities to a richer, more complex understanding of social and natural phenomena" (p.36).

The reforming of structure and content must go hand in hand to move the larger vision forward. The how and the what are equally important to the future.

### Superintendency

"It is amazing that any thoughtful person is still interested in educational administration, particularly the superintendency or the college presidency. The position destroys those who are not well prepared, and many who were thought to be fully competent" (Mitchell, 1981, p. 40).

### The Survival Agenda

Blumberg and Blumberg's (1985) comprehensive commentary on the nature of the superintendency gives a detailed and sophisticated description of the internal and external forces which shape the leader-follower relationship in the public school setting. Perhaps most telling is the subtitle of this book "Living with Conflict." The authors describe the role of the superintendent as dealing with and managing conflicts of one kind or another.

In researching the critical attributes of the superintendency, Konnert and Augenstein (1990) uncovered distinct roles which a superintendent must fill. These roles include chief executive officer, negotiator, communicator,

business manager, lobbyist, and consulter of specialists. In fulfilling these roles, the superintendent must bring certain intellectual and emotional capacities to the position. These include the ability to think divergently, motivate, assess risk-taking propensity, and empower. Because of the multiple roles to be filled, Lewis' (1986) observation that superintendents should be generalists seems appropriate. Callahan (1971) wanted the superintendency to be filled with educational statesmen. According to this author, these statesmen took the long view of history, accepted the belief that there is a sacred quality to childhood, and were more philosophical and reflective than reactive.

Perhaps the foundation of conflict can be discovered in the evolution of the superintendency. As described by Wilson (1960) the business of schools was originally tended to by committees which were appointed by local councilmen. From the beginning there was a political aspect to schooling because those in charge had legitimacy due to being elected. As the business of schooling, both locally and at the state level, grew in complexity and in funding, the lay people in charge sought the services of a professional to manage the system. As early as 1812, the office of state superintendency came into being. In 1874 the local superintendency was given legal status as a result of a court case involving the authority of a local school board to hire a superintendent (Nolte, 1971). Now the superintendency was legitimized by its political roots and by case law. Although the office of superintendent was

now recognized as legitimate, the scope and content of the superintendent's job was still based upon the desires of the local boards of education.

The ambiguity of the superintendent's job and the omnipresence of conflict result in a highly insecure position. Cuban (1976) saw this insecurity as part and parcel of the position:

The origin and growth of the superintendency, it was argued, accounted for the fundamental insecurity of the position. From the very birth of the job there were competing role demands upon the superintendent, and these have continued unabated to the present. (p. 165)

The literature consistently acknowledges that the concern with surviving in the position long enough to make a difference is on the minds of all superintendents to some degree (Blumberg & Blumberg, 1985; Eaton, 1990; Kaufman, 1955; Konnert & Augenstein, 1990; Schlecty, 1990). This underlying concern can greatly affect the actions of the superintendent related to leadership and organizational change. The insecurity can make her or him too cautious and introspective to the detriment of moving forward.

One superintendent is fond of saying that the best housing for superintendents is a deluxe motor home which can be moved on a moment's notice. This dark humor is legitimized by Blumberg and Blumberg (1985) in their finding that the survivability issue for superintendents played a part in every meaningful attempt at change. The superintendent who was comfortable in an intensely political environment, possessed political skills,



and who knew how to pick the most important battles was able to repress the fear of being fired long enough to forge ahead.

Superintendents who have survived to become Callahan's (1971) educational statesmen have done so by retaining their potency and activity. Blumberg and Blumberg (1985) explained:

The politics of their survival has been less concerned with surviving *per se* and more with behaving in ways that permit them to have a continuing productive impact on the system, thus ensuring their survival and power. That is, they become a commodity that is valued because it is potent and active, and not because it is impotent and inactive. (p. 50)

Adding to the challenge of maintaining potency, Burlingame (1981) suggested that, due to the ambiguous nature of educational settings, superintendents are relatively powerless. In order to survive, they must mystify and cover up. The temptation to define this ambiguous atmosphere as a threat is understandable. The response to this threat can be to control, stifle conflict, eliminate competition, and maintain the status quo. This reaction is the antithesis of leadership.

This survival agenda is closely related to the dilemmas with which a superintendent must contend in every facet of work life. The basic dilemma has its genesis in the original task of the superintendent, that of maintaining order. Over the years the school culture has become more complex, more participants have been invited to take part in policy-making,

the power of administrators has been reduced, and accountability to state and federal mandates, as well as to citizen control, has increased. Kirst (1984) pointed out that the superintendency has become increasingly reactive in order to "juggle the diverse and changing coalitions formed around different issues and operating across different levels of government" (p. 11). The superintendent finds the demands of such an environment treacherous. A natural reaction is to cling to the law and order frame. By doing so, the superintendent can become mired in managerial minutia having little or nothing to do with educational leadership.

While the superintendent is negotiating the terrain of this treacherous environment, she or he is setting the stage for the future. Willard Waller, writing in "Sociology of Teaching" in 1932, describes the situation which is still accurate sixty-plus years later. For the superintendent:

opportunities for becoming unpopular, to the point, almost, of infamy, are numerous, but opportunities for gaining friends are few. At the end of the first year, the superintendent has made some enemies, but the majority of the community. . . is still satisfied with the manner in which he is conducting the school. He has made some bitter enemies, as, unavoidably he must. . . . The superintendent has now acquired certain enemies on the school board and they serve the community as further radiant points of antagonism toward him. But the important fact, and the inexorable tragedy of the superintendent's life is that in the second

year he usually makes a few more enemies, but he rarely has an opportunity to restore the balance by making friends of those who have previously been inimical to him. . . . But if he does win at the end of the second year, he stands a greater chance of losing in the third year, for his position is continuously weakened. He makes more enemies, and only lukewarm friends. (quoted in Carlson, 1972, pp. 137-138)

As Eaton (1990) noted, it is difficult to nail down the reasons for the ultimate evidence of vulnerability: involuntary dismissal. All parties concerned generally try to make the event look voluntary and mutually agreeable. Therefore, it is easier to make note of the structural and political precursors to dismissal and perhaps draw some conclusions from those. Burlingame (1981) found that the smaller the school district the higher the superintendent turnover. Eaton (1990) commented on districts which tend to repeat the pattern of dismissal. The causes could be:

[1.] The local situation has reached the degree of "impossible" (angry citizens, severe financial conditions, uncontrollable teacher unions, etc.).

[2.] Once dismissal procedures are instituted by a board they find they have less reluctance to repeat them (known among practitioners as "the shark has the smell of blood").

[3.] A new superintendent who replaces a dismissed predecessor is subject to more scrutiny.

[4..] The membership of the board has usurped the power normally given to the professional administrator and refuses to return it. (p. 30)

At the heart of the survival issue is the ever present conflict which surrounds a superintendent. Battered on every side by special interest groups and wrestling with declining resources and growing need, the superintendent lives with conflict. Cuban (1976) called conflict the DNA of the superintendency. Callahan (1971) topped off his discussion by stating:

I am now convinced that very much of what has happened in American education since 1900 can be explained on the basis of the extreme vulnerability of our schoolmen to public criticism and pressure and that this vulnerability is built into our pattern of local support and control. This has been true in the past, and, unless changes are made, will continue to be true in the future. (p. viii)

#### The Superintendent and the Governing Board: The Question of Role and Power

Blumberg and Blumberg's (1985) study brings into focus two of the most powerful constituencies with whom the superintendent must maintain a relationship: the school board and represented labor. These two sub-groups within the school district are traditionally viewed as being diametrically opposed in many areas. The superintendent is often the human passageway through which ideas, emotions, and agreements are passed. This section deals with the governing board while represented labor is discussed later.

In order to exert leadership, a superintendent must have power and authority delegated by the board. That power and authority is then available to be used or to pass on to other leaders in the organization. The board is the superintendent's most important constituency; therefore, the importance of the board to the superintendent's life cannot be underestimated. With the board's support, the superintendent can confidently move through the arena of change and gather followers by tapping the values, wants, and needs of the teachers, parents and community members. A close match to the vision of the board is essential (Blumberg & Blumberg, 1985; Burns, 1978; Cuban 1976).

This kind of relationship with the board can be difficult to attain. Board members must appear independent as well as supportive of the superintendent. The relationship between board and superintendent involves a delicate political dance, accompanied by the shifting tune of the reform movement, including such legislation as Senate Bill 813.

How board members view themselves can have a significant effect on the relationship. Schlechty (1990) would say that board members who view themselves as moral and intellectual community leaders rather than as managers of schools are on the right track. When these types of board members are matched with superintendents who are visionary leaders, who confront problems, and who change schools to deal with those problems, the relationship equation is complete. Lewis (1986) would quantify the

relationship by setting a five percent margin for board turn-down of a superintendent's recommendations. Anything more than that would be a sign that the board is acting in a political way rather than in the best interests of the district.

Too often, though, the superintendent-board relationship is wounded by petty politics, confusion over role and authority, and, at times, genuine disagreements over direction and focus (Arnaz, 1981; Blumberg & Blumberg, 1985; Eaton, 1990; Konnert and Augenstein, 1990; Schlecty, 1990; Sizemore, 1981).

In this conundrum the superintendent is frequently tossed and thrown about as the political will of the board and community seeks to be expressed in policy and procedure. As Blumberg & Blumberg (1985) noted, there are managerial and structural rules of thumb for the superintendent which can add some stability to the ride. Some of their suggestions include: provide lots of information; never divide a board by one's actions or attitude; let the board know where one stands and what one is about. Chubb & Moe (1992) would say that while the superintendent may be able to stabilize the political situation, the use of the public as authority over an elected board will never yield to protocols and techniques. The public right to pressure elected representatives is in the fabric of the American psyche.

In a two dimensional world, these observations seem to be very obvious. In some cases they just seem to be rules of etiquette. However, in a deeper

sense as Blumberg & Blumberg (1985) pointed out, the superintendent-board relationship is the means by which the superintendent can influence the board. This influence relationship is essential to the evolution of the organization.

### Which Side Are You On?

At a time when public schools are under unprecedented attack from without, we are annihilating each other from within. Those who dislike the public schools must chortle with glee as we pick at each other--teacher organization against teacher organization, teacher versus administrator, custodian versus administrator, administrator versus administrator. (Reusswig, 1981, p. 83)

The issue of control is not only present in board-superintendent relationships. It is present in represented labor and superintendent relationships as well. Since the mid-1970s, California has had employee-manager relationships defined by collective bargaining laws. From the outset, the process has been adversarial, filled with as much intrigue as any grade B spy novel. Rather than starting from a common vision, management and labor come to the table with positions--positions which are often diametrically opposed to one another. When progress depends so much on relationship, it is not surprising that this adversarial process has chewed up employees, managers, board members, superintendents, and communities with so little to show for it in terms of real reform. This shift from common

good to parochial interests is described by Purpel (1989) as a change from "making the pie bigger or being happy with equal shares of the pie to how to have the biggest piece of a shrinking pie" (p. 17).

One of the universals in the dialogue between labor and management in the schools is how to decrease the bureaucracy in order to unleash the power of autonomy at the school sites and in the individual classrooms. This is an exercise in the "emperor has no clothes." As observed by Chubb and Moe (1992) "all major participants in democratic governance--including unions--complain that schools are too bureaucratic. And they mean what they say" (p. 39).

It is ironic, then, that with both union and management officials complain about schools being too bureaucratic, both parties use the bureaucratic process to embed their parochial positions into law. This limits the options for remedying problems. Security, even security which enslaves, appears to be better than uncertainty and broader options. It is dishonest to despise the bureaucracy and then enlarge the beast tenfold.

The responsibility for this dependence on bureaucratic thinking is shared by both management and employees. A high profile example of legislative intervention in the school reform movement occurred in Chicago. The Chicago superintendent refused to engage in power-sharing with the stakeholders. His resistance to any collaborative efforts forced the legislature into ordering school-based management approaches. The Chicago



superintendent was dogged by the example of other urban superintendents in San Diego, Dade County, Cincinnati, and Rochester who were hip deep in collaboration (Hess, 1992). He paled by comparison. The relationship between the superintendent and the teacher association officials often became mired in a power struggle.

Niccolo Machiavelli captured the leader's dilemma:

There is no more delicate matter to take in hand, nor more dangerous to conduct, nor more doubtful of success, than to step up as a leader in the introduction of changes. For he who innovates will have as his enemies all those who were well off under the existing order of things, and only lukewarm supporters in those who might be better off under the new.

*(Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livius, 1517)*

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this case study is to determine what leadership behaviors were manifested by a school district superintendent given the opportunities created by Senate Bill 813. As a comprehensive reform document, Senate Bill 813 touched on many of the core values which are purported to be held in high regard by stakeholders in the public schools. Senate Bill 813 addressed issues such as assuring professional competence, setting standards for student performance, rewarding outstanding teaching, and identifying curriculum content. As the researcher, I believed that there were lessons about leadership to be learned by the analysis of and reflection on this particular change effort.

Critical attributes of leadership definitions offered by Burns (1978), Rost (1985), and Foster (1989) have been used as the basis for this study. For the purpose of this study, leadership is an influence relationship which takes place in the context of a community. Individuals enter into this relationship with the intent of bringing about change based upon mutual purposes. It is this understanding of leadership that the researcher used to (a) delineate

and describe the behaviors of a superintendent during the implementation of Senate Bill 813, (b) describe the interactions of the superintendent and followers, and (c) analyze those interactions to determine whether a leadership relationship was present.

### The Research Setting

This case study was undertaken in a kindergarten-eighth grade school district of 18,000 students. The superintendent of this school district was highly visible in the local educational community. The researcher had observed him in one other position prior to his appointment as superintendent. He had consistently presented himself as a dedicated, knowledgeable, and improvement-oriented type of individual in each setting in which I observed him.

On several occasions I had heard him address groups on the notion of personal and organizational change and organizational development. His ability to describe processes and interactions was striking. It seemed to me that he would be able to reflect on the interactions which occurred during the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

I also had interacted with some of the individuals in the school district of which he was superintendent. I found them to be bright and highly capable people and believed that they would be ready sources of information during the research process. I felt confident that the quality of these key informants my own observations, and the use of district documents would provide

enough triangulation to enable me to produce conclusions and recommendations in response to the purpose and objectives of this study.

In considering whether to use a quantitative or qualitative approach to this study, I reviewed the merits of both and determined that the qualitative framework matched my abilities and interests as a researcher, as well as the nature and purpose of the study.

### Methodological Framework

There is an age old debate over the merits of applying the scientific or the naturalistic paradigm to research. It is almost as if the research community has two distinct brains. Although the hard sciences tout the strength of quantitative research, there is evolving evidence that even the hardest of the hard scientists are subject to the humanizing influences of qualitative research.

There are now several autobiographical accounts by scientists themselves and academic studies by sociologists of science that show that natural science research is frequently not carefully planned in advance and conducted according to set procedures, but often centers around compromises, short-cuts, hunches, and serendipitous occurrences.

(Walford, 1991, p. 1)

What can be said about this debate is that there are two methodologies--the quantitative and the qualitative--from which a researcher may choose when deciding the approach to a given research topic. The choice of one or

the other should be based on assumptions about the world, the purpose of the study, the research approach and the role of the researcher. The quantitative methodology assumes that (a) facts tell the tale, (b) discovering causes is the goal, (c) reducing error and manipulating variables render truth, and (d) the researcher should be detached. The qualitative methodology holds that (a) reality is socially constructed, (b) gaining understanding is the goal, and (c) the researcher's presence increases the validity of the study (Firestone, 1987).

While the qualitative approach has been dismissed by some in the past, it has an accepted and distinguished place in the minds and work of those who are studying the nature of organizations and the individuals in them. The scientific paradigm and quantitative methodology are often not adequate in this setting. It is the naturalistic paradigm which gives life to qualitative research.

Objective measuring and categorizing have a legitimate place in many inquiries. However, when the goal of a study is to describe a process and a relationship, there needs to be an evaluation which permits the researcher to enter into the process of evaluation, rather than remaining outside. What is needed is a method which allows for organizing units other than objectives to be used to gain insight into the topic at hand and in which a new language to describe the findings is available (Cronbach, 1963; Eisner, 1969; Guba, 1969; Scriven, 1967).

The departure from using objectives as the organizing unit for research requires that something else becomes the organizer for the study; this alternative organizer must be treated differently than an objective. Stufflebeam (1970) identified decisions as a legitimate organizer for research. In his context-input-process-product evaluation model, he identified delineating, obtaining, and applying as three separate and distinct evaluation processes. Delineating puts the researcher in personal contact with decision makers; obtaining involves the processing of information and applying delivers the information in a manner which is helpful to decision makers.

Stake (1975) furthered the cause of qualitative evaluation when he stated: "I recommend the responsive evaluation approach. It is an approach that trades off some measurement precision in order to increase the usefulness of the findings to persons in and around the program" (p. 14). The responsive evaluation approach allows the researcher to respond to the issues and concerns of those involved. The inquiry is marked by conversations with participants, personal observations of the evaluator, and the discovery of the stated and real purposes of the activity at hand.

Of critical importance to understand the qualitative approach is Stake's declaration that the instruments of research in the responsive model are observers and judges, in essence human instruments. Guba and Lincoln (1981) continued the discussion of human beings as research instruments:

Human beings as instruments are most responsive to the very areas of social organization about which we know the least: the social, the value resonant, the cultural. The capability of human beings to comprehend and accurately reflect alternative value systems and to become resocialized to the values of others so that inquiry is grounded in real-world context is lost when traditional "measurement" takes place. Rather, what is needed are those qualities that are uniquely human. These include the capacity to be responsive, to be flexible, to see social organizations as holistic entities rather than as components, to rely on both propositional and tacit knowledge, and to search for that which is expert, which is atypical, idiosyncratic, unique, singular, or uncharacteristic of the mainstream. (p. 151)

Changes in the world and our view of the world require that evaluation models also change. Perhaps the most important reason for the legitimizing of a qualitative model such as responsive evaluation is the "growing realization that American culture is value pluralistic" (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 29). Since organizations, including public schools, are not monolithic in nature, the use of the naturalistic paradigm makes sense because it allows for additional voices and truths which need to be recognized. It is in recognizing these perspectives that a fully dimensional picture can evolve.

Both Stake (1975) and Elliott (1981) provided specific comments on the naturalistic paradigm and its appropriateness to the educational setting.

Stake's observation was that naturalistic case study researchers believe that their inquiries are responsive to the "natural ways in which people assimilate information and arrive at understanding" (p. 13). Elliott amplified this thought, "The participants in a naturalistic inquiry tell the situation as it is, in all its complexity and messiness, refusing to filter through abstractions which oversimplify and distort the concrete settings in which people interact" (p. 507).

Elliott characterized the results of naturalistic inquiry as illuminating and conveying insights based upon a holistic impression taken from a multiplicity of angles and perspectives. The nature of the educational setting is one where multiple realities are present, where these realities are socially constructed, and where they reflect a complex interaction among the stakeholders (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). This match between the naturalistic paradigm and the educational setting confirmed my decision to use a qualitative research design for this study.

#### Why a Case Study?

A case study is an "empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (Yin, 1984, p. 23). The attributes of a case study include "thick description," an experiential perspective, a natural



language, and the opportunity to use "tacit knowledge" (Guba & Lincoln, 1981).

Yin (1984) asserted that the case study is the preferred research strategy when the investigator has little control over events and when "how" and "why" questions are the focus of the study. Schramm (1971) stated:

the essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or a set of decisions: Why they were made, how they were implemented, and with what results. (p. 22)

In this study I had no control over the events associated with the implementation of Senate Bill 813, nor did I have influence over the outcomes. The focus of the study is the "how" and "why" of the leadership relationship. In these significant ways the case study approach is a good match with the inquiry.

The case study I used is an embedded, single case design. The use of the single case design is justified because this inquiry is a "revelatory" case. As a revelatory case it provides "access to a situation previously inaccessible to scientific observation" (Yin, 1984, p. 42). Although the superintendent was the main unit of analysis, two principals, an assistant superintendent, two governing board members, and three teachers also provided information. Therefore, this is an embedded case design (Yin, 1984).

### Selection of Subjects

In his discussion of choosing a sample, Patton (1987) identified the difference between random and purposeful sampling in the qualitative research method. "The power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information rich cases for in-depth study. Information rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purposes of the evaluation" (pp. 51-52). He goes on to say,

There are no guidelines for determining the size of purposeful samples. The sample should be large enough to be credible given the purpose of the evaluation, but small enough to permit adequate depth and detail for each case or unit in the sample. (p. 59)

Patton identified ten selection strategies for choosing participants. The participants in this study were selected using the critical case (i. e., unit of analysis) sampling strategy. Critical cases

are those that can make a point quite dramatically or are, for some reason, particularly important in the scheme of things. A clue to the existence of a critical case is a statement to the effect that "if it happens there, it will happen anywhere," or vice versa, "if it doesn't happen there, it won't happen anywhere." Another clue to the existence of a critical case. . . is if that group is having problems then we can be sure all the groups are having problems. . . . A variation of the critical case strategy involves selecting (or sometimes avoiding) a politically sensitive site or

unit of analysis. . . . [Sampling the politically important cases is done to] increase the usefulness and utilization of information where resources permit the study of only a limited number of cases. (pp. 54-57)

The use of critical case sampling allowed me to hone in on the structural, human resources, and symbolic connections among and between leaders and followers. Given what is known about organizational theory and the culture of schools, those holding certain formal positions and those who hold informal authority were those who could tell the tale of the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

The superintendent was chosen by the reputational method. Based upon the researcher's direct observation and interaction with the superintendent in various settings, anecdotal information gathered from the superintendent's colleagues, and the verified participation of the superintendent as a leader in educational organizations such as the Association of California School Administrators, a superintendent of a kindergarten-eighth grade school district in California was chosen as the major unit of analysis for this study. In the initial dialogue with the subject of the study, he agreed to an extensive interviewing process and access to district meetings, board members, district staff, and records.

During the initial discussion with the superintendent, I asked him to be thinking of staff members and board members whom he believed could articulate their observations regarding the organizational and human

dynamics present during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. I relied upon his recommendations because any other process, such as random sampling, presented the possibility that an individual would be selected who knew little or nothing of Senate Bill 813 or who did not have the talent to reflect in a critical manner. The criteria for selection included their key roles in the implementation process, their abilities to reflect on that period of time and talk about it, and the superintendent's sense that they would give as honest a picture as possible about their relationship with him. Ultimately he identified several individuals as key players.

I selected from his recommendations the assistant superintendent of instruction, two principals, two board members and three teachers. Two of the teachers had been president of the teachers' association. One of these teachers became a principal. The remaining teacher had been deeply involved in the implementation of the mentor teacher program, which was a significant component of Senate Bill 813. The third teacher had been president of the teachers' association and was selected because his name came up repeatedly in my conversation with the other key informants. He was described as having been actively opposed to many of the superintendent's ideas associated with the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

All of the selected employees were employed by the district in 1983 when Senate Bill 813 implementation began. All employee participants had some

form of heightened responsibility relative to the implementation of Senate Bill 813 due to position in the organization, status as an elected representative, or appointment to a committee responsible for a particular part of the implementation. The two governing board members were serving as board members during the time of implementation. One served as a board member for fifteen years and was president of the board the year Senate Bill 813 was passed by the legislature. The other served as board member for thirteen years.

#### Collecting Data

Ongoing debate in the research community includes persistent questioning as to whether research which relies on human observation can be valid and reliable. It seems that the "whether" question has evolved into the "how to do it" question. In short, closeness does not make bias and loss of perspective inevitable; distance is no guarantee of objectivity. The mandate of qualitative methods is to go into the field and learn about the program firsthand" (Patton, 1987, p. 17).

As the human observer in this study, I found that my knowledge of the educational community and my experience as a teacher, site administrator, district level administrator, and superintendent to be of more assistance than hindrance. The language and culture which permeated the study were familiar to me. Discussion of key events such as a site council meeting immediately took on depth and character due to my experience. "Resistance

to change" and "entrenched behavior" carried tone and flavor beyond the familiar clichés. The concern that my familiarity might breed a bias of some sort is balanced by the requirement in my daily worklife to see the broad picture while simultaneously holding opposing views in my head. Certainly, once I have to make a decision those views are integrated or set aside; however, on my way to a decision I am able to see divergent perspectives. I am well practiced in this experience.

The integrity of the research design in this study was protected in several ways. The use of multiple sources of evidence, interview guides, tape recordings, and transcriptions of interviews and note taking during interviews served to strengthen the validity of the research (Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Patton, 1987; Yin, 1984).

Data were gathered from three sources: (a) district documentation such as memos and policies, (b) observations of district meetings and events, and (c) interviews with the superintendent, district staff, and board members. These multiple sources of information provided thick description as well as triangulation.

The superintendent and district staff were open and cooperative in assisting me with the gathering and reviewing of district documents. I was allowed to search archive records, review the board policy book, read memos and agendas and, when needed, reproduce documents to take with me.

Observation of district meetings and events was very informative. I attended two cabinet meetings (January, 1990 and February, 1990), an Administrative Committee meeting (February, 1990), two Governing Board meetings (February, 1990 and April, 1990), a Rotary Club luncheon (April, 1990), a district office luncheon (April 1990), an Area Directors meeting (April, 1990), and a Restructuring Workshop (April, 1990). I also observed a conference between a teacher and the superintendent and another between a principal and the superintendent (March, 1990). During these observations, I did not participate in any way and made myself as unobtrusive as possible. It was interesting to note that with the exception of the principal and teacher meeting, when their permission was obtained ahead of time, no one seemed to view my presence with any degree of interest.

Interviews were completed with the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, two principals, three teachers, and two board members. Interviews were held in 1989, 1990, and 1994. The lapse in time did not affect the quality of the interviews. Those informants interviewed in 1994 were as fresh in their recollections as those interviewed in 1990. In fact, I was startled by the detailed recall and immediacy of all informants' descriptions of emotions, processes, and products.

Interview guides were designed to draw out observations on the critical attributes of leadership theory as described in Chapter I, the intent and mandates of Senate Bill 813, and the dynamics of organizational change as

described in Chapter II. Since the interviews were open in nature, the interview guides asked for factual information as well as the opinions and insights of the participants (see Appendix A).

Prior to use in the research interviews, the guides were used with superintendents and other educators not in the study to determine their usefulness. I discovered in these piloting sessions that additional questions were generated as the interview process unfolded. This also occurred with the participants in the study. In a qualitative study this is not only expected but desired (Patton, 1987).

Four interviews with the superintendent took place in his office. The interviews took place in December, 1989; February, 1990; and March, 1990. They ranged from two to four hours in length. An additional one hour interview was held in January, 1994, at the annual California Superintendents' Conference. The superintendent prepared for the first interview by pulling his file on Senate Bill 813. This assisted in the discussion because he had some documents to which he could refer in recalling specific events and situations surrounding the implementation of Senate Bill 813. His manner was punctuated with a high degree of self-disclosure relative to feelings, motivations, and personal biases. He freely poked fun at himself when recollecting his approach to the change process. There were times in the interview when the current issues at hand and his relationship with the current board encroached into the discussion of



historical events. He was easily prompted back to the topic of Senate Bill 813.

The interview with the assistant superintendent of instruction took place in her office for a period of two hours. It was punctuated with well informed and energetic reflections on the dynamics of change present during implementation of Senate Bill 813. Because of her responsibilities for the instructional program of the whole district, her recollections were global and showed how this change effort affected the interconnected stakeholders in the district (i. e., individual teachers, teachers' association leaders, site administrators, mentors, etc.).

Both interviews with the principals were informative, and each was approximately two hours long. One principal was more circumspect in her responses, while the other was more spontaneous. The more circumspect of the two declared early in the interview that she knew that her perspective was going to be very different from what I had heard from the superintendent or other informants. I sensed that she was aware that her views might be perceived as negative. Although her observations were different from those of others, they were not negative in the destructive sense. They had a hard reality to them that made them genuine. The second principal had obviously developed a close, collegial relationship with the superintendent. She had served on several key committees during the

implementation of Senate Bill 813. Her responses reflected a deep respect for him.

The three teachers who were interviewed served as officials of the teachers' association during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. The interviews varied in length from forty-five minutes to two hours. One teacher has worked in the district for twenty-one years and became a mentor teacher soon after the program was adopted. He became involved in the teachers' association because he felt that mentor teachers were being ostracized by the association and that they should be active within the group to combat this negativity. He rose in the leadership ranks to the level of president. He has recently been appointed principal of an elementary school in the district. The second teacher has worked in the district for eighteen years. She was heavily involved in the negotiations concerning the implementation of Senate Bill 813. Although vehemently opposed to the mentor teacher program during the implementation stage, she now serves as a mentor in the district. The third teacher has served in the district for twenty years. He was extremely articulate and forceful in his descriptions of the implementation process of Senate Bill 813. He was frequently acknowledged by administrators and teachers as a significant participant in the dialogue and debate.

Two school board members were interviewed for approximately one hour each. One had been a teacher and a principal. He served on the board for

thirteen years. During that time he worked with three superintendents. He had a clear understanding that his role as a board member was to make policy. He readily remembered several aspects of Senate Bill 813 and provided clear and concise answers to the questions. The second board member served on the board for fifteen years. She was able to clearly remember the dynamics present among board members during the period under study and readily shared her feelings and thoughts. She was board president during the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

When there is more than one informant in a given category (i. e., three teachers, two principals, two governing board members) I am giving respondents a letter designation so the reader can distinguish among them. All quotes from one teacher are labeled as "teacher A, personal communication." In the case of the superintendent and assistant superintendent no such identification is used since only one individual filled each of those roles.

#### Analysis of Data

"Man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun. . . . [The analysis of those webs, or culture] is not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning" (Geertz, 1973, pp. 5-6).

In qualitative research the search for meaning is initiated with the first foray into that which is to be studied.

Analysis begins with the first interview, the first observation, the first document read. Emerging insights, hunches, and tentative hypotheses direct the next phase of data collection, which in turn leads to refinement or reformulation of one's questions, and so on. It is an interactive process throughout which the investigator is concerned with producing believable and trustworthy findings. (Merriam, 1988, pp. 120-121)

The data gathered in this study are indeed reflective of a web of culture. The analysis began with the highly positive affect shown by the superintendent when I initially asked him to consider being the subject of this study. Although the collection and analysis of data sometimes coincide, a very deliberative process was used in rendering a cogent and coherent response to this culture in relation to the purpose of the study. This analysis was completed in three ways: (a) Documents were reviewed and conclusions were drawn relative to the purposes of the study, (b) observational notes from the meetings and events were reviewed and conclusions were drawn relative to the purpose of this study, and (c) tapes of the interviews were transcribed and notes taken during the interviews were refined. A detailed analysis of the content of the transcriptions and notes was conducted and conclusions were drawn relative to the purposes of this study.

The process of analyzing the data is known as "pattern matching." Yin (1984) proposed that a pattern matching analysis should follow the propositions that generated the research questions. Those propositions are

found in Rost's (1991) and Foster's (1989) elements of the leadership relationship. The analysis of the data sought to identify common themes. These common themes were authenticated by the repetition and interrelatedness of their presence in multiple forms of evidence.

This process was successful in analyzing the leadership relationship in the implementation of the mentor teacher program, the teacher evaluation system, grade level expectancies, and proficiency testing. Other components of Senate Bill 813 were so quietly accepted that the subtlety did not allow for significant inquiry.

From collection to analysis, the researcher watched and identified the critical attributes of the leadership relationship. These observations and my interpretation of them formed the basis for the conclusions discussed in Chapter Five.

#### Limitations of the Research Design

The same reasons the use of "human instrumentation" are powerful in some settings also produce limitations. The proximity of the researcher to participants, especially the superintendent, could produce observations, interpretations, and conclusions which are contaminated by lack of objectivity. In addition, interviews are not exact by nature. They are illustrative, cautionary, and suggestive, at best. This is why multiple sources of information are so important to qualitative research.

Another limitation is the small sample size of those who were interviewed. Although each participant fulfilled a significant role in the organization which provides a depth of experience, additional informants in parallel positions would strengthen the base of information by giving the data breadth as well as depth.

An additional limitation is the fact that this is a single case study. This study is a thin slice of one district during one reform effort. It will be necessary to do follow-up studies with additional superintendents to verify the findings. While the informants' responses during these interviews certainly are legitimate from their perspective, it is only their perspective. Additional studies could drive the interviews deeper and wider in other organizations or reform efforts to gain validation or discover divergent perspectives.

#### Protection of Human Subjects

The nature of this study is highly political. Participation in the study requires candor and judgment. For these reasons, the participants were assured that their identity would be concealed to the best of my ability. However, all participants were informed that there was a risk that their participation might be discerned by individuals reading the final document.

Each participant signed a consent form (Appendix B). They were informed by me that they could review the transcript and notes of the interview at any time. Individuals also knew that their participation was

voluntary and they could decline to proceed at any time. In addition, the "Committee on Protection of Human Subjects" at the University of San Diego gave permission for this research to take place (Appendix B).

## CHAPTER IV

### THE MAN AND THE MANDATE:

#### A SUPERINTENDENT AND CALIFORNIA SCHOOL REFORM

##### Introduction

The data collected in this study were gathered from (a) a review of pertinent district documents, such as board policies, school improvement plans, collective bargaining agreements, and superintendent memos, (b) direct observation of district meetings, such as governing board meetings, restructuring meetings, cabinet meetings, and community meetings, and (c) interviews with the subject superintendent, two principals, three teachers, one assistant superintendent, and two governing board members. Two of the teachers held the presidency of the teachers' association during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. The third was an association official during implementation.

The data from the interviews are presented in Chapter Four in direct and indirect quotations. The interview data are reported as "personal communication" in the text of the chapter.



The data are organized to reflect the review of the literature. The data provided examples of many of the concepts discussed in the review of the literature, including the nature of the superintendency, policymaking, organizational theory and change, and leadership. Four major policy outcomes of Senate Bill 813--grade level expectancies, minimum proficiencies, the mentor teacher program, and the teacher evaluation system--are central to Chapter Four.

### The Man and the Mandate

Mandates speak louder than the message, yet the message is what gives meaning to the mandate. The mandate of Senate Bill 813 triggered a message of hope, fear, and anxiety in the corridors of school districts throughout California. In late June, 1983, the legislative process turned Senate Bill 813 into a garbage can in which, over the ensuing three years, the California Teachers Association, California School Administrators Association and California School Boards Association placed their offerings.

The subject of this study, a superintendent of a kindergarten through eighth grade school district in southern California, felt resentful as he took on the task of implementing Senate Bill 813. The superintendent stated:

The initial reaction to Senate Bill 813 was positive since it carried some money with it. The year before we hadn't gotten any money at all. So when 813 came along, we were very enthusiastic about the money. . . . But then a thousand things were thrown into the hopper which no one

had input on. We were happy about the money, but it was quite a surprise to see that the bill was three quarters of an inch thick. This was a lot more than just a funding bill. It was a shock that all moneys in California were going to be tied to reform. In the beginning I was very bitter about that and I really fought it psychologically. My response was, "This is not fair. This is the money that we should get because we are growing, because we need to survive." (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

So began one superintendent's endeavor to bring about change in the wake of Senate Bill 813. He brought twenty years of experience in education to the task, having been a teacher, principal, curriculum coordinator, director of a leadership development center, and assistant superintendent. He had been an assistant superintendent for one year prior to his appointment as superintendent.

The district served students in 24 schools. Providing programs for the children of the district was a precarious proposition given the rapidly changing demographics in the area. The Hispanic population was growing at a significantly greater rate than the Anglo population. The socioeconomic status of students grew more disparate each year. Increased housing density brought on by an onslaught of apartment houses, more single-parent families and limited-English-speaking children from the Middle East, Asia, Mexico, and Central and South America. The "haves" and "have-nots" grew

further apart as housing patterns clustered children in schools in a way which separated and isolated them along economic and social lines. On the whole, this district struggled with problems common to nearly all California districts.

At the time of Senate Bill 813 implementation, the district was experienced pressures from within and without. Certainly the change in student population impacted the system. The California State Department of Education sent signals on curriculum alignment. The advent of Senate Bill 813 added a major message to the schools in terms of focus and accountability. There were portions of Senate Bill 813 which ultimately mattered little in the day-to-day life of teachers and students or to the big picture of education. However, there were components which profoundly impacted schools and the individuals in them. In the district headed by the subject of this study, the components which grabbed time and attention were: teacher evaluations, mentor teacher program, proficiency testing, and grade level expectancies.

In reflecting on several areas in need of reform before the implementation of Senate Bill 813, the superintendent recognized how the mandates of Senate Bill 813 could be helpful:

When I came to this district, teachers were saying, "We don't know what to teach in each grade." When 813 came in, we had been working on curriculum alignment. Grade level expectancies fit right in. The two

year process of developing expectancies in each grade level was wonderful because it caused teachers to be thinking about commonalities. . . . It's not that I am opposed to diversity; it's just that I think it's a bit too diverse when we are using 34 reading programs in 24 schools. . . . During the alignment process we tried to include some criterion referenced testing. The teachers' organization went crazy and claimed we were going to use the results to evaluate teachers. We just backed off and it gave us a chance to work on the teacher evaluation system which took three years to complete. . . . Senate Bill 813 gave us the opportunity to get the district more in line with the California Assessment Program. . . . Our expectation became very clear: you'll be at the middle or above. Although we had already started on the course of centralizing certain aspects of the district program, 813 helped a lot. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

The previous superintendent had been very high on affect and low on accountability. The superintendent in this study had been hired to counteract a laissez-faire approach to managing the district. Senate Bill 813 provided a convergence of purpose for the superintendent and the governing board. Codifying procedures and expectations was now the law.

Deciding how to approach the implementation of Senate Bill 813 was the first task. The superintendent initially took a very linear and rational approach. This allowed him and other participants to get the lay of the land

before deciding which areas deserved or demanded time and attention. With over fifty mandates, this sorting procedure was an essential part of the process. This Model I approach to analysis, which is linear and rational, started at the top. The superintendent recalled:

It started with the executive committee which is made up of assistant superintendents and three or four principals. We analyzed the law, what it said, and what we thought it said. We were getting a zillion interpretations of what everything meant from many different points of view. We'd sit down and figure out what the law wanted us to do. Basically, someone would take on the responsibility for an area and provide the leadership to make it happen. It fell along traditional lines of instruction, personnel, or occasionally business services, and negotiations. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

Some of the deliberations took weeks to complete, while others took years. The length of time was determined by the complexity of the issue, the political content, and the organizational structures which guided the process along its way. Some aspects of Senate Bill 813 were tantalizing in content, yet disappointing in form, such as the professional growth requirement. All new teachers would complete 150 clock hours of professional growth activities over the first five years of service. As professionals, teachers should be required to continue learning about the work they do. The professional growth requirement appeared to address this fundamental

requirement. Yet, as the superintendent analyzed the mandate, he found it had no teeth. It was in essence a paper tiger. Even though he had a profound interest in this area, he invested little time and energy since the return would be so small.

Each component of Senate Bill 813 was delegated to an individual. Depending upon the topic, the principals' council, the management team, the teachers' or classified association, as well as the school board, might be involved. Once all the advising, conferring, and adopting had been completed, one more component of Senate Bill 813 was implemented.

As the implementation process proceeded, the superintendent's concern over the unfairness of the reform legislation continued to nag at him. His analysis of the bill included his feeling that it was very anti-administration. He felt one of the authors of the bill used the reform effort to express his personal feelings of being unappreciated as a teacher many years ago. In one written exchange with the legislator, the superintendent reported that he passionately explained that when the state legislates reform which requires the district to negotiate that reform with the teachers' association, it can rip a district apart--especially in a year when there is nothing with which to negotiate in terms of money. The superintendent did receive a response from the legislator. It basically said that if things were right in his district in the first place he wouldn't be having trouble with this kind of process (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1990).

Implementing Senate Bill 813 certainly immersed the district in grueling negotiations. Both informal and formal bargaining were required to put in place the mentor teacher program, the teacher evaluation system, the proficiency testing, and the grade level expectancies. A more complete discussion of these activities is included in a following section. An enormous amount of effort and emotional expense was required to negotiate the new ways of doing things and to inculcate the new cultural values required by such a reform. In fact, so consuming was the implementation of Senate Bill 813, the superintendent reported wondering what he was going to be doing with his time after Senate Bill 813 was in place (see Appendix C)!

The process of education reform is the process of organizational change. Since organizations change when people change, people were the key to the effort. The superintendent made an observation which deserves attention for its honesty and yet was alarming in terms of reform efforts:

We've brought in a lot of new people, hundreds in the last three years. What amazes me, Jennifer, is how many new people there have to be before the school turns around. In the books it talks about cultivating a little group of people. It's more than a little group. You've got to have a whole ton of them. I was very naive. I thought if you got a couple of key people in there, you could change things around. A principal has to have a whole bunch of people that support him or her. A couple of naysayers can still make it tremendously negative. Especially if they've been there

a long time and they're used to having their own way. New people are just not strong enough, even when they've been there four or five years. They're just not strong enough. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

This statement is a cautionary tale for superintendents interested in reform who find themselves in no growth times, with little opportunity to hire new people and with no incentives of interest to experienced employees to put on the bargaining table.

The process of reform lurched down the path of change, halting at various points in the road. Intermittent progress was made as resistance from the teachers' association was felt on multiple issues. Resistance in the administrative ranks was apparent as the more experienced principals voiced concern over the teacher evaluation system.

In reviewing the implementation process, the superintendent did not recall any resistance from governing board members on any topic relative to Senate Bill 813. The points of resistance with the teachers' association included the mentor teacher program, teacher evaluation system, proficiency testing, and grade level expectations.

Why did this superintendent so completely and wholeheartedly enter the change process, considering all the emotional ambivalence he felt about the underlying motivation for the introduction of Senate Bill 813, the lack of resources available to bring followers into the effort, the adversarial state of



relations between the district administrators and the teachers' association, and the relatively low return on a majority of the components of the bill?

A lot of it had to do with being new to the superintendency. New things just excite me. I have a hard time restraining myself about new ideas. My tendency is to plunge in, learn a lot about it, and see how it can be applied here. The vision has something to do with it. I find that there aren't a lot of things that come from the grassroots that are really all that powerful. You deal with a lot of nitty-gritty stuff. But the big ideas sort of get lost in the wind. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

This superintendent believed that the trigger for a change effort often came from the top, from a motivated individual. The process of change became much more dispersed as members of the organization entered into the process. He believed that commitment to change was self-induced, rather than commanded from the outside. As will be apparent in the following discussion, putting the reform movement to work was just that--hours of hard work over a long period of time which was sustained by personal motivation.

#### The Nature of the Superintendency and the Nature of the Superintendent

A frog and a scorpion sat on the bank of a river. The scorpion asked the frog to carry him across the river on his back. The frog refused, stating that the scorpion would sting him and he would drown. The scorpion promised he

would not. The frog agreed and, with the scorpion on his back, began the swim across the river. Halfway into the journey, the scorpion began to sting the frog. "Stop! Stop!" the frog screamed. "We will both drown.!" "I can't help it," replied the scorpion. "It is my nature" (Wooley, 1992).

At the annual California Superintendents' Conference there are as many different types of people present who serve as superintendents as there are districts in the state. While there is no one set of behaviors or a style which perfectly fits the job, the nature of the superintendency brings out the nature of the person serving in it. There are aspects to the superintendency which cannot be changed such as conflict, ambiguity, and politics. Likewise there are things within the superintendent which cannot be changed such as personality and past experiences. Understanding the nature of the superintendency and the individual occupying that position is critical to the success of the superintendent's superintendency.

No matter how big or small a district is, the nature of the superintendency is that staff and parents never feel the superintendent's presence enough or in the way they would like to feel it. Accurate communication is thwarted by lack of time all around, varying levels of interest, interpretation on the part of the sender and receiver, and bias on the part of the sender and receiver. Vision meets resistance when the separate realities of stakeholder groups become known. The grind of managerial minutia saps the energy needed for leadership. People attribute

more power to the position than it has and therefore demand unreasonable results from it or are intimidated by the individual in the superintendency. These are all reasons why the nature of the superintendency makes it a difficult job. These cannot, however, be excuses for a lack of leadership by the superintendent.

In reflecting on the superintendency, the subject of this study disclosed some of his experiences, beliefs and modus operandi which no doubt have an impact on how he views his nature and its fit with the superintendency.

#### When Man and Mandate Meet: Creating and Cultivating the Vision

When a dialogue is emotionally charged--and there were many during the implementation of Senate Bill 813--there is a tendency to want to fight fire with fire. In reflecting on this, the superintendent said,

In my childhood home you don't do that. You don't let things out and if you do you are knocked across the room. So number one, it's not part of my training. Number two, very seldom do I "get" people in front of groups. That's not me either. Number three, there's the role. So everybody expects you to be the model of everything and that gets old, really old, sometimes. Everybody else is angry, but you can't say what's on your mind. Most of the time you'd like to say, "This is a bunch of baloney. There is no issue here. You are making it an issue. Let's move on." That's what you would like to say, but you don't dare.

(superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

"Not daring to" has its root in wanting to keep the vision alive. Keeping it alive can mean a sort of existential cardiopulmonary resuscitation throughout the process of leading. The superintendent shared his thoughts on what maintained his motivation.

I've always had goals. To me that's always been very clear that you have goals, expectations, dreams, and visions. I was a great fan of King Arthur and his court. All that kind of stuff really had a personal meaning. I think that when you grow up on a farm in the Heartland, God knows you need something beside reality. The reality is dismal. I read a lot. I think I used it as an escape, but it also caused me to have a pretty healthy sense that there's something greater out there. You're just one little tweak on an iceberg. Having a lofty vision or set of goals and working toward them--that's all right with me. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

Bringing these personal instincts and inclinations to the superintendency matched the importance of this man's work in public education. The sacredness and nobility of teaching children, by its nature, deserves and requires lofty, beyond yourself kinds of thinking. Having the vision, communicating the vision, and having others take up the vision are separate and distinct things. Leaving it at the first level of development (having a vision) makes one a dreamer. Success at the second level of development (communicating the vision) puts one on the same level with a

TV evangelist. Moving to the third level of development (engaging others in the implementation of a vision) is the core of the leader-follower relationship.

The impediments to connecting followers with the vision are legion.

Overcoming them is the leader's task. The superintendent reflected:

You begin by making a conscious decision about what you are going to talk about. And you are going to talk about it all the time. You build the issue by talking about it. You can just allow things to happen but they won't be the things you want to have happen. Getting teachers and administrators to see the broader picture is a twenty-four-hour-a-day job. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

You need to find your grassroots. If you want something done at a the school, you go and talk to a couple of key teachers and you bring it up at the staff meeting. You cue the discussion. You cause it to happen. You stir up interest. Key players, like principals, are asking, "Do I have the time and energy?" A new idea is one of 99 things that all have top priority. It takes a long time for the word to get out. That is, for the word you want to get out, to get out. The word you don't want to get out, gets out just like that! [snap of his fingers] The good words you want to get out are very slow in moving out, so you have got to talk in lots of places. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

Defining the content of the vision is also a leadership task. The expansive list of topics in Senate Bill 813 required sorting and prioritizing.

Which of these requirements did the superintendent believe deserved the status of being part of the vision?

If I really see that it's going to have a positive impact on kids in the end, then it's important. I felt that both the grade level expectancies and the teacher evaluation system would impact kids directly. Both of these issues had a direct alignment with my values and the values of the board serving at the time. I felt very tenacious about both those issues.

There's always a space between reality and where you would like things to be. There are never fewer than 300 things that need to be done to improve the district. I've come to peace with myself that you can only pick off so many at a time. Some of the wars aren't worth fighting. You must pick and choose. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

The competition for time and attention in an organization requires that the leaders and followers protect the vision from being swallowed up by short-term thinking. The superintendent had three guiding practices which served to preserve the vision. First, there were very few "have to's" in the district. Managers could choose whether or not to come to district meetings. Committee membership was voluntary. Attendance was voluntary, even though everyone was held accountable for carrying out decisions that were made and for understanding information that was shared. Second, when a change effort met with resistance that was so negative it was impossible to

overcome it, the superintendent stopped pursuing it. Criterion referenced testing so terrified the teachers' association that all activity relative to it ceased. The superintendent came back to it with a different approach at a later time. Lastly, pacing the speed of change served to preserve the vision. The superintendent observed that followers lost heart very fast, especially in the initial stages of change. There was a high degree of uncertainty and anxiety. He counteracted this by extending the vision three years into the future with site and district plans. This allowed him to monitor the tolerance for change and, when needed, to back off a bit and allow followers to catch up without endangering the vision.

#### Surviving and Engaging Reference Groups

Part of the nature of the superintendency is that conflict is inevitable. When a major reform effort such as Senate Bill 813 is added to the mix, surviving long enough to see the vision become reality is a tall order. A key to survivability is engaging the diverse reference groups or stakeholders which move in and out of the change process. The significant reference groups which appeared during this study were the governing school board, the teachers' association, the cabinet, the principals, and the public.

The Governing Board. Coming to understand how board members view the world and their role as board members is essential to the superintendent's relationship with board members. The governing board composition changed every year of the superintendent's tenure; this turnover

rate is significantly unusual. At any given time, the five members of a board have separate and distinct opinions at various times and over various issues. As he thought about board members with whom he had worked over the years, the superintendent identified some personal attributes which he felt guided and shaped the board members' decisions and their relationships with him.

One member felt most comfortable with the numbers side of things. Give him the budget, test scores, anything that was finite and he felt comfortable. Another was greatly influenced by the social dynamics in the community. She was practiced at triggering outcries and then distancing herself from decisions which did not please her primary reference groups. One member held very defined religious and family values which came into play during a discussion on job shares. In his opinion, job shares would encourage more women to work outside the home which in this mind was a bad thing. Another member held the strong personal opinion that the district was just "no good." She spent her time locating all the "Darth Vaders" she could find. Several board members acted out of a philosophical position which elevated what was best for kids ahead of all other concerns.

Engaging board members in the vision means linking the vision to things that matter to them. Successfully making this link can increase the survivability and effectiveness of the superintendent. This kind of understanding of the vision as it connects to the things personally important



to board members may be as close as they get to truly capturing the vision. Boards tend to get caught up in procedures and discreet items like conference attendance. It is very hard to engage them in the vision on the scale which is understood by the superintendent and others. In reflecting on his own board, the superintendent observed that in any community you have four to five generations at any given time and the board often reflects those generational layers. The value systems for each generation are different. In this significant way it becomes harder and harder to build consensus.

In addition to the generational issues on the board, the superintendent found that having many new board members throughout the years posed relationship issues.

I just participated in a dissertation out of University of Southern California on what goes wrong with board superintendent relationships. It's like anything new-- a new job, a new marriage. In the beginning you are trying very hard to please each other. As the years go by there's less tolerance and there's more of a spread between the board and the superintendent and between board members. The study showed that after the fifth year they stop doing reality checks with each other. They think the board members have more and more autonomy. Meanwhile, there are new board members and they are wondering, "What's that guy doing over there without checking with us?" So the superintendent is operating on his wave length and the board members on their wave

lengths. They get further and further apart. The longer the superintendent was in the district, the greater the potential there was for this problem. (superintendent, personal communication, January, 1994)

Just as the superintendent has reference groups, the board has reference groups. The influence of these stakeholders impacts the relationship of the board to the superintendent. When a board constituency appears to protest a given decision, the relationship between the board and the superintendent is often on the line. Depending upon how clear the board members are about their roles and responsibilities, and depending upon the superintendent's tolerance for being questioned in his authority, these interactions can damage his survivability or enhance it. The superintendent in this study had the perspective that it only takes three or four outspoken parents to make something an issue.

You're never dealing with the majority. You're always dealing with the small minority of people who are fussing about something. They can make it sound a lot louder than it is and they can make mountains out of molehills. They have influence over the board because the board doesn't hear from the majority on issues. A couple of these people shouting and screaming have a big impact. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

Sensitivity to pressure can blur the understanding a superintendent has for the direction of the board. The superintendent noted that it is frustrating

to have one understanding of the board's position at 4:00 p.m. and have the opposite vote occur at 7:30 p.m. after public comment.

The view from outside the board room presented some observations which validated the political life of governing board members. A principal offered these thoughts on the life of a board member:

The community can get very ugly when it wants to. One group gets what it wants and then every pressure group gets on the band wagon. . . .

Board members are political animals so they go with the pressure.

(principal A, personal communication, February, 1994)

The superintendent voiced empathy for the situation board members often find themselves in. He described his own experience as a board member of a medical group and drew a parallel to what it must be like to be a on a school board.

I'm chairperson of the advisory committee for a medical/dental center. I really have to struggle to remember from time to time, "What is this?

Why is this important? What am I doing this for?" The ongoing operation of the advisory committee is just so ponderous because no one has really taken hold. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

While board members may experience a lack of focus and control during spirited debate, there is an equal danger in agenda items which appear to be pre-digested. The superintendent reported that a board member had voiced this concern. She felt the issues had been so well presented and the options

so finely tuned that the board had nothing to talk about. The superintendent's compulsion was to have everything neat and tidy, while a board member wanted a few wrinkles in it so she could do her job.

In their relationship with the superintendent, the two governing board members stated in their interviews that they both felt as if the superintendent viewed them as leaders. Both acknowledged having a close personal and professional relationship with him when they held the office of board member. He sought them out for advice and comfort. One board member received letters from the superintendent reflecting on issues and the role the board member played in a given effort. Several years after receiving those letters, the board member still kept them handy and viewed them with great pride as evidence of her hard work and successes on the school board. (governing board member B, personal communication, February, 1994).

The superintendent recognized that the governing board was his primary reference group at the beginning of his superintendency. As the board composition changed and there were more and more occasions when there was a split board, the superintendent observed that the divisions widened and soon the reference group disappeared. He mediated the disagreements among board members by running back and forth between them as an information carrier since they were not talking to each other. When he left the district in 1991, his heart wasn't with two of the board members. It is

perhaps the heart part that makes or breaks the link between the superintendent and the board.

The Teachers' Association. During his time as superintendent, the association had a change in formal leaders every two years. In the first year or two, the relationship between the association and the district was perceived by the superintendent to be adversarial. Negotiating meetings were punctuated with tension and shouting. While the superintendent did not sit at the table, he became personally involved with the association leaders on several issues related to Senate Bill 813. After three years there was a change in the tone of the association's leaders and then a "win-win" approach to negotiating began.

The superintendent watched the new leaders evolve out of the implementation of mentor teacher program. In the beginning there was a strong feeling on the part of the teacher association officials that mentors were really teachers in wolves' clothing--they wanted to be administrators. This feeling played out in mentors not being trusted by staunch association members. You could not be a true believer in the association and be a mentor. After the program was up and running, the mentors got a little tired of being treated in a mildly hostile way by their colleagues. So the mentors decided to have more power in the association. Tracking this development, the superintendent recalled the following:

One mentor came into association leadership as treasurer. He worked his way up and has been president these past two years. He's the same person he was before he became involved in the association. He's logical. His value system is clearly what is right for teachers, but that's closely coupled with what's right for kids. He comes in, we discuss. I say what I can do, what I cannot do; he discusses what he has to do and what he cannot do. I feel very close to him. I feel like he is my friend. The ones before I would hardly say that. In fact, when I walk by them--you know how your stomach does that little flip-flop? There used to be yelling and screaming matches that you cannot believe. Very, very abusive. Not on my part, either. So all that came out of 813. The fact that he was even president caused a new type of leadership [less adversarial] to emerge. In fact, mentors realized that to get anywhere with the teachers organization they had to hold some different leadership positions. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989 and April, 1990)

The superintendent took it upon himself to entice teachers into the association's top positions via the mentor teacher program. The teachers' association had blocked the participation of administrative interns in the mentor program. These administrative interns perceived these regulations as extremely unfair. After all, they were bargaining unit members and full-time classroom teachers. One such individual had a close relationship

with the superintendent and eventually became president of the association. He recalled the turmoil of implementing the mentor teacher program.

The association and the district quickly wrote up an agreement because there was a danger of the district not being eligible for mentor funds if it did not apply the first year. The implementation was dollar driven. It boiled down to a merit pay issue with the association. I had left the association membership when Proposition 13 came into being. I left because the association bargained for a pay increase and traded pink slips to teachers with five years or less experience. I felt cut out. I had grown up in a family with a strong teacher union history. My dad had to leave CTA when he became an administrator. When the mentor teacher program came along, I had to have an attorney convince the association that I was eligible since I was on leave the year before the year the mentorship was available. . . . I was allowed to apply. Mentoring is now seen as a legitimate extra money for 200 hours of extra work. I became treasurer of the association after that. I think there is a tradition of jealousy between the teachers' association and administrators over power and money. (teacher A, personal communication, February, 1994).

Both the governing board members who were interviewed remembered that there was resistance from the teachers' association during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. They did not recall the specific form of the resistance, but commented that it seemed to be rooted in the fear of losing

power and control over their lives. There was also reference to the high sensitivity teachers felt when they sensed they were being criticized. Both governing board members referenced the extensive amount of time the superintendent spent with the association and individual teachers, but did not offer details about the dialogue and debate.

When Senate Bill 813 came into being, there was a strong culture in this district that teachers could do what they wanted to do. The superintendent's appointment signaled a shift toward a certain amount of centralization. Senate Bill 813 added a bit of clout to his work of focusing the efforts of the district because now it was law to have things like grade level expectancies and proficiency requirements. During the implementation, teachers could be heard saying that they hadn't taken a job in so-and-so district because that was a controlling district. Now this one was becoming controlling also! The superintendent remembered that at his appearance at a staff meeting to discuss the grade level expectancies, a teacher stood up in the back of the room and said, "This is just another one of your administrative tricks to control teachers, isn't it" (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989).

So, even as association officials were changing and participating in vision building, individual teachers were still entrenched in their resentment and distrust of anything requiring change that had an administrative flavor to it. In order to get buy-in from this reference group, the superintendent



opened committee membership to teachers so they could help create the expectancies. Participation was voluntary. One principal observed that those who participated often had a pet topic they wanted to get into the expectancies (principal B, personal communication, May, 1990).

Participation certainly was not on the level of vision for some. Ironically, even this act of inclusion was viewed with wariness as if it were an organizational Trojan Horse.

The teachers' association gets lots of mixed messages. While I'm getting messages from ACSA and other organizations I belong to, CTA is generating a list of rules. It is a bit like the lottery money. ACSA and CSBA say don't put it on the table and CTA is saying get that money into salaries. So teachers hear a diversity of opinion. That's happening with 813, too. The legislation was originally presented as the first stages of teacher empowerment. People don't realize that today. In a mandated kind of way we were going to give up power to the teachers. When I say that, it sounds like we had it in the first place! I don't know that we ever did, but for the first time the law said you will share it. . . . There is always ongoing conflict between what the teachers perceive you as trying to do and what you are trying to do. And because it is a "central office" thing the connotations are control. And you know, in reality we are. We are a control agency. We call up and say, "Hey, you can't spend \$500 to buy balloons out of Chapter I." We do away with a teacher's good idea.

And it is ironic because I don't perceive myself as so controlling of others. I am very controlling of myself and of where I want to go. I'm very into that. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

There was a great deal of confusion on the part of teachers and administrators in interpreting the content and intent of Senate Bill 813. Part of the solution to the confusion for this superintendent was to fully include this reference group in dialogue. Greater detail on that interaction is covered in the section on Using The Tools--Forging the Relationship.

At the end of his second year as superintendent, signals were being sent that the association was going to revolt.

The second year they found out that I was going to follow up on a lot of these things. We had moved from a complete laissez faire district where every school did what they wanted to, to a district with structure. People began coming to me and saying, "The teachers' association is going revolt because you keep asking them to do all these things. They are out to get you and they are going to be successful if the regular people don't get to know you. You're too structured." Their ear was to the ground. So, I did some things conscientiously based on their recommendations. They said to go out and have lunch with staff. So indeed, every Friday I go to a school and have lunch with the staff. They said that when I visited a school I should send a note to every teacher after visiting their room, not just a few teachers. So I visit every classroom once a year and send a

note back to every teacher. I did this to regain the confidence of the classroom teacher. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

The relationship with this reference group was messy. It was a mix of the professional, the personal, the group, and the individual. Attempts at openness sometimes resulted in conflict. This superintendent met with a teachers' advisory committee once a month. The purpose was communication, clarification, sharing ideas, and answering questions. During implementation of 813, shortly after some of the meetings adjourned, he would get a call from the president accusing him of talking about negotiations during the teachers' advisory council meeting. Since many of the items of interest to all parties were also being negotiated, it was a bit impossible to have a meaningful dialogue without stepping into that territory. The formal and legal structure of negotiations hampered the leadership activity of the superintendent.

Lessening the estrangement that can occur between the superintendent and association and its members requires a great amount of empathy, selflessness, and time. Keeping the ultimate decision, whatever it may be, separate from personal feelings is one key to the health of the relationship. When things were said that were hurtful or downright untrue, the superintendent made an effort to clear things up. He found writing and sending his thoughts to individuals involved to be effective, in addition to

being available to talk. "Something that I think is hard in our jobs is to be looking for the nits all the time. By nature I'm not that kind of person. Part of my modus operandi now is, 'Will this be misinterpreted?' "  
(superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

The Cabinet. The superintendent's survivability was significantly dependent upon the work and advice of his senior advisors.

I have always been in a job where I know most of what is going on. For the first time in my life, I don't know but a corner of it. So my dependence upon the assistant superintendents is absolute. I cannot imagine being in a situation in a district where you didn't have absolute confidence in those people because your life flashes before your eyes many times a day and you just hope they are doing what they are supposed to be doing out there. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

Senior advisors were like seeing eye dogs helping him to interpret things with a sense other than his own. One assistant superintendent described her role as getting a capsule point-of-view in her area and passing that along to the superintendent and other cabinet members (assistant superintendent, personal communication, May, 1990). Cabinet members provided a traditional delineation between instruction, personnel and business. This linear view helped to initially organize and prioritize issues at hand. Those that required more in-depth consideration were routed to the appropriate

committees followed by frequent progress checks at weekly cabinet meetings. These weekly meetings were incredibly important to the superintendent as he prepared his thoughts for board meetings, committee meetings, and responses to other reference groups.

I rarely, rarely do something by myself. First of all, 97% of all decisions are made in cabinet. The three assistant superintendents are allowed the flexibility to do what they do best. They know I will support them. I'm counterbalanced by the people around me and I count on that.

(superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

The Principals. The superintendent viewed principals as key players in the organization.

The best thing we could have done was bring two principals in on the negotiating team. They can say what they can live with and what they can't. So goes the world. If they can live with it, I can live with it.

(superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

Bringing reference groups together, in this case the teachers' association and the principals, had the effect of cross-checking perceptions and building mutuality of goals. Even at the negotiating table where positions were often the currency of discussions, having a breadth of perspective took the edge off some of the demands. The superintendent vested quite a bit of confidence in the professionalism of the principal representatives when he linked his future to their decision of what they could live with. One principal described

the result of this effort to include all players as a "district where teachers and administrators all felt that they are going in the same direction" (principal B, personal communication, February, 1994).

He also invested principals with a great degree of responsibility. "I feel very comfortable saying, "This is the problem. What are you guys going to do about it? This is what we can do; this is what we can't do" (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989). The superintendent's trust and confidence in the principals was felt as affirming their leadership at their sites. However, one principal believed her influence at the district level was negligible, while another principal believed her influence was felt at the district level through her committee membership. She also felt the superintendent nurtured her leadership by asking for her help with tough issues. In her mind the superintendent's integrity was a significant factor in his ability to lead the district:

What he tells one person, he tells the next person. He has never gotten far from being a teacher or a principal. You know that when he visits the classrooms. Every note has a specific notion of something instructionally good that was going on at the time. He is still remembered for that behavior, although three years have passed since he left. His willingness to support principals and teachers was demonstrated at my school when a couple wanted their child moved from the classroom of a new teacher to a more seasoned teacher. The underlying reason which we found out

later was based on wanting to be in a room with certain families. The superintendent met with the teacher, me, and the parents. He wrote them a letter saying the child was staying in the classroom. That teacher will never forget how he supported her. I won't either. (principal B, personal communication, February, 1994)

The superintendent's trust in principals was extended through his policy that regularly scheduled meetings were not mandatory. If you as principal felt there was something more important or urgent at your site, it was your decision. Giving principals this latitude should not be interpreted as not holding people accountable for the improvements needed at their school sites.

He has us do objectives and we meet at the beginning of the year. He meets individually with us in the middle of the year. If you are superficial in your analysis, he is going to know. He is in touch enough with what's happening. . . . Your test scores are reviewed and, yes, if you are not up to snuff, then you have to write a response on what you are going to do to make them better. . . . I don't feel like he is always Big Brother looking over my shoulder. I feel he knows I know what I do, what I am about, and what my strengths are and what my weaker areas are. I think he knows that about every administrator. He tries to match up a school for you to take advantage of those strengths. (principal A, personal communication, May, 1990)

The size and complexity of the district was an impediment to ongoing communication with principals. The superintendent expressed concern that three weeks could go by without seeing or talking to a given principal. Were they OK? Were they alive? Principals of year-round schools worked themselves into the ground before he knew they hadn't taken a vacation day. His concern for the well being of his principals was reciprocated by principals making note that he worked incredibly long hours, met with too many parents, made superhuman efforts to be cordial and, perhaps, did too many things himself.

The balance of power and responsibility between the superintendent and the principals was an area of interest to the teachers' association officials. All the activity surrounding the implementation of Senate Bill 813 put the spotlight on the superintendent and the principals in the areas of evaluation, curriculum content, grade level expectancies, and the mentor teacher program. The association officials had an interest in watching these developments because they could then strategize ways to affect the dialogue and debate. In addition, during the implementation of Senate Bill 813, there were several points at which the balance between administrators and teachers was a hot topic.

During the first year of the new teacher evaluation system, a principal noted the results of standardized test results in teacher evaluations. Using test results in teacher evaluations was taboo because of a negotiated



agreement with the teachers' association.. This triggered a major incident in the district. As the association president at the time recalled it, he met with the superintendent and told him what had happened. The superintendent immediately conferenced with the principal and corrections were made. The superintendent's reaction reinforced the perception that all reference groups were valued by the superintendent, not just those closest to the top of the organizational chart. In spite of the superintendent's egalitarian approach to conflict resolution, principals reported feeling his support in the face of criticism from parents and teachers. (principal B, personal communication, February, 1994).

The superintendent offered a cautionary observation about his cabinet and principals. Although the positions were filled with a mix of men and women and ethnic groups were represented, they seemed to think the same way he did. They had the same value systems. At times they seemed to be an echo rather than a distinct voice (superintendent, personal communication, May, 1990).

The Parents and the Public. "The most unforgiving is the public." (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989). The most amorphous reference group includes those known as "the public" with a specific subgroup known as "the parents." Generally this reference group becomes aroused over a single issue that has rubbed the people in the group the wrong way. The depth of the arousal can be diminished or heightened by

the involvement of key players from other reference groups, such as the governing board or teachers' association. Rising up in indignation, the public and parents ascribe to basic administrative procedures all sorts of ulterior motives. The superintendent described one event which demonstrated how things could gain a head of steam without the superintendent even knowing what had happened.

A board member called extremely upset about a bell schedule change for the school in her area of the community. She told me that I had agreed that there would be no surprises and this was a surprise. I told her I would look into it and get back to her. As it turned out there was a bell schedule change which had been worked out between the principal and the director of transportation. I got calls from two parents screaming at me that I was trying to get back at them over some ancient issue and that I hated parents. When I got home at 9:00 p.m. that night my son told me he had locked the door because he thought there was a man who wanted to shoot me. I called the parent and he screamed at me for a half hour about my insensitivity to the community. He was going to take this to the Supreme Court. If I was responsible for this change he would see that the board had my head on a platter. . . . We only got two phone calls, not the thousands that were promised. That's just one example of something that comes unraveled that you don't have a clue about. And there's going to be a thousand things like that every week, most of which

sensible people will let go of because they don't expect you to know anything about it. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

### Perceived Power and Knowledge

The district organizational chart has a little box that frames the word superintendent. Perched atop the hierarchy with a dotted line connecting it to the governing board, it would appear that the superintendent is king of the hill. But the reality is much different than the chart portrays. The power and knowledge content of the position is not what it appears to be by those looking on. For instance, during the implementation of the proficiency standards there was a great amount of teacher fear that the proficiency scores would be used to fire teachers. The superintendent remembered those discussions.

In the beginning there was a great amount of fear on the part of teachers. They were convinced that the proficiencies would be tied to their evaluations and that would be used to fire a teacher. I laugh because to fire a teacher takes a blessing from beyond. They think that I can be cavalier--that somehow I can sit in my office and just say "Zap!" They've got this Star Wars approach in their minds. It's a real difference in perception. The public too. They'll come in here and say, "I want this teacher fired!" And you think, "There's this thing called due process. . . ."

"The teacher's fears are more unrealistic. There probably never has been a teacher fired in this district due to low student achievement. It

just does not happen. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

Because individuals imbue the position with such power, those who try to influence decisions often resort to intimidation in order to press for their demands. Principals and the superintendent recalled several occasions when parents would go to the top to lodge their protest. They were often politically savvy and would go for the jugular vein every time. Threats and waves of rage were the weapons of choice. The superintendent recalled feeling that the parent complaint policy which was adopted as part of Senate Bill 813 seemed a bit ponderous for a parent who wanted to make a complaint. On second thought, he acknowledged that the procedure did keep the more impossible parents from jumping rank and causing havoc. It rationalized the process.

A partner to the illusion of power is the illusion that a superintendent has infinite knowledge of all things at all times. In discussing this recurring perception the superintendent offered the following example:

The notion that I have a grip on things is much more imagined than real. It's sort of like the Wizard of Oz. Yesterday I was at a skating rink. I took the afternoon off and I was with a group of four year old kids. A teacher was there and he says to me, "Well, I suppose you heard about the fight." He's going on and on. I knew nothing of what he was talking about. Not a word. So people have this impression that you have this

knowledge of every nook and cranny in the district. In reality nothing could be further from the truth. I think the reason they think that is that occasionally you do something at a critical point. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

The illusion that the superintendent had a lot of knowledge was based on the fact that he gathered a lot of information. During my interviews with him, there would always be a pile of dictation that his secretary had processed. The memos were to people at every level in the organization. He was either asking for or acknowledging information that he needed in order to make sense of things. He believed that this work habit sent a signal that he knew what was going on to a greater degree than was true. From the principals' and assistant superintendents' perspectives, his high visibility also led people to conclude that he had a high knowledge level. He was known to travel miles for a negotiating team dinner which didn't last as long as the travel time took. He was known for working extremely long days, longer than he should, many said, and just that work ethic presented an image of high knowledge level.

During the research there was never a question that he knew a great deal about the organization and the people in it. The preceding discussion addresses the hyper-belief that he knew everything. No one can, no one should.

### Using the Tools - Forging the Relationship

Building the leadership relationship is done with the skillful use of organizational tools at hand. The tools include the process of policymaking as well as the structural, human resources, symbolic/cultural, and political, aspects of the organization.

#### Policymaking

The policy-making process involving four components of Senate Bill 813 was significant in terms of core values, interaction of stakeholders, and reconstruction of preferences. The components were: (a) grade level expectancies, (b) proficiency testing, (c) mentor teacher program, and (d) the teacher evaluation system.

Grade Level Expectancies. Grade level expectancies were as basic a reform effort as one could get. The law declared that each district would formalize what was to be taught in each grade level. By doing so, the district could align the curriculum in a logical and systematic way which would guide the instructional efforts of teachers and mark the progress of students. The results of this reform would touch the life of every teacher and administrator in the district. Perhaps the far-reaching consequences of this component triggered the in-depth process of dialogue and debate surrounding the grade level expectancies. The assistant superintendent of instruction recalled:

Creating grade level expectancies was a very lengthy process. In every content area, using the state framework, our knowledge of California Assessment Program, of Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, proficiencies, texts and materials, we came up with grade level expectancies. . . . They went into place a year after I got here. During the process we went through three or four drafts of each one. Those drafts went back to administrative council every time. The council is made up of all the administrators in the district so that's one arena you get a lot of principals involved. The superintendent is there. . . . We have an opportunity to clarify, to even promote our philosophies on these things we are working on. This is again duplicated in the teacher representative group so we hear the dialogue and we're able to go around and keep our mission in front of them. (assistant superintendent, personal communication, May, 1990)

The gulf was miles wide between how the superintendent viewed the effort to define grade level expectancies and how others viewed the effort. While he felt the effort had great meaning, a teacher who was a mentor and worked on the expectancies had a different view.

I was on a summer committee as a mentor. Someone got math, someone got sciences. We compiled all these expectancies. I hated having my name on it. Administrators would use it as a check off as to when a teacher was teaching this or teaching that. The taskmasters took over.

It was an exercise in fulfilling a requirement. Everyone knew that the level of the kids determines the content for the year. [It was a joke] when the expectancies were passed out. Grade level meetings were exasperating. (teacher A, personal communication, February, 1994)

The superintendent was very deliberate in defining this process of shaping the expectancies. The time, energy and effort focused on this component of Senate Bill 813 was equal to the importance it held in the organizational vision. The superintendent recaptured the personal investment he had in this process:

We'd do draft after draft and we'd take them out to teachers and out to the schools and it went through revisions and revisions. I had them all color-coded--science was green. It was just hundreds and hundreds of sheets of paper--back and forth and around. I was very heavy in the process because we wanted buy-in. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

No matter how inclusive the process, one can never see into the hearts and minds of those who step forward to be involved. With something as central as what a teacher was going to teach, it could be expected that some personal agendas would find their way into the product. A principal, who at the time of implementation was a teacher, and who participated on the expectancy committee as a teacher commented:



What the district did was bring teachers together who had interests and theoretically some background in the content areas. I sat on one of those so I know how that committee operated. . . . If you had a pet thing it became a grade level expectancy. . . . I thought the process was O.K.; the outcome, however, I don't feel was a great piece of work. (teacher C, personal communication, May, 1990)

This observation would suggest that the process of determining grade level expectancies was marked by cynicism and self-serving behaviors on the part of the teacher participants. This backroom look at the process is glaringly different from the intention of Senate Bill 813 and the superintendent's view of the final outcome. He believed that grade level expectancies were created as a professional document which would serve students and teachers well. The letter of Senate Bill 813 was complied with, but the spirit of the reform was not manifested in this document. Perhaps this is an example of how laws and sausage are made.

Minimum Proficiencies. Measuring student competency is a cornerstone to the profession of educators. Public confidence in our ability to do so had become so eroded that Senate Bill 813 made it law to assess student proficiency at least once in grades 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12. In retrospect, the need for this mandate is a bit shameful; but an examination of the debate associated with the institution of minimum proficiencies may give some insight into the need to do so.

The declaration of proficiency standards was highly symbolic. Now there would be a publicly declared and reported benchmark of success or failure. The law said that minimum proficiency in reading, writing, and math was required for graduation from high school. This warranty of accomplishment triggered a chain reaction to the middle and elementary schools where the proficiency became an early warning system for students who were in danger of not fulfilling minimum proficiency for high school graduation. The debate was sidetracked over this notion of minimum competency rather than staying on track and declaring what we believed students should have been able to do. So intimidating was the notion of public disclosure that many districts took the known road by converting norm referenced testing already in place into proficiency testing standards.

The superintendent verified the tentativeness of the initial effort. Committees made recommendations which were less than what he would consider grade level equivalency. Teachers were reporting that 95-96% of the students were meeting the minimal proficiency standards. Over the years the standards were raised as the anxiety of failure was alleviated.

The teachers and at least one principal verified that the proficiencies were a bit of a mirage on the horizon. The interviews all emphasized the minimum aspect of the proficiencies. In the case of the fourth grade test, the student tasks were those expected of students in grade two. One teacher

expressed great concern over the false signals parents received if their student passed the proficiency:

This was so ridiculous. It was minimum all right. The test was designed for two grade levels below the grade level being tested. You would have most kids pass with five or six failing. None of us liked the minimum level. Parent notification was not an accurate read of a student's progress. It gave a false sense of achievement. (teacher A, personal communication, February, 1994)

One governing board member reported having some of the same reservations as the teacher quoted above.

My problem with the minimums is that the minimums become what everyone teaches to. In every district you already have teachers who are doing the minimum. The minimum focused some teachers who needed focusing, but inhibited others. (governing board member B, personal communication, February, 1994)

The proficiencies had a self-extinguishing quality to them that was counter to the intent of the legislation. Students who were judged to be nonproficient were to have a remediation plan provided by the teacher. The paper work was intense and meaningless. At most the teacher and administrator could put a check by the required remediation plan. Whether the plan translated into future student success on the proficiency was highly questionable (see Appendix D).

The Mentor Teacher Program. Right from the beginning the superintendent was inspired by and drawn to the potential of the mentor teacher program (see Appendix E). In this component of Senate Bill 813 he saw a genuine opportunity to honor good teaching, and staff development, provide assistance from teacher to teacher, and to develop a "quality circle" approach to instructional research and development. Little did he know how political the implementation of this program would be.

There were two major problems: Who could be mentors and what was their job going to be?

After the first year I had ten ideas and the teachers' organization had ten ideas. The overlap was maybe 20%. It was terrible. . . . I assigned the implementation process to an administrator who volunteered. He had a long political history in the district. I didn't perceive it at the time, but he had whipped the teachers' association a couple of times. There was an instant clash between the teacher's organization and the mentor program that didn't have to be there. I had to replace that person from the process and put someone else in because we weren't getting anywhere. I was very involved in it because I really wanted the mentor program in the district and it looked like we were not going to get it because we couldn't agree. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

The teachers' association president at the time viewed the dialogue and debate about the mentor program to be the time a real rupture occurred in the relationship between himself and the superintendent. For the first time in his relationship with the superintendent, he felt the superintendent could not relate to those who disagreed with him. Once the dialogue got to the point where neither he nor the superintendent could budge off their positions, the association president felt that he was banished from the inner circle. Where he had previously been invited in to assist with hard decisions, he was now excluded. Where he'd once felt a personal and professional connection to the superintendent, he now felt distant (teacher, personal communication, February, 1994).

Another teacher leader in the association also felt the implementation of the mentor teacher program splintered the relationship among and between teachers in the district, district level administrators, the association, and the superintendent.

The idea was met with great skepticism on the part of the association. From the district's point of view it started out as a way to address merit pay. The association felt administrators would manipulate the program rather than allow it to be an opportunity for teachers to help teachers. The selection process was scary. The superintendent was committed to the idea. There were tremendous snags. There were eleven positions and administrators wanted these filled in key areas which were not the

same as what the teachers wanted. We came to an agreement, but when the positions were finalized they were not the same as we'd agreed upon. I knew that it was probably an honest error because the superintendent was free of manipulation. He fixed the mistake and the program was implemented. (teacher, personal communication, February, 1994)

The dialogue with the teachers' association came to a head in the superintendent's office on Palm Sunday, 1984. The president of the association and the superintendent had an extended debate over what the mentor positions were going to be. The superintendent remembered being powerless to leverage his position with the association.

I learned some things about negotiations that year. The district wanted to do all these things about 813 but we had already set a salary. There's nothing to negotiate with. You don't have any chips. We settled with the general agreement that these things [813 components] will be discussed afterward. Well, that's fine if you are in a very rational decision-making process. But when you are bargaining all I had in my power was saying, "We want the mentor program. We want the mentor program." The association was basically saying, "Buzz off." It was a very emotional time for me because I felt that it was such an important program and that it was going to be a sham. I didn't want that to happen. (superintendent personal communication, December, 1989)

After the second or third year, the issue of what the mentor's jobs were to be remained a hot spot. Mentor assignments sometimes drifted into the realm of administrative responsibilities and were a continual source of friction. The superintendent got five or six challenges to mentor assignments a year. The superintendent finally told the association officers that he was not going to argue about it anymore. Whatever they set forth was fine. Filling potholes was just fine with him (superintendent personal communication, December, 1989). After that, the problem went away, partly because the district had 40 mentor positions by that time; basically all the jobs which needed to be done were being done.

The assistant superintendent of instruction remembered her error in utilizing mentors (see Appendix F).

When I came to the district, the mentor program was off the ground. There was a coordinator in charge of it. I got burned by making some assumptions that I had no business making. I assumed that the mentors would be working and collaborating with the curriculum department and they would be willing to support and work on the district's mission and adoption cycles. Did I make an error! The first time I asked them to do something I was called in by the union president and the negotiators, and they told me I had no jurisdiction over the mentors, and I could not ask them to do anything. That was quite a surprise. It really took a lot of wind out of my sails. But never say die. I figured there were many

great teachers, some who were not mentors. So I developed a cadre of nonmentor teachers to help out in certain areas. . . . The adversarial perception of administrator versus mentor abated quite a bit. It just kind of mellowed down because I just stopped requesting anything from them. I really applaud the teacher-to-teacher support system. It took two years but [the mentors] started asking [to be involved] which was wonderful. (assistant superintendent, personal communication, May, 1990)

The battle to define what the mentors would do was equaled in ferocity to the fight over who could be a mentor. The debate over "who" was not as clear cut as the debate over "what." The what debate fell out along management/labor lines in that it was pretty predictable what management felt was appropriate and what labor felt was appropriate. The who debate cut across labor and management lines in that there were bargaining unit members who had views about who should be eligible that were similar to those held by managers.

The association's position was that only full-time classroom teachers would be eligible for mentor consideration. The bargaining unit included members who were not classroom teachers: resource teachers, counselors, teachers on special assignment, and librarians. They could not be mentors from the association's point of view. In addition, some bargaining unit members were participating in the administrative intern program. The



district's position was that all bargaining unit members should be eligible to apply for a mentorship. In the end, only bargaining unit members who were regular classroom teachers the year preceding the year of application could apply.

This caused a great amount of bitterness among some bargaining unit members. Some withdrew from the association membership in protest over the inequitable representation. Administrative interns became highly visible in the debate and exacerbated the uneasy feelings of some that teachers couldn't be teachers and be aspiring administrators at the same time. The exclusion of certain bargaining unit members from the mentor program is still in effect as of this writing.

The division between labor and management or anyone suspected of management aspirations was apparent in interviews with the superintendent and teacher leaders. The superintendent recalled:

We had a tremendous struggle over the administrative interns because they wanted to be mentors. They were in the classroom. One association leader sent me a letter saying, "What are you going to do to keep the best teachers from becoming administrators?" [My response was] "What is this? Do you want the worst teachers to become administrators?" Of course we want the best teachers to become administrators. If you want an instructional leader, you should be picking the very, very finest teachers. (superintendent personal communication, December, 1989)

A principal who was an administrative intern at the time of the inception of the mentor teacher program recalled:

The union is just their own special interest group, not looking out for everybody, and as interns, that is what we felt. We pay our dues so you are representing us too. I don't think they were doing what was good for everybody. . . . They were real busy setting up rules instead of guidelines. (principal A, personal communication, May, 1990)

The first round of selections of mentors reflected the ambivalence teachers felt about the program. Initially there were not enough applicants to fill the positions. This happened a couple of times before an association leader took it upon herself to promote the mentor program. She had initially opposed the program but, after many dialogues with the superintendent, had a change of heart (teacher C, personal communication, February, 1994). Although she remained a staunch association member, she did spread the word. The superintendent also recruited candidates. In a curious turn of events, one of the individuals he recruited became an association official because of the injustice the teacher felt was being meted out to mentor teachers.

In this district, the mentor teacher program became a part of the teacher contract. Not all districts codified the program in the contract. This is evidence of the strong teachers' association commitment in this district to

keeping the program safe from administrators who would have teachers do their bidding (see Appendix G).

Senate Bill 813 provided stipend funds for those serving as mentors. One of the initial debates in many districts was whether this stipend was to be given in acknowledgment of exemplary work or if it was given in exchange for additional services. One would think that the bargaining unit officials would want to protect their members from having to increase their work load and therefore the stipend would be given in acknowledgment of exemplary service.

But the bugaboo of merit pay stopped the idea dead in its tracks. In an ironic twist to the implementation of the mentor teacher program, the association insisted that the stipend be paid for extra work, not just for being a mentor. This "extra work for extra pay" approach assured the association officials that the mentor program was not a merit pay program. This was incredibly important to the association and 200 hundred additional hours of service was the exchange for the stipend. The irony, of course, is that management usually took the position that more money meant more duties. The mentor program was an opportunity for the organization to acknowledge that there were differences among teachers and some were better than others. The extra work for extra pay approach sustained the belief that all teachers were equal in quality of service . The superintendent viewed the mentor teaching program as the most political of all the components of 813.

I've learned very painfully that I shouldn't be so enthusiastic about things because the teachers know that if I really want something that there is something they can bargain very high for. I came on way too strong. . . . It was very clear from everyone's point of view that I wanted this to happen. While that may have created some resistance, the teachers used it as a more global negotiating tool. So the question is "What are we going to give them?" After you close negotiations, there isn't anything left to give. So you are really at their mercy. I was angry. I said to the leader, "This is never going to happen to me again where you convince me that you are going to negotiate in good faith after we close negotiations. There will be no salary increases until we get all these things in place." (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

Teacher Evaluation System. "Calm yourself, calm yourself. No, we aren't out to get you. Yes, we do love you" (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990). The superintendent summed up the emotional content of the teacher evaluation system in this brief sentence. The teacher evaluation component of Senate Bill 813 rivaled the mentor program in terms of latent hostility and entrenched beliefs being dragged into the arena of change.

The issues were no less central than who controls the content, process, and outcome of the educational endeavor. The superintendent viewed this

component as so critical that he wrote the policy, regulation, procedure and evaluation instrument himself (see Appendices H and I). The evaluation system which he created was the center of debate and dialogue for a good six months and took close to three years to negotiate. The brouhaha which accompanied this change process illustrates the point that it is not the destination but the journey that counts. At the end of it all, the first draft of the evaluation documented submitted by the superintendent emerged as a final draft with perhaps ten words changed. The high involvement of the superintendent profoundly affected the dialogue.

I went out to one staff meeting and they just blasted me. I was chewed alive. . . . I was right up front. They asked, "Well, where did you get this from?" I said, "I wrote it." That slows down the person real quick. They sort of need a different tack after that question is asked. Most of them, even if they will attack you philosophically are not going to attack you personally. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

The teacher evaluation document went through several drafts. A principal who was on the evaluation committee as well as the negotiating team remembered the debate over "ensure" and "encourage" to describe the teacher's responsibility in instructing students. The district gave in on these issues and got its way on others. She recalled that the association leaders were somewhat volatile at times during the dialogue (principal B, personal communication, February, 1994).

Perhaps the volatility from the association officials could be traced back to the teacher perception that evaluation is inherently subjective and any attempt to standardize it would be futile.

The inconsistency among administrators resulted in teachers feeling that they were not treated fairly. There were heated discussions about a teacher who worked for a conservative principal with tough standards. The teacher then transferred [to another school] and the principal there indiscriminately sprinkled everyone with "above standards." (teacher C, personal communication, February, 1994)

What the evaluation symbolized to teachers was described by the superintendent:

I had two or three staffs that were in revolt because they thought it was unprofessional that we would even consider looking at them. . . . The biggest argument was over the sorting out of the system. Initially there was an "above expectation," "within expectation," and a "below expectation" category. The biggest argument was that there shouldn't be an above expectation category. . . . So then we used the word "average." Big problem. No one wanted to be average. The better teachers were telling me they did want an above expectation category. They wanted some way to get recognition and the old form didn't have a way. So we changed the terminology to "above, within, and below standards." There was a lot of discussion about it and it raised everybody's awareness. . . .

The first year the principals were very nervous because I told them that most of their teachers were going to fall into the within standards category. No fair giving all above standards. We had lots of discussions at administrative council about the difference between above and within. No problem with below. The principals found out that I had read the evaluations over the summer and had given them individual feedback on whether they were within the boundaries we established, that caused a small stir, too. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

The teachers' association reaction to the document was adamant regarding the deletion of the above standards designation. The superintendent's response to that was that there were many good teachers who needed to be acknowledged for their work. He provided the association with an analysis of the evaluation results after the first year. He read 350 evaluations that first summer. He shared the data with the association's officials.

At that point I could argue them down on anything. Thirty-five percent of the teachers had received an "above standards" rating. They sort of gave up because they knew I had the data. After the first year some who feared the system were relieved and some happy. Then after the second year the other half of the district was evaluated. That just sort of diluted the discussion. (superintendent, personal communication, May, 1990)

Teachers were not the only group exhibiting anxiety and resistance to this change. Experienced principals were now required to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction using clinical supervision. The superintendent recognized that this change had training implications. Senate Bill 813 required that the superintendent attest that certificated managers were qualified to evaluate teachers using the clinical supervision model. A principal reported this part of the implementation "was not a big deal." This superintendent observed each principal in a conference with a teacher, provided feedback to the principal and then sent the certification to the board.

The interrelated nature of the components of Senate Bill 813 is illustrated by the coalescing of issues surrounding grade level expectancies, proficiencies, and mentor teacher program in the debate on teacher evaluation. All those interviewed acknowledged that there was significant concern on the part of teacher association officials that fulfilling the grade level expectancies and the results of proficiencies would be used in the evaluation of teachers. In addition, there was insistence on the part of the association that mentors be clearly set apart from any activities associated with evaluating teachers. As evidence of the dialogue, the teacher contract language relative to evaluation states that the result of district testing programs should not be a part of a teacher's evaluation. In addition, mentor



program language explicitly stated that mentor teachers were prohibited from engaging in evaluation activities.

### Looking Through the Windows

Through interviews, observations and review of documents, the organizational mechanisms which promote and inhibit the leadership relationship were identified. The four organizational mechanisms are: (a) the organization structures such as meetings, routines, school improvement plans, and procedures such as test score analysis, (b) human resources such as quality of interactions within the organization, (c) the symbolic content of the organizational culture such as ceremonies and ritual, and (d) the political content of the organization such as competition for resources and the presence of pressure groups.

Structures. The loosely coupled nature of the school district was described by the superintendent as "marbles in a bag." The organizational calendar of the district was riddled with meetings of diverse committees and advisory bodies. Weekly meetings of the cabinet brought the superintendent and the assistant superintendents together; monthly meetings of the executive committee were an extended cabinet of sorts, expanding to include the director of special education and principal representatives; twice monthly meetings of area directors included the principals of the four middle schools, the assistant superintendent of instruction, and the superintendent; the twice monthly meeting of the administrative council brought all certificated

administrators together; a monthly citizen's advisory council brought parent leaders together with the superintendent; the monthly meeting of the teacher advisory council gathered two representatives from every school to meet with the superintendent. In addition to these regularly scheduled meetings, the superintendent met with each classified job family once a year as well as with the classified managers at least twice per month.

The superintendent went to the people as well as bringing the people to him. He scheduled lunch every Friday at a different work site. He also visited every classroom in the district once a year and sent each teacher a note after the visit. In commenting on the extensive groups with whom he met and the tradition of being highly visible on the school sites, the superintendent was quick to connect these structures with the leadership task of building a vision:

I visit all the schools and I do classroom observations in all of the schools. When you are watching a kindergarten teacher working with 18 students who speak not a word of English, it's hard not to be aware of what the agenda has to be. You look at the suspensions coming across my desk every day for violent behavior, and you listen to the principals talking about a third grader they don't know what to do with. . . . The agenda becomes clear. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

Using Senate Bill 813, the superintendent introduced another structure to the district which helped focus the available energies and resources.

The school improvement plans (SIP) were an outgrowth of 813. The schools had done a preliminary plan even before that. But it wasn't nearly as structured. Right now it's very structured and very methodical and there's a big emphasis on progress. Back in those days it was usually put together by some willing teacher and the principal. There wasn't much buy-in. At this point staff buy-in is absolutely essential. Most of the 13 components have subcommittees of parents and teachers. It's a big commitment of time and energy on the part of staff and the principal, but I feel it builds collaboration. And when we compiled these reports [one from each school] you get some kind of sense of where we are going as a district and what we should be doing. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

Board meetings were held twice a month. The first monthly meeting was held at 7:30 p.m. and the second monthly meeting was held at 4:30 p.m.. Children performed and teachers presented curriculum information on a regular basis. If there were comments during the public comment section of the meeting, the superintendent sent a follow-up letter to the individuals responding to their comments. If the board made a particularly difficult decision which supported the administrative recommendation, he sent a letter to each thanking them for supporting the administrative

recommendation and acknowledging how hard it was to make tough decisions.

The superintendent evaluated principals on an annual basis, with a formal mid-year conference with each administrator. He also reviewed all teacher evaluations and sent each principal comments on their evaluations. The principal evaluation conferences were described by the two principal informants as valid and meaningful in that they contained information which evidenced the superintendent's practical knowledge of the principals' abilities and successes.

During the implementation of Senate Bill 813, the superintendent had the opportunity to expand his central administrative staff by one position. Although there were many needs, he designated this position as that of an evaluator. This decision set up an extensive array of structures directly related to measuring and reporting student progress. The office of evaluation worked closely with principals in setting performance goals. The superintendent viewed the evaluation data as significantly important to his task of monitoring the level of student progress. The complex demographics of the district--high mobility rates, disparate socioeconomic levels, growing numbers of limited-English speaking students--required the disaggregating of data. This allowed for the application of differentiated standards based upon the school site demographics. A principal observed:

The superintendent analyses the scores with the evaluator. The principal is responsible for responding back with a written plan about how to address the deficits. How are you going to work with your staff? What strategies are you going to use? Test scores don't just come in and die here. (principal, personal communication, May, 1990)

Human Resources. The highly developed committee/council model of organizational structure in this district is reflective of the superintendent's genuine and passionate belief in the dignity and worth of individuals. These were not superficial, decorative appendages. The individuals involved in these committees and councils provided knowledge and momentum at every stage of the implementation process. That is not to say that the momentum caused a linear movement forward. It was at times chaotic and frustrating for all involved. However, the point is that the energy was not circular and truncated; it was multidirectional and continuous.

In his own personal analysis of his interaction with people, the superintendent drew the conclusion that he worked very hard on the affective aspect of his personality. In addition, "I do not see myself as competitive, although close family members do. If I am competitive, it's competitive with myself" (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990).

In commenting on the need for people in his organization to know what he was thinking and feeling, the superintendent mused:

They want to hear from me. What can they do? What can't they do? What's the next step? . . . I think part of it is because they want to do things right, but they're also always checking on where I am in my perceptions of things. Sometimes this works to my advantage and sometimes it doesn't. But one's personality, the role of superintendent, and one's drives all get tangled up. . . . I don't know that I can very easily separate those in a given issue. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990)

During this study, it became apparent that the superintendent had an incredible knack of personalizing his interactions with those in his organization. Numerous comments were made by interviews about his ability to remember what was of particular interest to individuals. He wrote notes, sent articles, and inquired on a frequent basis in response to individual interests and circumstances. His recall of names and family situations was legendary.

The superintendent was able to transcend his own rightful sense of being wronged by individuals in the organization in order to respond humanely and wisely. An incident occurred where a staff member made public statements which were false and which reflected negatively on the superintendent. The superintendent chose to set the record straight with the individual and sent a letter to him putting his own perspective forward. The staff member responded with great hostility, claiming that his

professionalism had been attacked. The superintendent was mystified. He reread his letter and determined that the staff member was way off base. Rather than attack or ignore, the superintendent picked up the phone and had a conversation with the individual. It ended with the staff member thanking him for calling. All was well.

A second situation involved a husband and wife in the district who were vociferous critics of the superintendent. They mounted campaigns to resist many of the superintendent's implementation efforts. They lost their son in a tragic accident. The superintendent reached out to them with a phone call. All parties drew mutual support from each other (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990).

Those interviewed, with one exception, had a highly developed sense that the superintendent appreciated them. They discerned his appreciation from his accessibility and response to their ideas and concerns.

Listening to the Symbols. Symbols are contained in the rituals, myths and heroes of an organization. Symbols make the culture of the organization known to follower and leader alike. The beliefs and faith of the participants are embodied in the symbolic content of the organization. The symbolic content in the district was found in several structures and processes.

The superintendent injected his belief in the worth of individuals by opening his door to all who would knock. This is both a literal and figurative observation. His accessibility drew mixed reactions from those with whom I

spoke. Some felt it was the mark of a philosophical position which promoted an exchange of ideas. Others felt it allowed too many special interest groups to impact and strangle the organization.

His high interaction with staff and community was symbolized in stacks and stacks of phone messages which were neatly stored in his office. No one could remember being denied an audience with him. Some indicated that people got to him too quickly in the process, thus not allowing others in the organization to do their job. Others reported that his accessibility was what kept the process of change moving forward because it provided a safety valve for frustration and anger. Several people observed that as the implementation of Senate Bill 813 was in progress, administrative errors which were made in the mentor teacher program and evaluation system were taken directly to the superintendent. He informed the administrators to adhere to the letter and the spirit of agreements made with the teacher association. From the teacher association perspective, this was perceived as an exceptional act for a superintendent and accentuated what they believed to be his commitment to including teachers in a meaningful way.

Another superintendent behavior which was high in symbolic content was his willingness to place himself on the firing line. During the creation of and debate about the mentor teacher program and the teacher evaluation procedure, the superintendent did not take cover behind his position. He did not send his first lieutenants out into the battle. He went to the school sites



himself and took the heat. He talked to anyone who would listen to him about the vision that the policies represented.

The symbolic content of power and authority certainly comes into play in the culture of a school district. The notion of control is born out of the traditional hierarchy of bureaucratic design. As was mentioned in the review of the literature, stakeholders at one time or another use the bureaucracy to shroud their particular sacred cow from harm. However, most of the time the bureaucratic structure symbolizes a top down, authoritarian approach to running the organization. No matter how non-bureaucratic a superintendent may try to be, the structure will always symbolize a culture which keeps many stakeholders in abeyance.

Humanizing the bureaucratic structure is possible through hard work and the smart use of ritual and ceremony. The superintendent instituted an awards pin ceremony to honor members of the organizations.

It's not like you are dealing with a bunch of army men. You're dealing with a group of people who pride themselves on being sensitive, all-caring, and nurturing. So, you need to play a role. . . I've taught myself to do that. In the beginning I was very uncomfortable with that. But, I can do it with the best of them now. . . . At the first meeting we were giving out award pins. If the recipient was someone I knew really well, I hugged them. If it was someone I didn't know very well, I gave them their pin and shook their hand. . . . Well, the board members said

afterwards, "What are you doing? How come you're hugging?" I said, "If I know the person, I hug them." The board said, "You either do it one way or the other". . . .I said, "Okay, no hugging." (superintendent, personal communication, April 1990)

So, one never knows where the ritual and symbols begin and end for those observing. The ceremony itself went on to be a symbol honoring service to the district. The hugging behavior did not.

Who Got What, When and How? A discussion of the political content of the organization has its roots in the 1960s and 1970s. School board members, superintendents, and teachers with enough longevity can remember the attempts at equalization through Serrano-Priest and the devastating effects starting in 1978 of Proposition 13. Influence, the fuel of politics, is directly impacted by the control of resources. The authority to raise revenue and distribute those revenues is powerful stuff. The effect on local school boards of sending the money north to Sacramento was devastating. It was devastating both in the real sense that it became an impossible struggle to impact the amorphous political scene at the state level, as well as in the symbolic sense that local control had an exceedingly hollow ring. The superintendent was particularly sensitive to this issue.

When I talk about the effect of Proposition 13, many people get upset with me. I don't talk about Proposition 13 in the sense that it didn't do good things for the taxpayers. I'm talking about the shift of authority out

of the local setting to the state and the fact that we were tied to the state with all these constraints. . . . The local dollars were going north. The game is very different. And 813 was the "getting used to the game."  
(superintendent, personal communication, December 1989)

In a way, Senate Bill 813 was another assault on the notion of local control. The legislation required the codification of central symbols in the field of education: the measuring of student success, teacher performance standards, accountability to the public, what is taught in the classroom, the right of the public to challenge instructional materials, the acknowledgment that teachers have a legitimate role to play in the organization. While the topics and the requirements to formalize these topics into policies and procedures were dictated from Sacramento, local policymakers were charged with putting them into effect in the local school districts.

The financial reform movement in California neutralized local power to raise revenue while the education reform movement of the 1980s increased local responsibility for accountability. Concurrent with this call for accountability was a rise in the special interest groups asserting their rights to influence local governing boards. The superintendent described the double-bind of being responsible for results with too few resources while so many special interest groups were vying for those resources.

You would like to think that the greatest needs in the California education system would be addressed each year. I don't think it is

difficult to perceive what those needs are. Right now the changing demographics would dictate some changes in the state funding with the recognition that we are getting tons of kids who don't speak English. I think that most of us could come to agreement in a hurry on this. And yet, that is not how it's funded because that particular block of people in our society doesn't have a vote and doesn't have the influence so you don't get the money where the needs are. . . . The reality is that the pressure groups are the ones that cause things to happen. . . . When the pressure is on, you want to remove the irritant. (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989)

Both governing board members who I interviewed concurred with this observation. Boards and superintendents are rarely dealing with the majority. They deal with the minority who is angry about something at the moment. More and more pressure groups seem to coalesce around religious beliefs or single issues. The religious beliefs come into play during discussions of textbooks, course descriptions, and content, such as sex education, and the rightful place of parental influence over that of the secular schools. Single issue arousal could be year round education, boundary adjustments, or bell schedules. It is interesting to note that there was virtually no parent arousal relative to the implementation of Senate Bill 813. This could be attributed to the technical nature of the components of

Senate Bill 813 as well as the distance these components seemed to have had from the day-to-day lives of parents and students.

The political content of Senate Bill 813 included the competition for financial resources. The teachers' association was acutely aware that if money was allocated to the mentor teacher program that money was not available for salaries. Even though the money was allocated at the state level, conceptually it was money which could have been given in cost of living adjustments (COLA). In times of scarcity, programs which are guaranteed a funding source can become the target of resentment. This was the case with the mentor teacher program, as reported by the teachers who were interviewed. Although the questions of who could be a mentor and what they could do as a mentor had been settled through the collective bargaining process, teachers and principals report that there is still some hostility toward teachers who are getting the stipend while other teachers have gone without a significant pay increase for the last four years.

The negotiations involved in bringing about Senate Bill 813 were emotionally charged from the beginning. Too many core values were on the line for the teachers' association and the district for the implementation to be rational and linear. An active teachers' association member recalled the discussions "hitting the wall" when it appeared that association officials and the superintendent would not be able to see eye to eye on the mentor teacher program and the teacher evaluation system. The teacher described the

relationship as one where the superintendent was not able or willing to confront the issues at hand. The teacher association officials, on the other hand, were poised to confront the issues. The teacher association president felt that the superintendent just walked away from the interaction by saying, "Whatever you want, you can have." From the association president's perspective, this failure to meet the issues straight on seems to be the genesis of the perception that the relationship between the district and the association was adversarial (teacher B, personal communication, February, 1994).

The superintendent's view of the situation was similar in that he felt taken by the association. By his account, he had entered into the political process with an openness that ultimately worked against him. He put his emotional and resource cards on the table right from the beginning. His acute interest in the evaluation procedure, the mentor teacher program, the grade level expectancies and proficiencies all made him vulnerable to pressure from the association. If he wanted reform in these areas so badly, he was going to have to pay for that reform. As he said, "Sometimes it doesn't suit your interests to have all your cards on the table the first round" (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990).

Money is the best known of resources in the political arena, but the resources of time and attention should not be overlooked in the discussion of change in a school organization. The superintendent observed:

The struggle for time is a real issue. I think that most people are giving as much time as they can give, so anything new means giving up something old. Everybody is feeling maxed out. So when new curriculum content is introduced, teachers are getting very good at asking, "What are we giving up?" That's a very legitimate question. (superintendent, personal communication, April, 1990).

The competition for time and attention was escalated by the superintendent with his personal involvement in the creation of the mentor teacher program and the teacher evaluation system. The superintendent could have just let these implementation efforts run their course, but he knew his influence was meaningful. If he put time and attention to these two things, that would signal his commitment. He promoted the value of the mentor teacher program by singing the praises of teachers who provided service which was exemplary. He parlayed the value of rewarding teachers for a job well done. He spoke directly to administrative interns and told them they should have the right to be mentor teachers, that they should become active in the association business. When the debate over the terminology in the evaluation document took a turn for what he believed to be mediocrity, he framed the issue by again praising teachers and asking key teachers if they wanted an "above standard" category. By reading every teacher evaluation and having the data ready to refute the objections of the

association, his time and attention mattered in the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

### Leadership Tasks and Behaviors

On the whole, leadership relationships are entered into by individuals who have never spent much time thinking about leadership much less participating in formal education which addresses the phenomenon. Although the participants' views may seem unsophisticated or incomplete to those who study leadership, those views are important to the study of leadership because those views include background assumptions and expectations which accompany the participants into the leadership relationship. The superintendent and interviewees were asked to give their descriptions of leadership tasks and behaviors.

Leadership Tasks. The superintendent was asked what he believed to be the most important leadership tasks of the superintendent. He responded: "speaking on behalf of all kids, solving problems, mediating conflict, communicating to show the connections, and having a vision" (superintendent, personal communication, January, 1994).

Members of the organization were asked to describe the leadership tasks of a superintendent. I list the description of these tasks by the role a given key informant filled at the time of the implementation of Senate Bill 813. I think it is important to see the leadership role from the eyes of those most likely to be followers and leaders at any given time. The question asked was,



"What would you say are the five leadership tasks of a superintendent?"

These are a sample of the responses:

From a teacher:

Delegating to able personnel.

Following through.

Establishing tone and morale that facilitate a positive feeling.

Being a positive link between the governing board and teachers.

Being an "open receiver" and "effective deliverer." (teacher C, personal communication, February, 1994)

From a principal:

Instructional leader.

Personal power which commands a sense of followership, if not a sense of joining.

Inspires team spirit.

Makes the district a good place to work for employees.

Presents a good image with the community at large and within the business community. (principal B, personal communication,

February, 1994)

From a governing board member:

Knowledge of the educational organization.

Accomplishing the task at hand.

Planning.

Accounting for what you are doing. (governing board member A, personal communication, February, 1994)

When asked if the subject superintendent embraced those tasks, the answer was "yes" on the part of the interviewees listed above.

Leadership Behaviors. These interviewees were asked to respond to the question: "What behaviors on his part would you characterize as leadership behaviors?"

From a teacher:

He included the input we gave him in the policies.

High energy level.

He was a balanced person.

He never got uptight.

He cared about me as a person.

He was able to do a lot in a short amount of time. (teacher C, personal communication, February, 1994)

From a principal:

He talked instruction.

He didn't get too far away from being a principal and a teacher.

He would spend hours speaking with an individual.

He did not delegate complaints. (principal B, personal communication, February, 1994)

From a governing board member:

He was a tireless worker.

He had a drive beyond belief.

He was always thinking, always planning, always taking notes.

He was on a quest for excellence.

He worked with the board to focus us and bring us together; not necessarily on his ideas, but alternatives.

He helped us work as a team. (governing board member A,  
personal communication, February, 1994)

One key informant who held a leadership role in the teachers' association had a different perspective on the superintendent. Although he basically agreed with all the descriptions listed above, when asked if he thought the superintendent was a leader, he said no. He felt that the superintendent's intense drive to please everyone and to pursue consensus impeded his ability to exert leadership (teacher B, personal communication, February, 1994).

All key informants made reference to this dominant characteristic--the drive for consensus--but they did not make the observation that because of it, the superintendent was not a leader. On the contrary, these key informants affirmed his leadership behavior. They made comments such as, "He must have been exhausted trying to meet all the needs of all people;" "he had to spend an inordinate amount of time finding common ground on many issues;" "he was too nice and they kept coming back for more;" "he may have

forgotten who the bosses were [the governing board]." The picture drawn was of an individual who was taken advantage of because of his availability and empathy.

The activity associated with implementing Senate Bill 813 had a pulse of its own. The rate and rhythm of that pulse had a lot to do with how the superintendent initiated change. A principal, an assistant superintendent, and a board member gave their impressions.

He starts small, gets a core group supporting it and then hopes it spreads. . . . Some people get involved because it sounds great and they really want it to happen. [He keeps it a choice whether you join or not.] Eventually you are the last dog to hang and, "Hey, join the group!" The standard is here. . . . He always says he doesn't have a plan in mind. But he always has a plan in mind. . . . He leads by people wanting to follow. (principal A, personal communication, May, 1990)

He is just so unique. This is a man who sits across the table and. . . no matter what arena we are in, he gives the impression that everyone's opinion is equal. I mean all of your opinions. . . . Also, there is a feeling that you will not be penalized for your thinking if it's different than his. . . . It's like, "let us sit and reason together." I have never seen him where he just really "needed to be the boss." (assistant superintendent, personal communication, May 1990)

He would start discussing the change and his intent. He would call attention to how it would help our district. Even if you were against it, you would want what was in it for us. . . . He taught us how to compromise. He'd say, "Let's be big enough to go on." He could also sense how people felt about things. He'd try to remove roadblocks by repackaging the idea. (governing board member A, personal communication, February, 1994)

The rudiments of a leadership relationship were present in the behaviors and tasks as identified above by the participants in this study. These rudiments of a leadership relationship took many forms. All key informants felt that the superintendent valued their opinions and that frequently those opinions were reflected in his own thinking in the form of policies and procedures. They recounted specific ways that he responded to them such as returning phone calls promptly, seeking them out for key committee assignments, and soliciting their advice and support with their constituency groups. One principal commented that he had helped her "find her own voice" (principal B, personal communication, February, 1994).

In their singularity, these behaviors might be the mark of good management. However, there is evidence that these behaviors and the leadership tasks these behaviors addressed (i. e., speaking on behalf of all kids, solving problems, mediating conflicts, communicating to show the connections and having a vision) combined to produce a leadership

relationship. The superintendent's drive for consensus pointed to mutual purposes; his bias towards inclusion of many individuals drew in the context of community; the debate and dialogue gave rise to the use of influence as a key determiner of the outcomes associated with Senate Bill 813. The degree to which the leadership relationship was present is discussed in Chapter Five.

## CHAPTER V

### LEADING AND FOLLOWING:

#### PUTTING THE CALIFORNIA REFORM MOVEMENT TO WORK

The interactions and reactions of leaders and followers produce the emotional and intellectual fuel for the change process. In the educational arena, change is often described as "reform." In this study, the behaviors of the superintendent and his interactions with stakeholders during the implementation of Senate Bill 813 in California beginning in 1984 have been identified and analyzed in an attempt to understand the leadership relationships during this one change effort in one school district.

Through the use of interviews, observations, and a review of district documents, the following objectives have been addressed:

1. To delineate and investigate the superintendent's leadership behaviors which produced changes as Senate Bill 813 was implemented.
2. To describe the interactions of the superintendent and followers in the relationships established in response to Senate Bill 813. In particular, the study focuses on interactive processes such as how crisis and conflict came

into play, how debate and dialogue were manifested, and the presence or absence of moral/ethical considerations.

3. To analyze actions and interactions to determine whether or not the superintendent embraced a leadership relationship in implementing Senate Bill 813.

The first objective is addressed in the three sections on leadership behaviors. The second objective is addressed in the section entitled "Action." The third objective is addressed in the section entitled "The Leadership Relationship: Was It Present?"

### Leadership Behaviors

#### From the Perspective of Those Who Follow

Leadership is often in the eye of the beholder. Those who have the power to voluntarily participate in the leadership relationship have a picture in their minds identifying what makes a person worthy of their time and attention. That picture is simultaneously vague and highly defined when described with words. For instance, the superintendent was described as "delegating to able personnel." This is a visible and measurable behavior. He was also described as "establishing tone and morale that facilitate a positive feeling." This is subjective and hard to measure. This pattern of a mix between doing certain things (i. e., accounting for what one is doing) and being a certain way (i. e., a positive link between the governing board and teachers) was exhibited in many conversations about the superintendent.



The key informants were very able to identify the leadership tasks of a superintendent. They were equally able to describe the specific behaviors which the superintendent exhibited which convinced most key informants that the superintendent had embraced those tasks. Many of these behaviors had to do with how he interacted with people. Common observations were: "His behaviors were respectful of others;" "he included our input;" "he never got uptight with us;" "he cared about me as a person;" "he spent hours speaking with an individual." Others typically observed: "He had the ability to get so many things done;" "he was able to do a lot in a short amount of time;" "he was a tireless worker;" "he had drive beyond belief;" "he was always thinking, planning, taking notes." Digging beneath the obvious, those who chose to follow also recognized leadership behaviors which were integral to the superintendent's philosophical base: "He talked instruction;" "he was on a quest for excellence;" "he did not delegate complaints;" "he didn't get too far away from being a principal and a teacher;" "he helped us work as a team." these behaviors on the part of the superintendent invited others to participate in the change effort. Thus, his behaviors gave rise to the possibility of a leadership relationship.

### Leadership Behaviors

#### From the Perspective of One Who Chose Not to Follow

One key informant who held an influential role in the organization concluded that the superintendent had not embraced leadership tasks. He

acknowledged that while many of the elements of leadership behavior were present, two specific behaviors on the part of the superintendent overshadowed all others in terms of the leadership relationship. The first distinct behavior occurred if the superintendent did not get what he wanted; then, according to this key informant, the relationship with those opposing him was over. The superintendent would just fold up his cards and steal away. The other distinct behavior noted was the superintendent's tendency to try to please everyone. His bias towards compromise and consensus weakened his leadership in this individual's mind because it invited special interest groups to exert pressure which spawned another compromise, and that went on ad nauseam.

It would seem that the two behaviors--a stubbornness to the point of rejecting the opposing point of view, and the drive to please everyone--are diametrically opposed. How could the two be present in the same individual? In some ways, the answer to this question is found in the reflections of the superintendent himself.

### Leadership Behaviors

#### From the Superintendent's Perspective

The superintendent identified five leadership tasks found in the superintendency: speaking on behalf of all kids, solving problems, mediating conflict, communicating to show the connections, and having a vision.

In the change effort associated with Senate Bill 813, the superintendent had an opportunity to perform all these tasks as the policy process and the organizational culture changed to accommodate the elements of Senate Bill 813.

### Speaking on Behalf of All Kids

The superintendent's dedication to the teacher evaluation system was one way he gave voice to his concern for all kids. The quality of the teacher in each classroom was an organizational value that directly related to caring about limited-English speaking, gifted and talented, special education, regular education, and at-risk students. The superintendent's ritual of visiting each classroom also emphasized his care for all kids. He was not an events superintendent who only appeared for a play, a recital, a basketball game or academic bowl. He was a grass-roots superintendent in the sense that he kept in touch with the changing demographics and the frustrations of principals and teachers.

### Solving Problems

As described by one principal, the superintendent was not a "Big Brother" type of boss. He knew people's strengths and weaknesses, but he didn't inject himself into the daily life of the site administrators. He was, however, available for support and suggestions. The superintendent did inject himself in the ebb and flow of district-teachers' association business, especially on issues associated with Senate Bill 813. He was present, either

in the flesh or spirit, at every stage of implementation. He solved problems by declaration, as in the case of a principal who cited standardized scores in a teacher evaluation; he solved problems by encouraging people to talk to each other, as in the case of the assistant superintendent and the use of mentors for district curriculum development efforts. He solved problems by encouraging people to be actively involved on behalf of their own interests, as in the case of the administrative interns who were being excluded from the mentor teacher programs.

### Mediating Conflict

Many observers described the superintendent as someone who helped them work as a team. This is not possible if conflict plagues the organization. The superintendent approached conflict mediation with great patience and tenacity. In the case of the governing board, during the last few years of his tenure, he was reduced to acting as a message carrier because communication among members had all but stopped. As low level as this task was, it did keep the governance of the district functioning. Without his willingness to do this, and without his ability to let go of his ego and control needs, the governing board could have been held hostage to their own dysfunction.

Certainly there was conflict present in the relationship between the superintendent and certain teachers' association officials. The superintendent met the conflict head on, privately engaging the opposition in

heated debate, encouraging teachers who were less hostile to get involved as association leaders to protect their interests, and taking the issue to the rank and file teachers at school sites. The superintendent did not like the hostility and aggression but knew that if his vision of the mentor teacher program and teacher evaluation were to be protected, he would have to step into the arena of controversy. Mediating conflict did not come at a cheap price. The superintendent earned enemies and lost allies. His high visibility on these emotionally charged issues made him a target. He knew this yet he consciously went forward time and time again.

#### Communicating to Show the Connections

All one had to do to see how the superintendent played this task out was to look at his calendar. He methodically decided what the agenda for the year was--what messages he wanted to put forward. He then participated in a grueling yet satisfying marathon of formal committee and council meetings, ceremonial community and school functions, "in the trenches" visitations, and unscheduled conversations with every facet of the educational community.

This conscious building of the agenda for the year provided an intellectual framework and an emotional budget which he could call on as he carried forth the message of change and excellence. In the early days of Senate Bill 813, the messages were so numerous and diverse that he picked his own messages very carefully. Unless a component of Senate Bill 813 was

going to get a big bang for the effort expended, he did not invest himself too heavily in it. One component which was very close to his heart was the mandatory professional growth requirement. The superintendent was an absolute believer in staff development. But the professional growth component was poorly written and had no teeth to its enforcement. The superintendent invested very lightly in its implementation in his district. The parent complaint policy, although high in philosophical content, got very little of his attention because it was a linear process which required enforcement but very little interpretation.

During the implementation of Senate Bill 813, the mentor teacher program was at the top of his message agenda. The superintendent spent political capital to show the connections between the mentor teacher program, quality of instruction, and the need to reward teachers for excellence. He took on the sacred cow of merit pay and the punitive attitude many teachers had toward their colleagues who aspired to be administrators. He showed the connection between excellent teaching and excellent administration when he responded to the complaint that he was trying to lure all the good teachers into administration. He said, "Of course, I want the best teachers to become administrators because I want instructional leaders as principals" (superintendent, personal communication, December, 1989).

If one is looking for who won the battle on mentors, it would appear that in terms of discrete qualities of the program, the teachers' association won. Administrative interns could not be mentors, a prohibition which the superintendent opposed; mentors must provide 200 hours of service for the mentor stipend, rather than receive the stipend for the excellent service they provided as classroom teachers, which was the approach the superintendent favored; teachers who serve as specialists, librarians, and resource teachers were not eligible for mentorships, a limitation the superintendent found to be rather narrow in terms of defining who a teacher was.

The process of implementation did result in a mentor teacher program which involved over forty mentor teachers. While mentors may experience a vestige of resentment from the old days, the mentor program is now quite integrated into the culture of the district. New teachers get the assistance of a mentor, curriculum committees have a degree of participation by mentors, and mentors are no longer seen as having one foot in teaching and one foot in administration. On a personal level, some of the teacher leaders who once were highly suspicious of the mentor teacher program became mentors themselves. So, after ten years the program has substantially reshaped itself in ways which do reflect the superintendent's vision while still honoring the initial vision of the teachers' association.

The teacher evaluation system required a great degree of blood, sweat, and tears on the part of the superintendent. Many teachers found it hard to

imagine codifying into a meaningful and objective process what had been a subjective and, from their point of view, an unfair and unproductive system. From the beginning, the notion was viewed by teachers with great suspicion. Yet, for the superintendent, few things were as important as the evaluation system. It formalized what the organization believed was acceptable in the teaching endeavor. In his view, describing acceptable teaching in an official manner was incredibly important to the organization..

He took personal command of this component. He wrote the policy himself. He took it forward to groups and individuals. He defended it himself. He not only had to convince the teachers' association, but he also had to convince his principals, as well. One of these audiences would have been hard enough, but both at the same time presented horrendous odds against success.

His high degree of involvement and availability allowed him to decrease the anxiety among his principals. Some were about to retire, as one principal noted, but many others were in the beginning or middle stage of their careers. The superintendent nursed them through the elements of the clinical supervision process, and provided coaching by actually observing them in post observation conferences with teachers. This came easily to this superintendent because, as noted by those interviewed, he was a man who knew and loved instruction at its most meaningful level, teacher to student. The time he spent with principals to define what effective teaching looked



like was an effort well spent. As reported by principals and by the superintendent, the discussions brought out in the open their puzzlements and the challenges present in the whole notion of evaluation. The effort the superintendent made to control "evaluation inflation" is a notable one in that educators tend to be so people oriented that applying strict standards can be fraught with anxiety and second-guessing.

The creation and implementation of the teacher evaluation system in the arena shared with the teachers' association was emotionally charged and laden with many of the traditional points of division between the district and the association. Evaluation is a subjective act; therefore no system can be fair because ultimately the quality is dependent upon the person doing the observing. Therefore, having an evaluation system that went beyond the simple criterion that the teacher "meets or does not meet expectations" was not acceptable. On the other hand, there were teachers who communicated to the superintendent that they wanted a system which separated out the less effective from the more effective teacher.

By personally creating the system and then taking it out to the troops, the superintendent seized and controlled the dialogue to a large degree. Having it in black and white took some of the uncertainty out of the process. With a decrease in uncertainty there was a decrease in anxiety for some and an increase in resistance from others. Some could look at the document and say, "Well, it isn't as bad as I thought it would be." Others could say, "See,

they are trying to make us all the same and take away our right to teach the way we want to." This is where the superintendent's going out to the people made a crucial difference in the implementation process. First, this was a man with "a relationship quotient with many teachers." These were his words. The fact that many teachers trusted him was a plus. Second, this was a man who was very rational. By reviewing all the evaluations and tabulating the results, he was able to fight myth with truth. The fear that teachers would be downgraded in their evaluations or that principals would play favorites was countered by the facts. There was no spiking of evaluation results either way. It took three years, but the teacher evaluation system gradually found its place in the culture of the school district.

### Having A Vision

In synthesizing the reflections of his superintendency, I discerned six core values which guided his actions and efforts during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. These core values emerged throughout the four interviews with the superintendent in 1989 and 1990.

1. Defining the content of instruction is essential to the mission of the district.
2. All students can learn and they will learn. Analysis of student progress both at the school site and at the district level is essential to the mission of the district.

3. The principal must be an instructional leader and work in concert with the school staff.

4. The evaluation of certificated and administrative staff is a meaningful and essential component of the mission of the district.

5. On-going professional development for instructional and administrative staff is essential to the instruction of children and therefore to the mission of the district.

6. The centralization of services, programs and activities is legitimate when it furthers the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction; site based decisionmaking also has a legitimate place and should be encouraged when appropriate.

The superintendent's vision relative to Senate Bill 813 included these core values. It was broad in scope and specific in execution. The scope of his vision included all children as worthy learners; it included the belief that the district and the teachers' association could work in cooperation, and, it included a respect for lay governing boards. Working with these inclusive attitudes, he created an environment and pursued programs which put these attitudes into action.

During the interviews he frequently referred to children who have no one to speak for them. He was speaking of limited-English speaking students and those who came from families with low socio-economic status. He recognized that gifted students and special education students often had

advocates locally and at the seats of both the state and the federal government. He became the advocate for those without political clout. He focused on building a district which acknowledged the needs of all children, and he took some political risks in his quest to serve them. Of note were his efforts to expand the English as a Second Language program by designating an ESL mentor teacher position.

The superintendent genuinely valued the efforts of teachers. His vision for teachers included continuous and rigorous professional growth. He sought out and encouraged those he felt were ready, willing, and able to stretch their abilities perhaps by becoming involved in curriculum development projects, or by becoming a mentor teacher, or by pursuing an administrative degree.

The predictable animosity which has marked labor-management relationships since the introduction of collective bargaining into the public school system had its heyday in this district. But this superintendent influenced the association in such a way that throughout his tenure the relationship cycled through hostility to mutual respect and benefit. This is not to say that the rank and file all came to the choir loft singing the same song; rather, it is to say that , to a great degree, the association leaders and the superintendent were able to sustain a dialogue which was both passionate and professional.

When he was appointed, the superintendent was clearly bonded with the governing board. There is something exceptional about the relationship between a superintendent and the governing board which hires the superintendent, especially if the decision is unanimous, as it was in this case. Based on the interviews, both the superintendent and the governing board were aware that he was hired to balance the style and actions of the previous superintendent. The lackadaisical, decentralized operation of the past was no longer adequate to meet the needs of a district on the verge of growth and burgeoning diversity. The governing board relied on the new superintendent's reputation as an ethical man who knew the ins and outs of curriculum to lead the district to excellence.

The superintendent's ability to guide the district through an explosive era, both demographically and politically, was in great part due to his loyalty to the vision he consciously crafted. He deliberately selected the messages he wanted to send to the organization on an annual basis. These messages resounded with his vision that the district would be successful with every child. He made sure the members of the organization knew that he was aware of what went on in the classrooms. The annual visitations did more to draw individuals to the vision than any other ritual in the district. He reinforced this vision on every level by reviewing teacher evaluations, by observing administrators as they held post observation conferences with teachers, and by being available to meet with individuals who had a gripe or

suggestion. His ability to talk about instruction in a way which reflected his expertise and excitement were also "commitment catchers" as he visited schools on a regular basis.

These leadership behaviors as identified by followers and the superintendent were easily discussed by those involved. In a similar way, the teachers' association president who chose not to enter into the leadership relationship also had a clear picture in mind of what he believed to be a lack of leadership on the part of the superintendent. From these observations, both by those in the relationship and by one who was not, it is clear that the individuals who were interviewed spent time reflecting on the nature of the organization, their place in it, and the places their colleagues and the superintendent occupied during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. One teacher who was interviewed ten years after the reform began volunteered that she still had the files from "those days" in her classroom, and every once in a while she would refer to them when an historical question came up about mentors or evaluations. Being able to recall so readily and to locate the feelings, actions, and artifacts of the reform effort after a decade had passed is one indication of how significant it was.

#### Action!

The policies, procedures, and rituals associated with the implementation of Senate Bill 813 were forged on an anvil of conflict, crisis, and, for the most part, mutual respect.

The superintendent, teachers, administrators, and governing board members were like film directors and talented actors in a production. They all had the power to bring a scene to life with the use of a well turned phrase or dramatic body language. The implementation of Senate Bill 813 was packed with the organizational parallels of car chases and shoot 'em ups. There were moments of angst and separation which never found restful reconciliation, internally or externally.

### Crisis and Conflict

Crisis and conflict were inherent in the four components of Senate Bill 813 which have been discussed in this study: grade level expectations, minimum proficiencies, the mentor teacher program, and the teacher evaluation system. Crisis and conflict came into play as stakeholders strove to have their interests reflected in the final decision or product which was created.

Crisis and conflict had a natural path to follow in the organization because the superintendent had installed structures which invited participation. It was not unusual in this district to talk about issues in many different forums. The density of the issues found in Senate Bill 813, however, did change the pace and tone of the participation. Participants were required to know their philosophical, legal, and practical agendas inside and out. Some components of Senate Bill 813, such as the mentor teacher program, drove the organization to terminate the dialogue and to get on with

the program in order to maintain eligibility for funding. Some components, such as teacher evaluation, gave the organization an opportunity to mold and shape the process and product over a prolonged period of time.

*Crisis* was dramatic and short-lived. There was the Palm Sunday massacre when the superintendent and the association officials engaged in a battle of wills and vision over the mentor teacher program. There was the moment when the superintendent told the principals that they had to justify giving superior marks on the teacher evaluations. There was the moment when administrative interns were written out of the eligibility pool for mentor teachers. All were significant turning points in the implementation of Senate Bill 813 because they ruptured relationships, sealed fates, or loosened the grip of strongly held assumptions. The organization would be a different place now that administrative control of mentor activities was diminished, as principals had to overtly indicate why they evaluated a teacher the way they did, now that administrative interns were disenfranchised, becoming neither fish nor fowl.

*Conflict*, on the other hand, became a chronic condition. Because the scope of Senate Bill 813 was so broad, there was a siege mentality present as the association circled the wagons to protect the rights of their members and the superintendent tried to seek out every moment of reform opportunity that Senate Bill 813 presented. The Model I, rational and linear approach used by the superintendent at the initial stage of implementation saved the



organization from either over or under responding. By dissecting and analyzing the legislation, he and his administrative staff were able to sift through the layers of mandates and weigh their relative merits and impact on the organization.

"What is worth the conflict and crisis which will be generated?" seem to determine which components of Senate Bill 813 received the greatest amount of attention. Indeed, the four components which ultimately received the lion's share of the superintendent's energies were those which furthered the mission and vision of the organization to the greatest degree. The superintendent's ability to sort through these layers, given his bent for thoroughness and accuracy, allowed him to husband his political, philosophical, and personal authority in order to bring them to bear on the Big Four.

A word should be said about those Senate Bill 813 components which did not make it into the arena of conflict and debate in this district. Some did not make it because their legitimacy was so painfully apparent. "Notification to parents of failing students" is an example. Others did not make it because those with the biggest stake in these issues did not have a clue as to what they meant or how to impact the system. "Complaints against school personnel" is an example. As the superintendent noted, this process is cumbersome and discouraging to the complainant. But during the implementation of Senate Bill 813, there was no natural constituency to

address this component. How do those who may have a complaint in the future identify themselves? The natural constituency in this case was the attorneys who wrote the education code and created sample policies to harness complaints in such a way that only the most enraged and persistent person can have access to the superintendent and the governing board. Ultimately the process serves the district and employees well because it requires full disclosure of the complaint to the employee and directs resolution between the parties at the lowest level of intervention. For a superintendent who tended to welcome all comers into his office, the policy protected him from being buried in whines and whims and conserved his authority for the big issues.

#### Debate and Dialogue

Debate and dialogue were present throughout the deliberation and implementation of Senate Bill 813. The recollections of the governing board members who were interviewed revealed that they were removed from the primary dialogue between the district administrators and the teachers' association officials. Neither governing board member interviewed recalled being contacted by teachers regarding any portion of Senate Bill 813. Both recall the passion the superintendent felt for the four components highlighted in this study. All components of Senate Bill 813 which were brought to the board in policy form received unanimous passage with little or no debate.

The dynamics of the debate flowed in and out of the traditional organizational chart. The superintendent took his perspective directly to the people. He went to staff meetings and answered questions. He took his hits from antagonistic people. He talked with people one-on-one and encouraged them to see how his vision met their needs. This was especially true when it came to mentors and teacher evaluation.

The association's position on both these issues was anchored in the labor notion that workers are all the same and should be treated the same. Therefore, being a mentor teacher was suspect. Receiving an evaluation which rated your skills above those of peers was nothing but a subjective comment from a given administrator. In visiting the people, the superintendent found that the rank and file were far from being unanimous on these topics. He found teachers who said they wanted to be acknowledged for doing a more effective job than their peers. He found teachers who felt betrayed by their association when they were written out of the mentor teacher program because they were administrative interns or specialists.

The association's assertive and public comments about these topics and the superintendent's willingness to engage the debate with association members and leaders opened up the dialogue. This allowed for a multidirectional debate about the worth of the mentor teacher program and the teacher evaluation system. When one looks at the outcome from a "who won?" perspective, the mentor teacher program reflected the association's

perspective much more than that of the superintendent. The evaluation system reflected the superintendent's perspective more than that of the association.

There were some dynamics of the debate and dialogue which contributed to the particular outcomes of these latter two components. The mentor teacher debate was played out on issues of control and compensation. Senate Bill 813 began as a teacher empowerment reform movement, and the mentor program was central to the philosophy that teachers rather than administrators were the experts. The question of whether the mentor stipend was merit pay or extra pay for extra work was a battle ground for mutually exclusive philosophies. The association would not go near anything that smelled like merit pay. The superintendent wanted to reward excellent teaching. When there are two diametrically opposed views which cannot be mediated by fact, there is no middle ground. A belief is a belief, period. The debate and dialogue as to the nature of the mentor stipend were dead on arrival because the association held all the cards. All the association had to do was wait it out and eventually the deadline for funding application would force the hand of the superintendent. The superintendent had nothing to bargain: no money, no moral authority to match the historical belief in worker equality, nothing. The association ruled on this one.

The teacher evaluation system, however, gave the superintendent and the association a little more to talk about. The superintendent took control of

this debate by writing the policy and creating the instrument himself. Because he had taken the time to build a relationship of trust with the classroom teachers in the district and because he had a reputation for being fair, he could transfer all that political capital into this debate. The combination of his ability to persuade and his personal investment in the actual policy and instrument made him a double threat to the association's position that teachers were all equal.

The association's concern over administrative favoritism and the differences between administrator evaluation philosophies were legitimate. The wild swings of the principals at various school sites would make anyone question the possibility of objectifying the process. But this situation gave the superintendent even more ammunition in his quest to make the process more defined and measurable so that the organizational standards would be upheld throughout the district. The question was: "Since the evaluation process is so out of whack, shouldn't we find a better way to do it?"

The lengthy debate and dialogue among the teachers' association officials, the school administrators, and the superintendent were painstaking. Dividing the performance of a teacher into 24 areas and then rating each area as "above standard," "standard," and "needs improvement," requires a great amount of intellectual honesty and academic rigor. The interactions between the superintendent and association officials were protracted and volatile. It was impossible to separate out past experiences,

horror tales, and personal fears from the conversation. Individuals interviewed reported the debate being testy and accusatory at times.

The superintendent also had to deal with the reluctance the site administrators exhibited about this new direction in accountability. Many veterans were set in their ways, while some of the most recently appointed principals were not at all put off by the idea of clinical supervision. The reported lengthy discussions with site administrators and the in-service sessions held for them seemed to have resulted in their attitudes and actions moving into alignment with the superintendent's vision of evaluation.

In this instance, the rational and the political influences on the debate played out in favor of the superintendent's vision. Given an administrator trained in supervision (as required by Senate Bill 813), given an appraisal instrument which delineates the specific behaviors which match the appraisal levels, given that the information is distributed to all teachers in an effective way, given that at any point in time teachers show strengths in various areas, and given that teachers themselves acknowledge the various levels of expertise in their profession, shouldn't the evaluation system allow for a sophisticated and meaningful appraisal document and process?

The superintendent didn't stop with the first round of success in getting the policy and instrument into place in the policy manual and the teacher contract. He spent exhaustive time debunking the prediction that the new evaluation system would significantly skew the evaluations one way or the

other, too high or too low. He provided an analysis of the results districtwide as well as site by site. By reading each evaluation and providing an analysis, he sent three messages to the organization: (a) This process is important, (b) I am holding site administrators accountable for the process, and (c) I know where the instructional strengths and weaknesses are in this organization.

Such an act of rationality is linked to the political and emotional content of the organization. Facts do give rise to new beliefs and spark a different kind of dialogue. The fact that the superintendent found no dramatic skewing of the evaluation profiles either districtwide or site by site built a case for the objectivity of the site administrators. The fact that the superintendent received empirical data that teachers felt good about being acknowledged for their above average performance in the classroom was proof that there was a degree of acceptance among the rank and file membership. The fact that after year two of implementation the hue and cry from the association dwindled to nothing spoke volumes about the power of the rational at certain stages of policy acceptance.

Although the debate and dialogue about what the appraisal system ratings should look like occupied most of the time, it is important to note that the subtleties associated with the content of the appraisal instrument were also important to the organization's learning about itself. The 24 performance areas as presented by the superintendent were the sum and substance of instructional competence in the district (Appendix I). If it was

not on the appraisal instrument, it was not viewed as significant. The dialogue which took place among and between administrators and teachers, teachers and teachers, association leaders and membership, and association leaders and district administrators resulted in a clearer understanding of what the instructional act should look like. This furthered the district's mission in providing for all students. After all, if effective instruction is the mission, the members of the organization should be able to describe it, deliver it, and evaluate its delivery.

When minimum proficiencies and grade level expectancies came up for discussion, the debate and dialogue were focused on the nitty gritty of daily life in the classroom. What am I to teach in the classroom? What should be in my lesson plans? What does student progress look like? Unlike the mentor teacher program and the teacher evaluation system, which had its debate origins in philosophical and political content, the content of minimum proficiencies and grade level expectations was much more available to all the stakeholders because both directly affected all stakeholders in an immediate and urgent way. One might think that the closeness to the stakeholders would have propelled meaningful debate; however, the process and the outcomes associated with the implementation of these components received the most lukewarm observations of all from those interviewed.

With the exception of the superintendent who held the process and outcomes in high regard, both administrators and teachers who were



interviewed were skeptical about the motives of those who participated in the process of developing the expectancies. For some, the process of identifying grade level expectancies meant protecting pet projects: if one had a sacred cow of a science activity the person made sure to get on the science committee and then made certain that the project got placed at the correct grade level. Some participants revealed that they felt ashamed to have their names associated with the final product because it was a sham. A decade after the grand effort to codify grade level expectancies, a principal observed that the curriculum was still set by the teachers at each grade level. The debate and dialogue was deeply compromised by parochial interests of the most individual kind and by the cynicism about people's motivations for participation.

The notion of minimum competencies was also severely compromised by disingenuous attitudes during the debate and dialogue. The teachers were suspicious about how their students' performance in reaching the competencies might be used in teacher evaluations. The result of the debate and dialogue set the competencies at such a low level that they became a joke among many teachers and administrators. Many educators voiced considerable concern about the false signal sent by a "meets minimum competency" notification to a parent. There was very little confidence in the legitimacy of the assessment protocol among those interviewed except for the governing board members. Both of them indicated that they felt the reports

they received relative to pass rates were an indication of institutional success.

Although the superintendent did view both the proficiencies and the grade level expectancies as significant reform efforts, he was not as visible in the debate and dialogue as he was for the mentor teacher and teacher evaluation components. He monitored the process. He could even recall the color coding of the subject areas as the many drafts of minimum competencies were circulated throughout the district. He placed people in whom he had great confidence on the committees and let the process roll.

Part of the dialogue and debate problem with grade level expectancies was the breadth of the issue. In a kindergarten-eighth grade district where there are four core instructional areas per grade level plus physical education, performing arts, and junior high electives, the process can get bogged down due to the weight of the content alone.

The sharpness of the minimum proficiency debate was blunted by the complexities of a district serving a diverse student population. How does the organization declare standards of performance that are also flexible enough to be appropriate for educationally disadvantaged students and limited-English speaking students? This complexity played a significant part in diluting the debate. When the standards of the school requires grade level placement, generally by chronological age, the learning levels of students as well as their impediments do not fit into convenient categories. Therefore,

the debate about what competency looks like came to a dead stop because there was no way to use a simplistic formula to measure a complex situation.

### Moral and Ethical Considerations

An analysis of the moral and ethical considerations present in the implementation of Senate Bill 813 must begin with an acknowledgment that there were many cultures present in the district, all impacting the functions of the district in a variety of ways. These cultures were not defined by ethnicity or religion; they were defined by beliefs commonly held by members of the organization. It is important to the discussion of moral and ethical considerations to understand these subgroups within the district and some of their beliefs.

The school district was home to many cultures to which the employees belonged. The three most obvious were management, classified, and certificated. All three had rituals, myths, language, and legends which perpetuated a sense of belonging and a sense of singularity. But the implementation of Senate Bill 813 brought into focus many subtler cultures which brought their own realities to the debate and dialogue.

One of the most powerful cultures was that within the teachers' association. Right down the line, the association brought forward a hard-line labor agenda which demanded that members be given their due and that union precepts be a cornerstone of all policy and practice codification. The moral-ethical content of the association's contribution to the debate and

dialogue had to do with protection of members, involvement in the decisionmaking, and curbing the authority of managers who would abuse the increased power if it was given to them.

However, the teachers' association was not representing a monolithic membership. The moral and ethical considerations for several bargaining unit members were different from the official association stand. For instance, the administrative interns felt exceptionally ill-served by the association on the issue of the mentor teacher program. The interns were, after all, full-time teachers, but the age-old adversarial positioning of the association toward management required the association to exclude the administrative interns from eligibility for mentor program. By adhering to this historical moral/ethical position, the association violated another moral/ethical position--that of equally representing all members of the bargaining unit. Resource teachers, librarians, and nurses were also excluded from the mentor program because the culture of the association did not clearly recognize these unit members as "real teachers."

The mentor teacher program was not the only point where the association ran into a divergence of moral and ethical viewpoints among its members. The teacher evaluation system also challenged the stated belief that the teachers viewed teaching as a profession and that it should be judged by professional standards. The party line, however, was to resist giving power to administrators in the evaluation process and at the same

time to prohibit mentor teachers from being involved in the evaluation process. The association found itself in an ongoing argument with itself over conflicting moral and ethical precepts. We believe in evaluation, but who should evaluate?

During the process of implementing Senate Bill 813, the association did go through a change in officials and a shift in culture to one which seemed more open to finding common ground with the superintendent on components of Senate Bill 813. It is interesting to note that the change in leaders included an individual who had been initially denied the opportunity to apply for a mentorship position in the first year of the program. His moral and ethical principles were so offended by the association's actions that he had his brother, an attorney, write a letter threatening suit against the association if he was not allowed to apply. Later, at the urging of the superintendent and at the suggestion of some members of the association, this individual ran for association office and eventually became its president.

The culture of the governing board changed frequently and significantly during the superintendent's tenure. In the beginning, he felt, and the board members interviewed for this study concurred, that there was a strong match of beliefs between the superintendent and the governing board who hired him. One would expect that to be the case, given the selection process which involved the entire board selecting the superintendent, and the superintendent voluntarily accepting. The commonly held principles in this

culture included the division between the role of the superintendent and the governing board. With the exception of the last two years of his tenure, there were no comments from the key informants that either the board micro-managed the district or that the superintendent kept the board in the dark. The superintendent and the governing board were both future oriented.

Although the last two years of the superintendent's tenure were riddled with petty arguments between the superintendent and certain board members over issues such as whether a relocatable classroom should be placed at a certain school or not, on the whole the superintendent's eight year tenure was productive and dynamic, filled with broad policy issues such as accommodating an increasingly diverse and growing student population and meeting the expanding needs of the district with a shrinking budget. The culture of the board allowed him to invest a good portion of his time developing leadership in the district among teachers and administrators. He would hone in on particular people who were bright, motivated, and global in their thinking and nurture their sense of efficacy. His available energy for these endeavors was depleted during the last two to three years when the governing board culture was fractured by in-fighting, hostility, and distrust both between board members and between the superintendent and at least one board member.

The superintendent's cabinet had a culture which was based on support and service to the superintendent. He viewed the members of the cabinet as a primary reference group for the purpose of setting goals, solving problems, and sustaining his emotional equilibrium as he went about his work. The moral and ethical principles of the cabinet from his perspective included a high commitment to the vision of the district, loyalty to him, to each other, and to maintaining a high level of knowledge in each area represented in cabinet. Several individuals noted in the interviews that the assistant superintendent of business was a key emissary for the superintendent in working with the teachers' association and management team when it came to understanding the finances of the district. This man had cultivated a trust among even the most assertive of the association leaders based on his longevity in the district and his past performance as a straight shooter when it came to salary settlements.

A distinct culture among the site administrators did not emerge during the study. What did emerge was the influence the superintendent had on principals as individuals rather than the content of the relationship between the superintendent and the site administrators as a whole.

Individual principals who were interviewed all attested to the strong influence the superintendent had in developing the components of Senate Bill 813. His concern for them as individuals was a reflection of his moral and ethical stand that each individual was a valued members of the

organization and respect should be accorded to each of them. They all felt that he viewed them as leaders in some aspect of the implementation due to his appointment of them to key committees or because of the attention he gave to their ideas and observations.

The superintendent implemented Senate Bill 813 in a moral and ethical way because he matched his words with his actions, showing a consistency based on principle rather than politics. The two criticisms of the superintendent which were expressed during the study--a bias for consensus which resulted in indecisiveness or organizational chaos, and an inability to tolerate differing opinions--really reflected his moral and ethical character. The bias toward consensus was an outgrowth of his belief that all people were entitled to express their ideas and beliefs, their wants and desires. His impatience with differing opinions only emerged after his extensive attempts to convince and influence others through facts and inspiration. Once he had exhausted these approaches, the superintendent's belief in team work kicked in and required that he separate those who were loyal to the core values of the district from those who were not.

#### The Leadership Relationship: Was It Present?

"Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real change that reflects their mutual purposes" (Rost, 1991, p. 102). As Foster (1989) observed, leadership takes place in the context of a community.



The key components of this view of leadership include influence, relationship, real change, mutual purposes, and community. At various times and for various components, several leadership relationships were present during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. The superintendent was able to engage followers because of his commitment of time and emotions, his rigorous rational analysis, his personal interactions, and his reputation as a moral and ethical individual.

There were also factors which impeded the leadership relationship. These included culture roadblocks to mutuality of goals, a variance in the definitions of real change and mutual purposes, and a changing community context during his tenure as superintendent. The factors which encouraged and impeded this relationship are discussed below.

#### Embracing Leadership: The Superintendent and Teachers' Association

A complex, primary leadership relationship developed during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. It was between the superintendent and the teachers' association. This should not be a surprise when one remembers that Senate Bill 813 was originally crafted as a teacher empowerment piece of legislation. It was carried forward by Senator Gary Hart who was known for his close connection to the California Teachers Association. There was also a perception that Hart was anti-administrator, although this is belied by his personal and congenial friendships with individual school administrators. Perhaps he would be better characterized as having a dislike for the species,

but on an individual basis administrators might be acceptable. This pro-teacher, anti-administrator caricature of the legislation found its way into the messages sent from CTA to local units, and from the Association of California School Administrators to individual superintendents. Both sides were told to be careful not to give power or authority to the other side and to avoid putting into policy more than the law required.

Given these adversarial roots of the implementation, the superintendent had to begin somewhere. His Model I, or linear/rational approach, enabled him to pare down the legislation in order to identify those components which were most important to his vision and to also locate where the match and discrepancy with the teachers' association would most likely occur. By his actions as described in the previous section, he also realized that the teachers in the district functioned in two zones--as individuals and as bargaining unit members. This understanding of culture and organizational dynamics would prove invaluable as he laid the groundwork for the implementation of the mentor teacher program and the teacher evaluation system.

Leadership is present when the mutual purposes of those involved are the object of the relationship. Senate Bill 813 was jammed packed with purposes and the test of leadership was to mold and shape the change process so those purposes became mutual. There were many moments of irony when the superintendent and the association tried to find purposes that were mutual. One of those moments involved the mentor teacher

program. The thought of bargaining unit members receiving additional compensation would traditionally be seen by labor organizations as a great thing. Management would traditionally want to know what the district was getting in return. The irony came into play when the association demanded that the mentor program be based on extra pay for extra work. The superintendent wanted to identify excellent teachers and reward them for the excellent job they did on a daily basis. The superintendent ultimately got one of his purposes met, the identification of excellent teaching. The association ultimately got control over mentor work and the requirement of extra work in exchange for a mentor stipend.

There was very little mutuality of purpose in this mentor teacher change process in terms of the product, the policy, and the program. However, there was significant mutuality of purpose in the process involved in the policy implementation. Although the policy looked like a compromise between parties which satisfied none, as the years passed the mentor teacher program took on many qualities which reflected mutual purposes. For instance, the projects which mentors worked on initially were highly disputed by the association officials and the superintendent. With the passage of time the association's rigid view began to soften and the mentors themselves stepped forward to participate in staff development, in new teacher support, in CAP/CLAS assessment procedures, and in the development of grade level expectancies, all of which the association had previously labeled

administrative work. Also, the number of mentors increased in the district with the passage of time, so virtually all projects supported by the association and by the superintendent eventually involved the use of mentor teachers.

Another sign of mutual purpose was the participation of association leaders as mentors. Two individuals interviewed had held association offices and yet had become mentors. This evolution from ideology (no merit pay) to reality (at any given time there are teachers who exhibit skills which can be measured as exemplary) took the mentor teacher program to a new level of acceptability among teachers and simultaneously approached the superintendent's vision of the program.

After a brief fight with the association over the use of mentors, the assistant superintendent of instruction also found her needs being met by those teachers in the mentor program. This mutuality of purpose evolved after the assistant superintendent backed off her initial vision of the program. This vision was management oriented in the association's view. To counter this perception, she solicited the assistance of exemplary teachers who were not mentors. Shifting the partnership between teachers and the district office to those who were not associated with the mentor program enticed additional leaders and followers into the arena of change. This adjustment in the assistant superintendent's approach allowed the superintendent to maintain the leadership relationship with the association.

The potential for mutual purposes was exceptionally present in the implementation of the teacher evaluation system. Teachers wanted to be treated as professionals. The superintendent wanted to calibrate evaluation to identify more closely those behaviors which were optimal for the success of the instructional act. The association viewed accountability as a part of professionalism, but the degree to which the superintendent wanted to codify evaluation smacked of administrative power and control. The association's distrust for site administrators and the inconsistency from site to site when it came to evaluation made the identification of mutual purposes in this area extremely difficult.

This was a situation, however, when the association did not speak for the entire bargaining unit. Teachers knew that some of them were better teachers than others and several told the superintendent they wanted to have an appraisal instrument that reflected that fact. Ultimately the appraisal instrument did include a tri-level calibration which included an above standard notation. Since the terms and conditions of employment, which included the evaluation system, were covered by the collective bargaining agreement, the superintendent had to hang in there long enough to get this document in place and ratified. He did not stop there. He continued to drive home his position by providing objective data which indicated that teachers were not having negative or unusable evaluations jammed down their throats.

Recently the district has adopted a new evaluation appraisal instrument which returned to the "on or off" evaluation approach. A teacher either "meets standards" or "needs improvement." The older, more detailed instrument developed during the implementation of Senate Bill 813 by the superintendent in this study fell under the weight of determining the lines between above, meets, and does not meet standards. The variations on a theme became too much for the administrators and the teachers to assimilate. It would seem that the superintendent's departure loosened the organizational commitment to the teacher evaluation system and provided the opponents of the system a chance to gain a beachhead with the new superintendent and governing board.

Mutuality of purpose in the implementation of grade level expectancies and minimum proficiency was nonexistent. The association officials never acknowledged the need for grade level expectancies and saw them as an attempt to rope in their authority and autonomy. The superintendent, on the other hand, saw them as critical to the curricular integrity of the district. The superintendent believed that the stated policy would be put into practice at the classroom level. However, one principal remarked that new teachers really learn what to teach at their grade level from their colleagues at that grade level, not from the district adopted curriculum. Although I believe his viewpoint to be overstated, it is an indication that the superintendent's

perception of the effectiveness of grade level expectancies in the classroom did not exactly match what was really happening.

Minimum proficiencies had a difficult time finding a natural constituency. Again, many teachers viewed the declaration of student standards as a threat to their autonomy and jobs. The superintendent found that minimum proficiencies appealed to his sense of logic and order. The final form of the proficiencies put both the teachers' association and the superintendent in a bind. The final product was based on unbelievably low standards which damaged the credibility of the reform intent. The reality of remediation plans for students not achieving proficiency was never systematically realized. Teachers laughed up their sleeves about what the proficiencies really meant. The superintendent found himself caught between wanting to set standards and needing to be responsive to the changing student population. How could he have one set of standards for a school with a high socio-economic status (SES) and another for a second school with a lower SES which often had a large number of minority and poor children? He couldn't. Politically, the easiest thing to do was to set the proficiencies low enough-- two grade levels behind the grade being tested--so that virtually all students could pass.

Although the superintendent got something on paper, he accomplished very little that would substantially impact the instructional program. The association went along with the standards mainly because that's all it could

do. Lack of time, assessment resources, and political leverage prohibited this component of Senate Bill 813 from coming into full bloom in this district.

#### Embracing Leadership: The Superintendent and District Administrators

As mentioned above, the real action in implementing Senate Bill 813 was with the teachers' association. In the hands of a less skilled superintendent, the energies and attention would have been focused solely in that relationship.

However, the superintendent recognized that in order to drive the changes deep into the organization, he had to engage district level and site administrators as well as teacher leaders. He sought out and encouraged administrators to be active in the process of implementing Senate Bill 813. True to his idea that there are very few mandatory events, participants involved were self-selected and/or anointed by him to chair or participate on key committees.

In addition to participating in the development phase of implementing Senate Bill 813, principals received coaching and encouragement from the superintendent in the area of teacher evaluation. He did not decree the product; rather, he taught the process. I believe this leadership behavior, along with the superintendent's review of all evaluations, is an example of intergenerational leadership. As one principal revealed, she felt the superintendent through his leadership behaviors had helped her find her own voice. This happens only when the superintendent takes the time and



expends the energy to be a presence in the lives of those with whom the leadership relationship is forged.

The leadership relationship between the superintendent and administrators was evident when the administrators and the superintendent engaged in extended dialogue regarding the calibration of the teacher evaluation assessment instrument. As the superintendent noted, the administrators wanted to know what he was thinking, what he wanted. This is a sign of a leader engaging followers in capturing the vision. In this case, the vision of teaching excellence was being defined in an organizational document. The superintendent cued the standards in the hearts and minds of principals; in turn, they returned to their sites and engaged the followers in the dialogue and debate. It was an iterative and recursive process which grew stronger, or weaker, based upon the influence exerted by those carrying the message.

There is no doubt that the results at the site level were mixed in terms of evaluation becoming a meaningful and professional partnership between the principal and the teacher. The superintendent acknowledged the varying levels of expertise and interest on the part of different principals. However, for every evaluation experience which raised one teacher and one principal to a higher understanding of the teaching act, the organization as a whole was strengthened. Sometimes meaningful change is incremental on a grand scale, yet transformational on a small scale.

I believe that the superintendent would be somewhat disappointed in the perception on the part of some administrators that the grade level expectancies were basically a sham. He imbued the work and the document with much more credibility than those who were in charge of seeing that the proficiencies were in effect in the classrooms throughout the district. This discrepancy between the superintendent's view and that of the principals is a good example of the *stated* being different from what actually happens in a loosely coupled organization.

The expectancies were a linear response to a set of complex circumstances surrounding the culture of the classroom and the culture of a given school. It was going to take more than a document of a few pages to codify grade level expectancies. It was going to take time to instill interest on the part of teachers; to inspire commitment on the part of administrators; and to command the professionalism needed to apply the discipline of a defined curriculum. Time was not on the leader's side in this case. Consequently, this component of Senate Bill 813 was not adequately developed in the relationship between the superintendent and administrators, or teachers, for that matter.

#### Embracing Leadership: The Superintendent and the Governing Board

This superintendent was selected by a governing board with a unanimous vote. In essence, the board and the superintendent picked each other. This cannot be overlooked as a key component in the leadership

relationship between the board and the superintendent. It is one of the rare instances where a bureaucracy allows a totally voluntary relationship to come into being. The dynamics among and between a superintendent and the board who unanimously selects the superintendent is marked by a high degree of trust and mutuality. All parties want success and will work hard to ensure the success of each other. For a period of two years, the superintendent enjoyed a collegial and productive relationship with the governing board that selected him. He felt supported and well counseled by the governing board members. Two of the members of this board reported a high degree of confidence in the superintendent's character and competence. There was a mutual acknowledgment of leadership roles from the superintendent to the board and the board to the superintendent.

In the interviews with the governing board members, it became clear that the governing board was removed from the daily gore of running a school district. They maintained a policy-making consciousness and left the implementation and management to the superintendent. The board members observed that the superintendent experienced a degree of frustration when his change efforts met resistance in the teacher ranks, but it was a sanitized knowledge on their part. The superintendent is a controlled and private individual and he did not expose the governing board to the mayhem associated with the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

As reported by the governing board members, the relationship link between the board and the superintendent was forged by the superintendent's exhaustive efforts at communicating with them. Whether in a formal or informal setting, with the entire board or individually, written or verbal, the superintendent kept the board aware of the subtle and not-so-subtle events and dynamics which were present in the district.

The superintendent reported that he consciously identified points of mutual interest within the agenda of Senate Bill 813 which matched the interests of governing board members. By doing this, the superintendent provided connections for the board as individuals and as a corporate body which gave weight to the reform effort. He paced the amount of information given to the board so it could be absorbed at a healthy and helpful rate by the lay board.

The superintendent expressed a high degree of empathy for the lay board in grappling with the complex and technical issues upon which they had to act. His genuine respect for the role of the board was reflected in his extensive efforts to help them understand the issues at hand. Even though the board changed in membership several times during his tenure, he was able to find common ground with each and every member until the last two years of his superintendency. He came to realize that with one board member there was no way to interact due to what he perceived as a destructive and hostile attitude on the part of the board member. After eight

years as superintendent and four years spent implementing Senate Bill 813, he took his leave and moved on to his second superintendency.

### The Presence of Leadership

Leadership relationships existed during the implementation of Senate Bill 813. The presence of leadership was deeper and broader at some points during the implementation than at others. The presence of leadership was possible because key players had access to and the will to use influence resources during this change effort.

The leadership relationship was initiated when the superintendent chose to place the influence he possessed at the service of what he believed to be best for students. By exerting his influence he engaged other stakeholders who also had influence within the organization. The superintendent had many forms of influence: moral authority, position power, authority to allocate resources, a reputation as a fair-minded individual, a twenty year track record as a bright and knowledgeable educator, and the verbal talents to engage in rigorous dialogue. All these forms of influence came into play as he sought allies in his intention to bring about real change.

Potential followers also possessed influence. Administrators held influence because of their close proximity to teachers and parents. Administrators had their own loyal constituents who influenced the way they viewed the implementation of Senate Bill 813. Certainly the officials in the teachers' association had influence emanating from collective bargaining

protocols, their position power as the sole representative of certificated employees, and formal language in Senate Bill 813 which empowered teacher associations to a greater degree than management. The association also had articulate officials who were passionate in their quest to protect those they represented.

These diverse forms of influence circulated through the relationships among and between the superintendent and reference groups. At times the influence of one or the other entities was felt to a greater degree than others. These influence relationships enabled the superintendent and other stakeholders to mold and shape the dialogue associated with the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

The mutual purposes in these influence relationships were distilled by continual and dynamic dialogue and debate. The process of identifying mutual purposes was triggered in a global sense by the content of Senate Bill 813. At the district level, the process of identifying mutual purposes of local interest continued. Within the teachers' association, dissonance was present as well as solidarity, depending on the issue at hand. Likewise, among administrators there were varying level of engagement in response to implementing Senate Bill 813. The superintendent consistently took the proactive position and presented purposes which he believed could be mutual, and then allowed the process to run its course. In some cases key players were able to buy into those purposes after having a chance to modify

them, such as the teacher evaluation system. In other cases, a key stakeholder group, the teachers, never recognized a legitimate purpose in this endeavor, such as grade level expectancies.

The community in which this leadership relationship was present had many complexities. The geographical boundaries did not change, but the student demographics as described earlier were undergoing great change. More importantly, the psychological boundaries of the community were fragile and at times cross-connected in terms of focus and intent. The reason for this was that within the community an individual could be fulfilling multiple roles at one time. A teacher can be a parent, a taxpayer, and an association member simultaneously. Similarly, a board member could be a champion for students, a political conservative, and a supporter of teachers who do their job. When a significant change effort, such as Senate Bill 813, is underway there is a good chance that a psychological boundary or two will be violated due to multiple perspectives within a given individual. The implications for the leadership task of identifying mutual purposes within this complexity of motivations and interests are significant.

The superintendent in this study employed three guiding principles which I believe assisted the organization in dealing with the complexity within the psychological boundaries of the community. First, by relying on voluntary participation in most endeavors, he allowed a natural selection process to occur. Freely choosing to be involved is one of the hallmarks of the

leadership relationship. Secondly, by measuring the resistance to a given change effort and monitoring the level of resistance, the superintendent was able to execute a strategic retreat before the resistance generalized to all change efforts. The superintendent recognized that a strategic retreat was not defeat, but a matter of timing the change effort. Thirdly, the superintendent paced the change efforts so that the stakeholders had an opportunity to adjust and thereby avoid being overwhelmed.

Perhaps the most difficult leadership component in this change effort to measure is that of "intend real change." Certainly when the four policy efforts highlighted in this study are measured, there is a mixed result. The teacher evaluation instrument did not survive the superintendent's departure; the grade level expectancies and minimum proficiencies were not recognized as legitimate by many teachers; the mentor teacher program survived and expanded.

However, the product is not the sum and substance of the relationship. The process in and of itself has worth. The dialogue and debate became an internal mechanism for some individuals to reflect on their own professionalism. There is evidence that the leadership relationship reconstructed preferences for at least some teachers. One became an association official out of a sense of injustice generated by the debate over the mentor teacher program. Another teacher association official is now serving as a mentor after vehemently opposing the program. A majority of the key



informants reported being changed professionally and personally by the leadership relationship they had with the superintendent during the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

#### The Magnitude and the Limitations of the Leadership Relationship

During this study, I became familiar with the magnitude and the limits of the leadership relationship. Several factors contribute to such a relationship.

The leadership relationship is magnified or diminished by the level of maturity of the participants. When a participant's vision is impaired by a hearkening to past events, the vision and the relationship is reduced. In the public school setting, the presence of collective bargaining in its traditional adversarial form--and its institutionalized memory of slights and errors--is a significant inhibitor to real change. Participants who bring an evolved sense that complex problems require sophisticated analysis and solutions are the new thinkers needed in this post-industrial age.

The leadership relationship is magnified or diminished by the amount of time and focus the participants are willing to bring to an issue. A leader attempting to engage followers has the same twenty-four hours in a day that those who resist the change have. In order to preserve a most powerful resource in the change process--time--the leader must quickly locate messengers of change within the organization who can replicate the message. The leader cannot do it alone. That's the point of the leadership relationship.

Leadership must be generated at every level and in every sub-culture present in the organization.

The leadership relationship is magnified or diminished by the degree of personal antipathy or affinity among and between those who hold positional power in the organization. While leadership is not dependent upon a personality type, it is dependent upon the leaders' and followers' ability to interact with the vision in mind. Hostility and antagonism diminish the relationship, while respect and collegiality magnify the relationship.

The leadership relationship is magnified or diminished by the political acumen of those in the relationship. The use of power resources to promote or inhibit movement toward real intended change is a strategic and moral choice on the part of key players. Withholding or "spinning" information, reluctance to debate and dialogue, and invoking rituals and symbols which cause anxiety and fear among followers can result in inhibiting the change process. A readiness to share, listen, respond and provide emotional and psychological safety can promote the change process.

Like the frog and the scorpion from *The Crying Game*, those in the leadership relationship are at each other's service and mercy. The ebb and flow of issues, responses, progress and stagnation provide fertile ground for success. Although individuals can and do profoundly impact the movement toward real, intended change, the power is magnified many fold when individuals enter the leadership relationship.

### Leadership: The Horror and the Hope

The horror of leadership is that it may fail. Quite frankly, given the inhibiting structural, human, symbolic, and political factors, odds are against the leadership relationship from taking root at all in school districts. With so many pressing and significant problems facing the world in general, and public schools in particular, the price of failure is unacceptably high.

In the public school setting, those who should be natural partners in the leadership relationship find themselves alienated from one another. For example, the California School Employee's Association display flyers showing an obviously stressed bus driver staring into the camera. He is being told, "If you go in alone, chances are that management will ignore you." In 1994, the president of CTA took advantage of the California Learning Assessment System (CLAS) debacle to issue a searing four page letter to the acting superintendent of public instruction. CLAS embraced a sophisticated approach to assessment. The idea and concept were sound, but the execution fell short of expectations. Special interest groups went on a rampage through the press and the courts. The president of the CTA joined these critics and engaged in heavy administrator bashing. Local school boards find themselves fending off criticism from special interest groups which demand the impossible from those elected to represent everyone. These are but a few of the dynamics which divide those who should have a mutual vested interest in seeing public education succeed yet continue with divisive actions.

The horror of leadership is the high personal price it demands of those in the leadership relationship. The contrived tensions present in the labor-management process divide participants into seemingly armed camps. Teachers who dare to see managers' interests are traitors. Managers who are sensitive to employees are wimps. Players continually position themselves to take advantage of each opening to further their position. The superintendent mentioned that feeling he got in his stomach when encountering "the enemy." Imagine the added distress of having one's family intimidated by angry phone calls when a participant was irate.

The horror of leadership is that it can be undone so quickly by so few. Articulate opposition to a leadership effort can turn cold the feet of the undecided which, at any given time, generally make up the majority of the potential followers. Old grudges hold new ideas at bay. As the superintendent observed, it takes so many new people to turn a school around.

The hope of leadership is that a critical body of knowledge can increase analytic abilities and strengthen resolve to bring real, intended change to the public school system.

The hope of leadership is that various crises have forced a re-evaluation of the place of public education in society. This re-evaluation has given vitality to the dialogue and debate.

The hope of leadership is that it is personal and therefore inspiring. Many of those involved in public education tend to have an altruistic streak in them. A leader proposing a leadership relationship can use the mind and the heart of followers to harness energies in pursuit of the vision.

The horror and the hope of leadership were integral parts of this superintendent's life. He was strong enough to withstand the horror and sensitive enough to embrace the hope. He transformed the way individuals thought of themselves as educators; he kept students and instruction at the center of the district's efforts; he led by example and was rewarded by the aspirations of those who entered the leadership relationship. The superintendent's use of the rational and intuitive during the change process was a brilliant act of leadership. He gave as much as he had, which is all that can be asked.

I would judge his efforts as leadership behaviors. He elevated the expectations, cared about fairness and remained true to every child's potential. While some would say his efforts were incomplete, I would respond that the leadership relationship is not about completing a change process. It is about individuals and organizations which learn to evolve. They are called to change by the vision of the future. This superintendent taught the lessons of change and the district reaped the benefits.

### Discussion and Recommendations

One never knows what one is getting into at the beginning of a journey. This research inquiry took me down paths both familiar and unknown. I found myself rejoicing at some points that the research design brought forth some very rich narrative; at other times I felt that I wanted to pursue other avenues which were unavailable due to lack of time and opportunity.

#### Strengths of the Study

The subject of this study was remarkably accessible. He provided expansive replies to questions and volunteered perspectives which I had not included in the initial question. He conveyed a sense of disclosure that assured me I was seeing his life through his eyes, without pretense or defense.

I found a similar quality in the interviews with key informants. I was pleased that these interviews included what I believe were candid observations of situations, personalities and outcomes. A monolith picture would have been of little help to me in understanding the complexities of the leadership relationship.

The use of a significant reform effort, such as Senate Bill 813, proved more helpful than I initially realized it would be. I was intrigued by the clarity of recall individuals had after the passing of ten years. The landmark content of Senate Bill 813 had drawn organizational and individual attention to the activities surrounding its implementation. This attention was driven

deeper by the local efforts in the district. The study was strengthened by framing the leadership relationship within the implementation of Senate Bill 813.

The historical evidence available in the district documents from the implementation time helped to fully illustrate the organizational response to the change effort. These documents added dimension to the interview accounts of the change effort.

### Weaknesses of the Study

The inclusion of one district, one superintendent and one change effort narrowed and restricted the amount of insight one gained from this study. While the practical aspects of this study were served by this moderate approach, the breadth of applicability of results may be reduced.

Senate Bill 813 was an external mandate to which the superintendent and teacher leaders had to respond. It was top-down in origin, emanating from the legislature of the State of California. This bureaucratic beginning continued down the organizational chart to the California Department of Education and Commission on Teacher Credentialing which drew up regulations. The comprehensive nature of the legislation did not reflect the usual type of local change effort at the district level. In that way it was singular. Such a sweeping reform effort with its political clout and high visibility happens only once in a great while.

The district reflected many of the struggles experienced by districts throughout the state and the nation. Lack of resources, growing needs, and polarized constituents were present. However, it was a large, suburban school district serving kindergarten-eighth grade students. The nature of this organization may lack some of the dynamics found in urban or rural districts or in districts which are kindergarten-twelfth grade or of a different size.

The inclusion of one superintendent focused the study in a way which allows close scrutiny. However, the study is dependent on the perceptions of this one superintendent and his colleagues. This narrow view may hamper the application of study observations when a superintendent is a woman, or of a different experience level, or of a different ethnic background.

In the study I asked for a frank discussion of the presence of leadership or the lack of it, but there are reasons to be cautious in accepting the observations of participants at face value. The participants could be inhibited from being frank because they did not want to hurt the feelings or reputations of those involved or place themselves in jeopardy.

The small number of participants limited the available perspectives. This was particularly true regarding the parent and community member category since no representatives of these stakeholder groups were included in the study.



### Future Studies

The inquiry into the leadership relationship in a public school setting requires continuing attention. There are emerging signs of health in some areas but there is also a lingering shadow of dysfunction. Progress is possible only through the discipline of inquiry and the application of knowledge and effort.

Future studies need to include a broader representation of informants. In this particular study, I might have included the assistant superintendent of business who seemed to have cornered the market on trust with the teachers' association leaders. The superintendent benefited from the relationship between this long time employee and the layers of association leaders. I should have known more about this relationship. Given more time, I would include board members who were on the board when the superintendent departed the district. This would give additional insight into the demise of a leadership relationship which may be as important as understanding how a leadership relationship is sustained.

It would be useful to replicate this study using a reform effort which is less comprehensive and more local than Senate Bill 813. This might help in differentiating the elements of a leadership relationship when change is mandated versus when change evolves from mutually agreed-upon interests.

Selecting additional superintendents to reflect on their experiences during the implementation of Senate Bill 813 may help to identify common

elements in the leadership relationships and also describe some of the differences. Further inquiry could help assess what factors in the organization and in the individuals may account for these differences. This would add to the knowledge base of leadership studies.

### Concluding Remarks

I have benefited immensely from this study. On a professional and personal level, this dissertation has served as a process through which the content of the doctoral program has been distilled and synthesized. I feel that my growth as an educator and leader has been heightened beyond what it would have been without the opportunity to pursue these ideas.

Leadership in the public school setting has everything to do with change. Those who continue to dedicate their lives to public education must seize the opportunities presented by the raging controversy reported on a regular basis in the press and confirmed by those teaching in and managing the schools. This controversy, whether centered in curriculum, accountability, religion in the schools, or CLAS testing, must be used as an opportunity for reform. It must be used to redefine and redirect attention and energy to the most democratic of all endeavors--the education of individuals who can fully participate economically, socially and politically in all the facets of our society's life. This drive towards an informed citizenry must be anchored in a sound and resilient system of public education.

We in education must shed the past practices of an agrarian and industrial society and embrace the multiple dimensions of contemporary life. Both the structures and content of the public school system must shift toward the future. Technology, a "thinking" curriculum and inclusive management strategies are three key parts of a vision which will render public education an enduring institution.

The implication for leaders are profound given the barrage of criticism leveled at public education. Leaders in every sector of the institution must conserve their emotional, political and moral resources for the weightiest of battles. These resources must be applied using the lessons of leadership learned from previous change efforts. These leadership lessons have taught us that analysis provides the strategy, passion provides the fuel, and tenacity provides the vehicle for the change effort.

The road is hard and treacherous. That is why it is so critical that leaders throughout the organization be engaged in the quest. This will ensure that the effort is not dependent upon the personal power and authority of one individual, but rests upon the mutual effort and commitment of a diverse group of individuals.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. D., & Spencer, S. A. (1986). The strategic leadership perspective. In J. D. Adams (Ed. ), *Transforming leadership* (pp. 5-12). Virginia: Miles River Press.
- Adler, M. J. (1982). *The paideia proposal*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Allison, G. T. (1971). *Essence of decision: Explaining the cuban missile crisis*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1977). Organization development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 28, 197-225.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organizational learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arnaz, N. L. (1981). *The besieged school superintendent: A case study of school superintendent-school board relations in Washington, D.C. 1973-75*. Washington, DC: The University of America Press.
- Bacharach, S., & Lawler, E. (1981). *Power and politics in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Badaracco, J. L., Jr., & Ellsworth, R. R. (1989). *Leadership and the quest for integrity*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Baldrige, J. V., & Deal T. (Eds. ). (1983). *The dynamics of organizational change in education*. Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Baldrige, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G., & Riley, G. L. (1978). *Policy-making and effective leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bass, B. M. (1985, Winter). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 26-39.

- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bennis, W. (1984). Transformative power. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 64-71). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Blumberg, A., & Blumberg, P. (1985). *The school superintendent: Living with conflict*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1985). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. L. (1981). *Common learning*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. L. (1985, March). In the aftermath of excellence. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 10-13.
- Bullard, P., & Taylor, B. O. (1993). *Making school reform happen*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Burlingame, M. (1981). Superintendent power retention. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Organizational behavior in schools and school districts* (pp. 425-473). New York: Praeger.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Callahan, R. E. (1971). George S. Counts: Educational statesman. In R. J. Havighurst (Ed.), *Leaders in American education* (pp. 177-87). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carlson, R. O. (1972). *School superintendents: Careers and performance*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1992). Educational choice: Why it is needed and how it will work. In C. E. Finn & T. Rebarber (Eds.), *Education reform in the '90's* (pp. 36-52). New York: Macmillan.

- Clark, B. (1983). The organizational saga in higher education. In J. V. Balderidge & T. Deal (Eds. ), *The dynamics of organizational change in education* (pp. 373-382). Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Clark, D. L., & Meloy, J. M. (1989). Renouncing bureaucracy: A democratic structure for leadership. In T. J. Sergiovanni, & T. Moore (Eds. ), *Schooling for tomorrow* (pp. 272-293). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1983). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In J. V. Balderidge, & T. Deal (Eds. ), *The dynamics of organizational change in education* (pp. 333-372). Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1-25.
- Cohen, P. S. (1969). Theories of myth. In *Man*, 4. In L. G. Bohlman & T. E. Deal, (1985), *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations* (pp. ). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Combs, A. W. (1988, February). New assumptions for educational reform. *Educational Leadership*, 45, 38-40.
- Comenius, John Amos. (1632). *The great didactic*.
- Commager, H. S. (1984, August). Toqueville's mistake. *Harper's Magazine*, pp. 70-74.
- Commission on Public School Administration and Leadership. (1988). *Return to greatness: Strategies for powerful improvements in our schools*. Burlingame, CA: Association for School Administrators.
- Corbett, D., III, Dawson, J. A., & Firestone, W. A. (1984). *School context and school change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1963). Course improvement through evaluation. *Teachers College Record*, 64, 672-683.
- Cuban. L. (1976). *Urban school chiefs under fire*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cuban, L. (1988, January). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 341-344.
- Dahl, R. A. (1961). *Who governs?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Dean, J. W., & Goodman, P. S. (1982). Creating long-term organizational change. In P. Goodman & Associates (Eds. ), *Change in organizations* (pp. 226-279). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dilenschneider, R. L. (1992). *A briefing for leaders*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Duttweiler, P., & Mutchler, S. (1990). *Barriers to school restructuring*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Dye, T. R. (1984). *Understanding public policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. New York: Wiley.
- Eaton, W. E. (1990). The vulnerability of school superintendents: The thesis reconsidered. In W.E. Eaton (Ed.), *Shaping the superintendency: A re-examination of Callahan and the cult of efficiency* (pp. 11-35). New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Edelman, M. (1965). *The symbolic uses of politics*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (1969). Instructional and expressive objectives: Their formulation and use in curriculum. *AERA Monograph Series in Curriculum Evaluation, No. 3*, Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Elam, S. (Ed. ). (1993). *The state of the nation's public schools: A conference report*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Elliott, J. (1981). In search of an alternative power base. *Education & Urban Society, 13* (4), pp. 507-529.
- Farrar, E., De Sanctis, J., & Cohen, D. (1980, November). The lawn party: The evolution of federal programs in the local settings. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 167-171.
- Finn, C. E., Jr., & Ravitch, D. (1985). The humanities: A truly challenging course of study. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds. ), *The great school debate: Which way for American education?* (pp. 204-208). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Firestone, W. A., (1980). *Great expectations for small schools*. New York: Praeger.

- Firestone, W. A. (1987, October). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. *Educational Research*, 16, 16-23.
- Firestone, W. A., Fuhrman, S. H., & Kirst, M. W. (1989). *The progress of reform: Appraisal of state education initiatives*. New Jersey: Center for Policy Research in Education.
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1985). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 39-62). London: The Falmer Press.
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 60-84). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Fritz, R. (1986). The leader as creator. In J. D. Adamas (Ed.), *Transforming leadership: From vision to results* (pp. 159-182). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Garcia, O. (1985). Foreign languages for excellence?: Reading between the lines in the language requirements. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), *The great school debate: Which way for American education?* (pp. 209-212). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of culture*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geiger, K. (1993). From tinkering to true reform. In S. Elam (Ed.), *The state of the nation's public schools: A conference report* (pp. 75-87). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Goodman, P., & Dean, J. W. (1982). Creating long-term organizational change. In P. Goodman & Associates (Eds.), *Change in organizations* (pp. 226-279). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Goodman, P., & Associates (Eds.). (1982). *Change in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.



- Green, J. (1987). *The next wave: A synopsis of recent education reform reports*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Greenfield, T. B. (1984). Leaders and schools: Willfulness and non-natural order in organizations. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds. ), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 142-169). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Gross, B., & Gross, R. (Eds. ). (1985). *The great school debate: Which way for American education?* New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gross, N., Giaquinta, J. G., & Bernstein, M. (1971). *Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change*. New York: Basic Books.
- Guba, E. G. (1969). The failure of educational evaluation. *Educational Technology*, 9, 29-38.
- Guba, E. C., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Harrison, R. (1985). Strategies for a new age. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds. ), *The planning of change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Havelock, R. G. (1973). *The change agent's guide to innovation in education*. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.
- Herriott, R., & Green, N. (Eds. ). (1979). *The dynamics of planned educational change*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Nateman, W. E. (1979). *Situational leadership, perception, and the impact of power*. San Diego, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.
- Hess, G. A. (1992). Restructuring the Chicago public schools. In C. E. Finn & T. Rebarber (Eds. ), *Education reform in the '90's* (pp. 53-76). New York: Macmillan.
- Hooks, S. (1953). *Heresy, yes - conspiracy, no*. New York: John Day Co.

- Iannoccone, L. (1990). Callahan's contribution in the context of American realignment politics. In W. E. Eaton (Ed. ), *Shaping the superintendency: A re-examination of Callahan and the cult of efficiency* (pp. 11-35). New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Joiner, W. B. (1986). Leadership for organizational learning. In J. D. Adamas (Ed. ), *Transforming leadership: From vision to results* (pp. 39-58). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters--innovation and entrepreneurship in the American corporation*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kaufman, H. (1955). Emerging conflicts in the doctrine of public administration. *American Political Science Review*, 50, 1057-1073.
- Kinsman, F. (1986). Leadership from alongside. In J. D. Adamas (Ed. ), *Transforming leadership: From vision to results* (pp. 19-28). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Kirst, M. W. (1984). *Who controls our schools?* New York: Freeman.
- Klein, D. (1985). Some notes on the dynamics of resistance to change: The defender role. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds. ), *The planning of change* (pp.98-105). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Kohl, H. (1985). Computers in school: Beyond drill. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds. ), *The great school debate: Which way for American education?* (pp. 212-217). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Konnert, M. W., & Augenstein, J. J. (1990). *The superintendency in the nineties: What superintendents and board members need to know..* Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1936). *Politics: Who gets, what, when and how*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper.
- Lewis, J. (1986). *Excellence in our schools*. Westbury, NY: Wilkerson.

- Lindblom, C. E. (1968). *The policy-making process* (1st ed. ). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1980). *The policy-making process* (2nd ed. ). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lion-Berger, H. F. (1961). *Adoption of New Ideas and Practices*. New York: Free Press.
- Litzinger, W., & Schaefer, T. (1984). Leadership through followership. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds. ), *Contemporary issues in leadership* (pp. 138-143). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Maccoby, M. (1981). *The leader*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Machiavelli, N. (1517). *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livius*.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed. ). New York: Harper & Bros.
- McDonnell, L. M. (1989). *Restructuring American schools: The promise and the pitfalls*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Menges, R. (1977). *The intentional teacher*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure* (rev. ed. ). New York: Free Press.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Meyers, J. (1989, November/December). Building a shared decision making model that works. *Thrust*, 19 (3), pp. 14-16.
- Mitchell, E. (1981). Educational leadership: Confronting crisis with style. In K. Cirincione-Coles (Ed. ), *The future of education: Policy issues and challenges* (pp. 35-42). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Morrison, A. M. (1992). *The new leaders: Guidelines for leadership diversity in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nair, K. (1990). *Beyond winning: The handbook for the leadership revolution*. Phoenix, AZ: Paradox Press.
- Nanus, B. (1989). *The leader's edge*. Chicago, IL: Contemporary Books.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Neustadt, R. E. (1980). *Presidential power: The politics of leadership* (2nd ed. ). New York: Wiley.
- Niebuhr, R. (1932). *Moral man and immoral society*. New York: Charles Scribner.
- Nolte, M. C. (Ed. ). (1971). *Law and the school superintendent*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Ortner, S. (1973). On key symbols. *American Anthropologist*, 75, 1338-1346.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. New York: Avon.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. New York: Free Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in education*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Peters, T. A., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Presseisen, B. Z. (1985). *Unlearned lessons: current and past reforms for school improvement*. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.
- Purpel, D. E. (1989). *The moral and spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice and compassion in education*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Ravitch, D. (1985). Why educators resist a basic required curriculum. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds. ), *The great school debate: Which way for American education?* (pp. 199-203). New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Reusswig, J. M. (1981). The superintendency: Does it matter? In K. Cirincione-Coles (Ed. ), *The future of education: Policy issues and challenges* (pp. 77-86). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rost, J. C. (1981, August). *The political model: A synthesis from the literature*. Paper presented at the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Seattle, WA.
- Rost, J. C. (1985). *A leadership theory of policy making*. Unpublished manuscript, University of San Diego, Division of Leadership and Administration.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.
- Rothman, R. (1989, May 17). What to teach: Reform turns finally to the essential question. *Education Week*, pp. 1, 8, 10.
- Rowley, S. (1989). Assessing administrator concerns about site-based management. *Thrust*, 19 (3), pp. 22-23.
- Schattschneider, E. W. (1960). *The semisovereign people*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Schein, E. H. (1984, Winter). Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12, pp. 13-28.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schlechty, P. C. (1990). *Schools for the twenty-first century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schon, D. A. (1984). Leadership as reflection-in-action. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds. ), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 36-63). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Schramm, W. (1971). Notes on case studies of instructional media projects. *Working papers for the Academy of Educational Development*, Washington, D.C.: Academy of Educational Development.
- Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. *AERA Monograph Series in Curriculum Evaluation, No. 1*, Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership as cultural expression. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds. ), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 105-114). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1989). What really counts in improving schools? In T. J. Sergiovanni & T. Moore (Eds. ), *Schooling for tomorrow* (pp. 1-8). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shandler, M. (1986). Leadership and the art of understanding structure. In J. D. Adams (Ed. ), *Transforming leadership: From vision to results* (pp.159-182). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Sizemore, B. A. (1981). *The ruptured diamond: The politics of decentralization of the District of Columbia public schools*. Washington, DC: University of America Press.
- Sizer, T. R. (1985). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smith, M. P. (1976). Barriers to organizational democracy in public administration. *Administration and Society*, 18 (3), 275-317.
- Stake, R. E. (1975). *Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- State Department of Education. (1987). *Language Arts Framework*. Sacramento, CA: State Department of Education.
- State Department of Education. (1992). *Science*. Sacramento, CA: State Department of Education.
- Staw, B. M. (1982). Counterforces to change. In P. S. Goodman & Associates (Eds. ), *Change in organizations* (pp. 87-121). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1970, June). *An introduction to the PDK book: Educational evaluation and decision-making*. Paper presented at the eleventh annual Phi Delta Kappan Symposium on Educational Research, Ohio State University.

- Taylor, W. (1984). Organizational culture and administrative leadership in universities. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds. ), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 125-141). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Truman, D. (1971). *The governmental process* (rev. ed. ). New York: Knopf.
- Vaile, P. B. (1984). The purposing of high-performing systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds. ), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 85-104). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Walford, G. (1991). Reflexive accounts of doing educational research. In G. Walford (Ed.), *Doing Educational Research*, pp. 1-18, London: Routledge.
- Waterman, R. A. (1987). *The renewal factor*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Weick, K. E. (1982). Management of organizational change among loosely coupled elements. In P. S. Goodman & Associates (Eds. ), *Change in organizations* (pp. 375-408). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Weick, K. E., & McDaniel, R. R. (1989). How professional organizations work: Implications for school organizations and management. In T. J. Sergiovanni & T. Moore (Eds. ), *Schooling for tomorrow* (pp. 330-355). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wiles, D. K., Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1981). *Practical politics for school administrators*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wilson, R. (1960). *The modern school superintendency*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wise, A. (1983). Why educational policies often fail: The hyperrationalization hypothesis. In Balderidge, J. V. & Deal T. (Eds. ), *The dynamics of organizational change in education* (pp. 93-113). Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Wooley, S. (Producer). & Jordan, N. (Director). (1992). *The Crying Game* (Film). Miramax Films.
- Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

**APPENDIX A**

**INTERVIEW GUIDES**



**SUPERINTENDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE**

1. **When Senate Bill 813 was enacted, what was your initial reaction?**
2. **Tell me about your initial aspirations for your district in response to this reform mandate?**
3. **Describe the processes you used to begin implementing Senate Bill 813.**
4. **Who was involved in the implementation?**
5. **In pursuing implementation, what process did you use to set the goals needed for implementation? Who was involved in creating these goals?**
6. **Describe the leaders in your district who had significant influence over the process of determining goals and priorities. What did you observe about them and the way they exerted leadership?**
7. **Describe the power resources you used to implement Senate Bill 813.**
8. **During this change process, did you attempt to reconstruct preferences among staff, parents, board members? If so, how did you go about it?**
9. **What facilitated reconstructing individuals' preferences? What inhibited this process?**
10. **Did competition come into play during implementation? If so, what form did it take?**
11. **Did you use competition to bring about change?**
12. **Were there points where competition for resources and influence worked against the change process? If so, how did you respond to this?**
13. **Tell me what part cooperation and collaboration played during these years of reform, if any.**
14. **What organizational symbols or myths did you use to inspire others to embrace the changes needed to implement Senate Bill 813?**
15. **What organizational beliefs impeded the change process? How did you respond to these?**

16. What did you do, if anything, to promote and protect the values of your organization?
17. What organizational mechanisms or processes have you used or created to allow for emerging leadership?
18. How do you nurture leadership throughout your organization?
19. Were there times while implementing Senate Bill 813 that you used your position, power, and authority rather than influence to bring about change?
20. Describe the most significant changes that have occurred in response to Senate Bill 813.
21. In reflecting on these changes, what specific processes, events, and/or reactions played a part in bringing change about?
22. Of the specific outcomes required in Senate Bill 813, what outcome reflects the most collaborative of processes? Who was involved?
23. Which outcome reflects the least collaborative process? Why was this so?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR TEACHERS, GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS,  
AND PRINCIPALS

1. How long have you worked for the district?
2. In what capacities have you served?
3. What committees or projects have you worked on?
4. When you think of a particular change that has taken place in the district, how do you think that change came about?
5. If you wanted to initiate a change in the district, how would you go about it?
6. During the implementation of Senate Bill 813, who did you perceive to be a leader in the district? Why did you perceive them to be leaders?
7. Do you feel the superintendent saw you as a leader?
8. What encouraged you to continue in your role as a leader?
9. What part did collaboration and cooperation play in bringing about change?
10. What would you say are the five leadership tasks of a superintendent?
11. Did the superintendent embrace those tasks?
12. What behaviors on his part would you characterize as leadership behaviors?
13. It's been ten years since Senate Bill 813 came into effect. Reflecting before and after 813, what changes in your district do you believe are attributable to the implementation of 813? These changes could be in the form of a product, process, or attitude.
14. Tell me what you remember about the implementation of the mentor teacher program.
15. Tell me what you remember about the implementation of grade level expectancies.

16. Tell me what you remember about the implementation of minimum proficiencies.
17. Tell me what you remember about the implementation of the teacher evaluation system.
18. What influence did the superintendent have on your growth as an educator and leader?
19. Do you have any observations about the relationship between the governing board and the superintendent?

**APPENDIX B**  
**CONSENT FORM,**  
**COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS**

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of San Diego conducting research for a dissertation entitled: The Leadership of a School Superintendent: Putting the California School Reform Movement to Work. Specifically, I will study the leadership relationships in your district as they pertained to the implementation of SB 813. I want to conduct an in-depth case study, focusing particularly on how the district superintendent engaged in leadership relationships with key players in the district. Because you have worked closely with the superintendent, I would like to interview you as part of the study. The interview will last probably no more than one hour. Follow-up interviews will occur only by mutual agreement.

I am aware that organizational change is, in part, a highly political process. Your participation in this research does present some risk to you. I will minimize its extent through disguising your name and specific identifying characteristics. However, there is a chance that an informed reader may attribute particular quotations to you. In addition, there is the possibility that negative information may be obtained. Should you choose to, you will have an opportunity to review the interview.

On the other hand, there are some benefits to participating in a study such as this one. You will have an opportunity to reflect on your work and on the way your organization adapts to change. You will also be contributing important information to the literature on leadership studies.

Your participation, of course, is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any time. If you choose to withdraw, any transcripts and/or recordings of interviews with you will be destroyed and will not appear in the study. I will answer any questions you may have about procedures before you agree to participate. Your signing of this consent form implies no other agreement, verbal or written, beyond that expressed on this form.

=====

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanation and, on that basis, give consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

_____	_____
Signature of Subject	Date
_____	_____
Signature of Researcher	Date
_____	_____
Signature of Witness	Date
Done at _____	_____
City	State

**APPENDIX C**  
**MEMO ON CHANGE FROM SUPERINTENDENT**



TO: All Employees  
FROM:  
RE: Changes in

Nearly everyone is aware that changes are taking place in our District and many are wondering "why?"

Four years ago the school district was very decentralized, and programs, policies, and practices were unique to individual sites. Funding from the state legislature was adequate, and on occasion the reserves of the District supplemented a shortfall from the state. Reforms from the State Department of Education came with School Improvement Programs, but the programs were optional for districts and schools.

Since 1981, four major events have taken place to cause change. First, in 1981, a new Governing Board was elected in . The change in membership led to a shift in philosophy and direction for the District.

Secondly, the national economy turned downward. As the state economy followed the national trend, funds for schools became fewer. And since Proposition 13, we compete each year for funding. For the last two years our funding is linked to reforms. SB 813 brought over sixty reforms and has initiated enormous change.

Thirdly, a new State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Bill Honig, was elected to "reform education in the state." He is doing it now.

And finally, more than thirty national reports indicate that education needs reform. These reforms have become very popular with President Reagan, Governor Deukmejian, and our legislators. Over thirty-six states have introduced reforms to bring about change.

In our District, we have a united Governing Board in its quest for excellence and accountability at every job site in the District. An administration, supportive of the Governing Board, works to translate the policies into practice.



The tremendous emphasis on reform and change at both the national and state levels are impacting every district and classroom in the state. As our local Governing Board examines each issue, and considers local needs and state law, changes are coming to our District. This is of great concern to many employees. Some of the major changes include:

1. The establishment of grade level expectancies that define the content and expectations for students. In the past, this was solely teacher judgment. The change, therefore sets a target as to the "what" teachers teach in the classroom.
2. The emphasis on student achievement, testing, and accountability are major changes in the District. The expectation is that all students can learn, and that they will. Our informal expectation is that each grade level in each school will perform at grade level. Three years ago, test scores had very little credibility in the District. Now they are important.
3. Modification to the role of the principal in \_\_\_\_\_ has probably resulted in the greatest change. We now have principals who not only understand instruction, but are willing to implement it in their schools. They see themselves as instructional leaders and do provide direction in the school. They visit classrooms, promote school-wide practices, and enforce adopted standards. This is a very different approach from some of the past practices.
4. Meaningful evaluation of administrators and teachers is yet another change. While many certificated staff indicated an interest in more specific and more informative evaluations, the actual implementation of a specific process can be stressful for both teachers and some administrators.
5. The move towards centralization of some services, programs, and activities is also causing great anxiety for some administrators and teachers. Even though we provide considerable input in the development of a procedure, the implementation and enforcement of the change appears to be difficult for some to accept.

While most of us view these changes as effective management practices and strong instructional leadership, others find them a high mountain to scale. I believe that the Governing Board and Administration need to be sensitive to these feelings and concerns because they do exist.

While changes are occurring, frustration and tension may build. I realize that change can be threatening to most of us. Too much change absolutely overwhelms us. However, some change is a healthy thing both for individuals and for our District. During a time of change there is always much reflection on "The way it used to be" and considerable faultfinding. Low morale is frequently cited during any period of change. We need to be intellectually and emotionally aware of the needs of District employees and respond to them. We can help each other by providing moral support and understanding.

Perhaps one course of action is to continue to talk about the changes; listen to concerns; and follow a step-by-step in implementation. It seems essential to me that we talk openly about the issues to reduce rumors and fear. Please ask questions and seek clarification.

What we all need to clearly understand is that changes in education today are evidence of a national and state reform movement. The implementation of SB 813 will continue to cause many changes and literally compel us to look at education in new ways. At the local level we are responding in what we believe to be a rational approach and we ask for your understanding and cooperation as we implement the new procedures and practices.

This can be an opportunity for us all to grow. It is my personal hope that the changes can be masterfully forged into an even stronger District that will provide benefits not only for all students but for all of us.

**APPENDIX D**  
**STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY IN BASIC SKILLS**

- INSTRUCTIONStandards of Proficiency in Basic Skills

The governing board shall establish standards of expected pupil achievement in reading comprehension, writing and math computational skills for pupils in grades 4, 6, and 8. Students in the seventh grade will be tested annually to determine eligibility for remedial summer session. Each student shall be expected to meet the minimum proficiency standards of the basic skills at each level, or a plan for re-teaching each child not meeting such minimum standards shall be prescribed before completion of the eighth grade.

Legal Reference:	Education Code	
	51224	Adoption by governing board of minimum academic standards for high school graduation
	51225	Graduation requirements
	51225.5	Standards of proficiency
	51400	Diploma issuance by examination; exceptions
	51401	Diploma issuance with examination
	51402	Diploma conferred upon completion of course of study

Policy Adopted: 1/25/83

**APPENDIX E**

**EDUCATION CODE 44490 - 44497**

## § 44462

## ELEMENTARY &amp; SECONDARY EDUCATION

76-  
Title 2

than eight interns may be supervised by one staff member and the normal district salary paid each intern may be reduced by as much as, but no more than, one-eighth to pay the salary of the supervisor. In no event may an intern be paid less than the minimum salary required to be paid by the state to a regularly certificated teacher. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44463. Change of school districts by interns

An intern shall have the right to change school districts upon completion of a school contract year and become an intern in a new school district if recommended by the new school district. A new application recommending issuance of a new internship credential shall be submitted by the school district in behalf of the individual and the renewal procedures shall be followed. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44464. Period of validity of internship credential

An internship credential shall be valid only as long as the holder is in good standing in the teacher internship program of the district that makes the request, notwithstanding any provision of Section 44463, and the rights provided by Sections 44948 and 44949 shall not be afforded to interns. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44465. Special supervision and assistance

A school district shall give special supervision and assistance to each intern above and beyond that given to other newly certificated and newly employed school personnel. A school district shall seek the assistance of the college or university in coordinating the program for the intern. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44466. Tenure

Interns shall not acquire tenure while serving on an internship credential, but each year of service as an intern shall count toward the achievement of tenure. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44467. Development of internship credential programs by colleges and universities

Colleges and universities may continue the development and maintenance of internship credential programs under their own auspices seeking the cooperation of school districts in their full implementation. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

ARTICLE 4. CALIFORNIA MENTOR  
TEACHER PROGRAM

Section	
44490.	Legislative intent and findings.
44491.	California mentor teacher program; establishment; rules and regulations; qualifications.
44492.	Allocation of funds; designation of teachers as mentors; costs; reimbursement; application for and receipt of funds.
44492.3.	Insufficient stipend funds; pro rata decrease in allocation and number of mentors.
44492.5.	Report.
44493.	District program accounts; use of funds.
44494.	Mentors; stipend; allocation for personal growth or release time; duration; inclusion of subject in collective bargaining.
44495.	Selection procedures; minimum requirements.
44496.	Mentor teachers; duties and responsibilities; requirements; administrator-teacher ratios.
44497.	School district defined.

## § 44490. Legislative intent and findings

The Legislature recognizes that the classroom is the center of teaching reward and satisfaction. However, the Legislature finds that many potentially effective teachers leave the teaching profession because it does not offer them support, assistance, recognition, and career opportunities that they need.

It is the intent of the Legislature in the enactment of this article to encourage teachers currently employed in the public school system to continue to pursue excellence within their profession, to provide incentives to teachers of demonstrated ability and expertise to remain in the public school system, and to restore the teaching profession to its position of primary importance within the structure of the state educational system. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 1302, § 12, eff. Sept. 30, 1983.)

## § 44491. California mentor teacher program; establishment; rules and regulations; qualifications

(a) There is hereby established the California Mentor Teacher Program. On or before November 15, 1983, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall recommend to the State Board of Education, and on or before January 1, 1984, the State Board of Education shall prescribe, rules and regulations establishing guidelines for the implementation of mentor teacher programs in school districts.

(b) The adopted rules and regulations shall specify that persons seeking classification as a mentor teacher shall meet each of the following qualifications:

(1) Is a credentialed classroom teacher with permanent status or, in any school district with an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils, is a credentialed classroom teacher who has completed at least three consecutive school years as an employee of the district in a position requiring certification qualifications.

(2) Has substantial recent experience in classroom instruction.

(3) Has demonstrated exemplary teaching ability, as indicated by, among other things, effective communication skills, subject matter knowledge, and mastery of a range of teaching strategies necessary to meet the needs of pupils in different contexts. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 1302, § 12.5, eff. Sept. 30, 1983.)

## § 44492. Allocation of funds; designation of teachers as mentors; costs; reimbursement; application for and receipt of funds

(a) Out of the funds available for that purpose, the superintendent shall allocate funds to participating school districts for the purpose of providing stipends to mentor teachers. The superintendent shall annually make a determination as to the number of certificated classroom teachers employed by each participating school district and may authorize the district to designate as mentors up to 5 percent of the total number of certificated classroom teachers in the district. Teachers designated as mentors shall meet the minimum qualifications established by subdivision (b) of Section 44491.

The superintendent shall increase any fraction resulting from the 5 percent calculation to the next integer, and shall allow districts that have at least five certificated employees to designate one classroom teacher as a mentor teacher.

(b) Each district that has less than five certificated employees shall be eligible for an amount of funding in the mentor teacher program computed by multiplying the number of certificated employees in the district by 5 percent, and multiplying the result by four thousand dollars (\$4,000).

(c) Out of the funds available for that purpose, the superintendent shall, in the exercise of his or her discretion, allocate to participating school districts an amount that the superintendent determines to be sufficient to reimburse the necessary costs of participation in the mentor teacher program. For purposes of this subdivision, necessary costs of participation in the mentor teacher program shall include, but not be limited to, the costs of employing a substitute classroom teacher, or other teachers, and costs of administering the program.

If at the end of any fiscal year, an amount of the funds available for purposes of this subdivision remains unallocated, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall utilize the unallocated amount for purposes of subdivision (a) or (b) in the next fiscal year.

(d) Any school district may apply for and receive funds for the purposes of this program.

School districts that operate mentor teacher programs together under cooperative agreements or pursuant to Section 6502 of the Government Code shall not receive entitlements from state funds in amounts above that which each district would have received while operating its own program. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 1302, § 12.7, eff. Sept. 30, 1983; Stats.1984, c. 482, § 9.7, eff. July 17, 1984; Stats.1987, c. 1452, § 363.)

**§ 4492.3. Insufficient stipend funds; pro rata decrease in allocation and number of mentors**

In the event that funds available for purposes of providing stipends to mentor teachers are insufficient to provide stipends for the maximum number of certificated classroom teachers authorized to be designated as mentors pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44492, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall decrease the percentage multiplier established in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 44492 so that the allocation and authorized number of mentors for each participating school district would be decreased on a pro rata basis. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983.)

**§ 4492.5. Report**

On or before November 15, 1983, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall submit a report to the Legislature which shall include the superintendent's plan for the programmatic review of applications submitted by districts for funding pursuant to Section 44492, and a summary of the implementation of the California Mentor Teacher Program to date. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983.)

**§ 4493. District program accounts; use of funds**

Participating school districts receiving funding pursuant to Section 44492 shall establish a special account exclusively for the support of the mentor teacher program. None of the funds allocated by the superintendent pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44492 for purposes of providing stipends to mentor teachers shall be used by the participating district for the cost of administering the program. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983.)

**§ 4494. Mentors; stipend; allocation for personal growth or release time; duration; inclusion of subject in collective bargaining**

(a) On or before September 1 of each year, participating school districts which receive funding pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44492 shall allocate no less than four thousand dollars (\$4,000) to provide each qualified mentor with an additional annual stipend over and above the regular salary to which he or she is entitled. The amount of the annual stipend shall be four thousand dollars (\$4,000) for a full school year of

service as a mentor, or a pro rata share of that amount for less than a full school year of service as a mentor, except that participating school districts which receive funding pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 44492 shall allocate the full amount so received to provide a qualified mentor with an additional annual stipend over and above the regular salary to which he or she is entitled. This stipend shall not be counted as salary or wages for purposes of calculating employer contribution rates or employee benefits under the State Teachers' Retirement System.

(b) A mentor may propose that the district allocate all or part of the stipend for his or her professional growth or release time.

(c) The governing board may designate certificated employees as mentor teachers pursuant to Section 44491 and pay these persons the additional annual stipend authorized under subdivision (a) for a period not to exceed three consecutive school years. Upon completing three years as a mentor teacher, an individual may be reviewed and renominated.

(d) The subject of participation by a school district or an individual certificated classroom teacher in a mentor teacher program shall not be included within the scope of representation in collective bargaining among a public school employer and eligible employee organizations. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 1302, § 13, eff. Sept. 30, 1983.)

**§ 4495. Selection procedures; minimum requirements**

The selection procedures for the designation of certificated classroom teachers as mentor teachers shall, at a minimum, provide for the following:

(a) A selection committee shall be established to nominate candidates for selection as mentor teachers. The majority of the committee shall be composed of certificated classroom teachers chosen to serve on the committee by other certificated classroom teachers. The remainder of the committee shall be composed of school administrators, chosen to serve on the committee by other school administrators. The governing board of a participating school district shall consider including parents, pupils, or other public representatives in the selection process, and may, at its option, include such persons.

(b) Candidates for mentor teacher shall be nominated by the majority vote of the selection committee.

(c) The selection process shall include provisions for classroom observation of candidates by administrators and classroom teachers employed by the district.

(d) The final designation of any person as a mentor teacher shall be by action of the governing board of the school district from persons nominated pursuant to subdivision (b). The governing board may reject any nominations. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983.)

**§ 4496. Mentor teachers; duties and responsibilities; requirements; administrator-teacher ratios**

(a) Persons designated as mentor teachers pursuant to this article shall be assigned duties and responsibilities in accordance with the following:

(1) The primary function of a mentor teacher shall be to provide assistance and guidance to new teachers. A mentor teacher may also provide assistance and guidance to more experienced teachers.

(2) Mentor teachers may provide staff development for teachers, and may develop special curriculum.

(3) A mentor teacher shall not participate in the evaluation of teachers.

## § 44496

## ELEMENTARY &amp; SECONDARY EDUCATION

766  
Title 2

(b) No administrative or pupil personnel services credential shall be required of any mentor teacher. Each mentor teacher shall spend, on the average, not less than 60 percent of his or her time in the direct instruction of pupils.

(c) For the purposes of determining administrator-teacher ratios, mentors shall be considered full-time teachers. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 498, § 28, eff. July 28, 1983. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 1302, § 14, eff. Sept. 30, 1983.)

## § 44497. School district defined

For purposes of this article, "school district" shall include county offices of education. (Added by Stats.1983, c. 1302, § 15, eff. Sept. 30, 1983.)

## ARTICLE 5. NEW CAREERS PROGRAM

## Section

- 44520. In-service preparation in ethnic backgrounds.
- 44521. Participation in program by institutions of higher education.
- 44522. Participation by school districts.
- 44523. Agreements between department of education and participating school districts.
- 44524. Eligibility to participate in program.
- 44525. Preservice program for interns.
- 44526. Selection of interns and team leaders for program.
- 44527. Number of interns under team leader's supervision.
- 44528. Course of study for intern.
- 44529. Teacher education program for interns.
- 44530. Percentage of compensation paid by participating school district.
- 44531. Payment of intern's tuition by participating school district.
- 44532. Adoption of rules and regulations.
- 44533. Reimbursement of school districts.
- 44534. Payment of costs incurred by participating institution of higher education.

## 44520. In-service preparation in ethnic backgrounds

It is the intent and purpose of the Legislature by enacting this chapter to make provisions for a New Careers Program to recruit and train persons who have completed at least 60 units of college work in a community college or a four-year institution of higher education for teaching in low-income elementary schools. It is the further intent and purpose of this chapter to provide a means by which capable persons of low-income background may enter the teaching profession. The New Careers Program is designed to provide practical teaching experience in schools with high concentrations of low-income families, as determined by the Director of Compensatory Education, concurrently with upper division academic and professional education. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44521. Participation in program by institutions of higher education

The University of California, the California State University, or any private institution of higher education may participate in the program prescribed in this article. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 143, § 27.)

## § 44522. Participation by school districts

Any school district may enter into an agreement with the University of California, the California State University, or any private institution of higher education to participate in the New Careers Program prescribed in this article. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 143, § 28.)

## § 44523. Agreements between department of education and participating school districts

The State Department of Education may enter into an agreement with a participating school district to provide training and to share administrative costs and salary support in the New Careers Program prescribed in this article.

A person selected to participate in the program prescribed in this article shall be known as an "intern." (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44524. Eligibility to participate in program

Any person who has completed at least 60 units of collegiate work and who has lived or worked extensively in areas of high concentrations of low-income families, or is a member of a minority racial or ethnic group who has lived and worked extensively in low-income areas, shall be eligible to be selected to participate in the program prescribed in this article. An intern shall be selected on the basis of high teaching potential and shall meet the personal qualifications for the issuance of a credential prescribed in Section 44258. The intern shall give reasonable evidence that he will teach for at least two years following the training program in a school in a low-income area.

Recruitment of interns for this program shall be primarily from two groups: (1) community college or lower division college students or other persons having completed 60 units of college work and (2) teacher aides already employed under Sections 44833, 54481, or 45360 to 45367, inclusive, and other programs providing training and teacher aide experience in the classroom setting. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44525. Preservice program for interns

An intern shall be enrolled in at least a 6-week, but not more than a 12-week, preservice program at the participating university, campus of the California State University, or private institution of higher education. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 143, § 29.)

## § 44526. Selection of interns and team leaders for program

The participating university, state college, or private institution of higher education and school district shall jointly select the interns and team leaders to participate in the program prescribed in this article.

A team leader shall be an experienced teacher who has demonstrated capability in teaching educationally disadvantaged pupils and shall be directly responsible to direct, aid, coordinate, and supervise interns in their internship pursuant to this article in the participating school district. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44527. Number of interns under team leader's supervision

The team leader shall have at least 6 but not more than 10 interns under his supervision. The team leader and his interns shall assist in the teaching process in the participating school district. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977.)

## § 44528. Course of study for intern

An intern shall enroll in a course of study at the participating university, campus of the California State University, or private institution of higher education which will lead to a baccalaureate degree and a teaching credential. (Stats.1976, c. 1010, § 2, operative April 30, 1977. Amended by Stats.1983, c. 143, § 30.)



**APPENDIX F**  
**MEMOS FROM ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT**  
**REGARDING CONTRACT VIOLATIONS: MENTORS**



September 23, 1985

TO:

FROM:

RE: Mentor Teachers

It was brought to my attention that inviting Mentor Teachers to be presenters at the Grade Level Expectations meetings could be in violation of the contract. I have obtained further clarification from and in a meeting held on September 23, 1985, and I am canceling their participation in the planning meeting scheduled for September 24 at 3:30 p.m. in the Curriculum Conference Room, and the inservice sessions scheduled for October 1, 2, 3, and 10.

The Curriculum Coordinators and I are pleased that you will be meeting with us on September 24, at 9 a.m., to clarify procedures for working with the Mentor Teachers. Would you please provide us with written copies of the procedure we are to use when requesting services of the Mentors. Also, we welcome any other information that you could furnish that will assist in our working relationship with the Mentors.

Attached, for your information, is a copy of a communication that was mailed to the Mentor Teachers who were requested to assist in the October presentations. In the future, any formal communication to the Mentors from me will come through you, the administrator assigned to the Mentor Teacher Program.

If there are questions, please do not hesitate to call.



Assistant Superintendent  
Instructional Services

September 23, 1985

TO: ..... Representative

FROM: .....

RE: Recap of Meeting Regarding The Role of the Mentor Teacher

It was a pleasure meeting with you in your role as ..... representative, and assisting me in my understanding of the operation of the Mentor Teacher program at ..... School District.

I had requested, through memo, the participation of six Mentor Teachers in the presentation of the Grade Level Expectations in a series of teacher meetings. You related that several Mentor Teachers had contacted you in reference to this request. Their major concern was that they did not write the expectations; they had only edited them, and did not feel comfortable in presenting them at the meetings scheduled for October 1, 2, and 3.

I related that my reason for inviting them to participate as presenters at the meetings was a direct result of a comment made by the Governing Board president at the September 10, Board meeting. He commended the staff for a good job and expressed the desire that Mentor Teachers be acknowledged for their contribution to this major task. My invitation to the Mentors to be a part of presenting the expectations was in response to this comment. I understand from you that the Mentor Teacher agreement between the ..... and the District is to "promote teachers as assisting teachers". This was precisely my concept of their participation in the Grade Level Expectation meetings. Since it's not possible to have them as presenters, I understand from you that they will be available to answer questions in reference to their ability to assist teachers as they implement the expectations.

You requested that I send you a copy of all my communications with the Mentors. I related that in order to keep communications clear I plan to do any further formal communication to the Mentors through ..... who has been assigned as the administrator for the program. Thanks so much for your time and for assisting me in obtaining a greater understanding of how the Mentor Teacher Program works in our District.

If there are questions in the future, please do not hesitate to call me.

cc: .....



Assistant Superintendent  
Instructional Services  
September 23, 1985

TO:

FROM:

RE: Participation as Presenters at the Grade Level Expectations Meetings

Your participation at the Grade Level Expectations meetings scheduled for October 1, 2, 3, and 10th was questioned. Clarification on this issue revealed that your participation as presenters is not in keeping with the original agreement with CVEA.

Many thanks to those of you who called earlier confirming your participation. I have canceled your participation in both the planning session scheduled for September 24, 1985, and your participation on the agendas of the October 1, 2, 3, and 10th meetings.

Mary Lou Meerson, the Curriculum Coordinators, and I, have a meeting scheduled for September 24, at 9 a.m. At that time we will receive information on the types of services you are authorized to provide.

In the future I will make formal communication to you through the administration in charge of the Mentor Teacher Program.

If there are questions do not hesitate to call.

cc:

**APPENDIX G**  
**TEACHER ASSOCIATION CONTRACT:**  
**MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM**

**ADDENDUM 1****MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM****I. Philosophy**

- A. The Mentor Program shall provide avenues of initiative and creativity which would encourage teachers to remain in classroom teaching.
- B. The Mentor Program shall attempt to improve classroom instruction in the District by meeting identified teacher needs.
- C. The primary function of the mentor teacher is to assist other classroom teachers with specifically identified areas of need.
- D. This program is not a "merit pay" plan but one in which a very small percentage of teachers are allowed to earn a stipend.
- E. Mentors are not to be regarded as administrators, and shall not be assigned administrative duties.
- F. Mentor duties shall be designed to impact children in classroom groupings rather than meeting student needs on an individual basis.

**II. Selection Committee**

- A. The Selection Committee shall consist of seven full-time classroom teachers, five administrators, and one parent.
- B. Fixed rotating terms: three teachers off the first year, four teachers off the second year. The teachers are to be replaced on the committee based on grade level representation.
- C. Teachers who plan to apply for the Mentor Program may not serve on the Selection Committee.
- D. Procedure for electing teacher members:
  - 1. The representative at each school site shall hold an election to nominate, by secret ballot, one candidate for the Selection Committee, except for junior highs and middle school which will select two.
  - \*2. Voting is to be done by certificated teachers of permanent or probationary status.

- \*3. The selected names will be submitted to . . . All submitted names will be placed on a District ballot from which teachers will choose seven to serve on the committee, two will be junior high or middle school and five will be elementary teachers. . . will submit election procedures and ballot materials to the District prior to the election.
- \*4. Votes will be counted by and Administration designees.
- 5. From election results, a list of two junior high and four elementary alternates will be established to fill vacancies occurring before the next year's election.
- 6. The list of members and alternates will be printed by the District within three days of the election.

### III. Eligibility to Serve as Mentor

- A. Any classroom teacher who meets the following qualifications is eligible to seek classification as a mentor teacher. (Classroom teachers are all certificated teachers with permanent status who directly instruct children for a minimum of 200 minutes each school day and are employed by the District on a full-time basis).
  - 1. Has achieved permanent status.
  - 2. Has substantial recent experience in classroom instruction.
    - a. Recent is three out of the last five years in the classroom.
    - b. Applicant must be a classroom teacher in the District during the school year application is made.
    - c. In the event mentor openings occur during summer recess, the applicant must have been a classroom teacher in the District the prior school year.
  - 3. Has demonstrated exemplary teaching ability.
  - 4. Submits a written application for participation prior to the established deadline.
  - 5. Submits written release of evaluations to be removed from personnel file (entire file not to be viewed by committee members).
  - 6. Mentor teachers shall not participate in administrative intern programs during their regularly assigned contract day.

#### IV. Selection of Mentor

- \*A. Principals will be responsible for seeing that all teachers have direct access to:
  - 1. Description of Mentor Program and duties.
  - 2. Application form and consent form.
  - 3. Information about deadlines and application.
  - 4. Information concerning training and time commitment required.
- \*B. Mentor teacher applications are to be submitted to the Personnel Office.
- C. Selection Committee will meet as necessary to visit classes, review evaluations, and deliberate. Release time will be arranged using only administrative funds provided by the program.
  - 1. Observations are restricted to members of the committee who are classroom teachers or administrators in the District. (#44495C State regulation).
  - 2. Mentor nominees are to be notified in advance of committee observations if candidate so desires.
  - 3. Methods of indirect observation, such as videotaping, shall not be used except with express written consent of candidate.
- \*D. Mentor nominations will be submitted to the Governing Board.
- E. The Governing Board may reject any recommended nominee, but shall designate as mentors only teachers who are recommended by the Selection Committee process.
- F. The Selection Committee may designate a list of alternates to cover mentor vacancies occurring during the year.
- G. Should full funding not occur, the Selection Committee shall recommend to the Governing Board which mentor positions will be filled.
- H. The Administration shall consult with President to determine mentor position job descriptions when:
  - 1. New mentor positions open from the state.
  - 2. Existing mentor positions are evaluated as needing change.



**V. Mentor Duties****A. Teacher assistance:**

1. Mentors may assist classroom teachers as a result of:
  - a. Written request initiated by classroom teacher.
  - b. Recommendation following unsatisfactory evaluation.
  - c. Voluntary participation in a District program where mentors are already included.
2. Mentors will not evaluate teachers.
3. Assistance will be limited to specific areas identified before mentor involvement.
4. Mentor teachers shall not have any authority over any other teacher by virtue of his/her position as a mentor teacher.

**B. Mentor teachers may provide staff development for teachers and may develop special curriculum.****C. Time**

1. Eighty percent or more of a mentor's time must be spent in his/her regular classroom.
  - a. Release time will primarily be limited to assisting other teachers in the classroom setting.
  - b. Conferences, meetings, and training will take place outside the mentor's regular teaching day whenever possible.
  - c. Time spent out of the classroom during the school day will not be documented toward mentor pay.
  - d. Mentor teachers will not be exempted from any usual assignments or meetings required of other staff members.
2. Prior to June 10, the duration of each mentor term will be evaluated for possible extension, not to exceed three years. The selection committee shall recommend to the Governing Board mentor assignment extensions.

**D. Funds**

1. Stipend monies will be paid quarterly.
2. Each mentor's duties will be evaluated quarterly. The balance of a stipend will be withheld from any employee who has ceased to perform his/her duties.
3. When the stipend is completely distributed, the mentor is released from all mentor duties and expectations until further funding is supplied.
4. No expense required for the operation of this program including release time, shall be budgeted or charged to the general fund or to any mentor stipend.

**VI. Evaluation of Mentor Teachers**

The teachers shall be evaluated only as specified in Article XII of the contract. In addition, the District shall independently evaluate mentor teachers in relationship to the Mentor Program.

\*Dates to be agreed upon by \_\_\_\_\_ and Administration each year.

**APPENDIX H**  
**TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION CONTRACT:**  
**EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

**ARTICLE XII: EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

1. It is understood and agreed by both parties that the principal objective is to maintain or improve the professional performance of the teacher, thereby increasing the quality of education in the District. (See Addendum 3, Certificated Appraisal System, and Addendum 4, Certificated Appraisal System/Special Education Teachers)
2. The District shall evaluate and assess employee competency as it reasonably relates to:
  - A. The progress of pupils toward the standards of expected student achievement at each grade level in each area of study.
  - B. The instructional techniques and strategies used by the teacher.
  - C. The teacher's adherence to curricular objectives.
  - D. The establishment and maintenance of a suitable learning environment within the scope of the teacher's responsibilities.
  - E. Adjunct duties or job responsibilities.
  - F. The evaluation and assessment of employee competence shall not include the use of publishers' norms established by standardized tests.
3. Evaluations shall not refer to: (a) a teacher's freedom of speech or use of materials unless such speech or use of materials interfere with the educational processes of the District or (b) the private, political, or organizational activities of any teacher unless such activities interfere with the educational processes of the District.
4. Alleged facts or hearsay statements about a teacher shall not be used in the evaluation of a teacher or to justify an adverse action unless the Governing Board, or designated representative, confirms the accuracy of the alleged facts or statements and notifies the affected teacher in writing that an adverse action may be taken.
5. The immediate supervisor and the teacher shall meet and discuss the elements upon which the evaluation is to be based. These elements shall be constrained by anomalies such as class size, intellectual abilities of learners, and the learning environment provided.
6. Every probationary teacher or preschool teacher shall be evaluated in writing by the immediate supervisor at least once each school year.
7. Every permanent teacher shall be evaluated in writing by the immediate supervisor at least once every other school year.
8. Evaluation summaries shall be submitted to the Personnel Office by May 1 of each year.

9. Each formal evaluation shall be based upon at least two (2) observations, and shall be followed by an evaluation conference in which the evaluator and the teacher shall review the observations and what is to be incorporated into the written evaluation. At least three (3) observations shall take place prior to negative comments or judgments being included in the evaluation. The immediate supervisor shall base the evaluation on information collected through observation and conferences, and first hand knowledge of the total performance of the teacher.
10. When any permanent certificated teacher has received an unsatisfactory evaluation, the District shall annually evaluate the teacher until the teacher achieves a positive evaluation or is separated from the District.

The immediate supervisor shall take action to assist in correcting any cited deficiencies. Such action shall include specific recommendations for improvement and assistance by the Administration in implementing such recommendations. The District may require the teacher with cited deficiencies to participate in performance improvement programs. Such participation shall be at no cost to the teacher unless mutually agreed upon.

11. Recognition for outstanding performance should be given and reference to this effect placed in the teacher's personnel file.
12. For purposes of evaluation review and upon written authorization by a teacher, a representative of the Association shall be permitted to examine material in that teacher's file. Copies of material from an individual teacher's file may be removed only by that individual.
13. Certificated staff not assigned to a regular classroom, who are on a single school site for 80 percent of their assignment, will be evaluated by their immediate supervisor, the school principal, with ongoing communication regarding program from district-level department personnel responsible for the job category.
14. Certificated staff not assigned to a regular classroom, who are on multiple school sites for their assignment, will be evaluated by their immediate supervisor (district-level department personnel designated as supervisor), with ongoing communication regarding program from the principals at sites where the person has been assigned.

#### ARTICLE XIII: PARENT COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

##### 1. Public Concern

- A. Parental or guardian concerns involving members of the bargaining unit may be presented to the immediate supervisor or his/her designee, however, parents or guardians with concerns should be encouraged to present them first to the employee who is the subject of the concern.
- B. If the concern involves a member of the bargaining unit, the immediate supervisor or his/her designee and/or bargaining member shall seek a solution to the concern.

**APPENDIX I**  
**CERTIFICATED APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT**

## CERTIFICATED APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ School: \_\_\_\_\_ School Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Assignment: \_\_\_\_\_ Probationary ( ) Permanent ( ) Temporary ( ) Recommended for Tenure? Yes ( ) No ( )

**Instructions:**

Please write in the rating (AS = Above standard, usually exceeds the standards for good performance; S = Standard, professionally competent, doing a good job, and NI = Needs improvement) that best approximates the performance of the certificated employee for each factor below. If any areas are marked "NI," please comment and include how the area might be improved. Comments in other areas are also welcome.

OVERALL APPRAISAL: ABOVE AVERAGE/SATISFACTORY ( ) UNSATISFACTORY ( )

Factors	Rating (AS, S, or NI)	Commendations or Need for Improvement (Use additional pages if needed)
<b><u>PROGRESS OF PUPILS TOWARD GRADE LEVEL DISTRICT STANDARDS</u></b>		
1. The teacher uses the grade level expectancies to develop instructional objectives.		
2. The teacher maintains records on each pupil's performance in the areas of basic skills.		
3. The teacher evaluates pupil progress in relationship to the expected performance on grade level expectancies. (Judgment is based upon observations and objective information.)		
4. The overall achievement of pupils equals the expected pupil performance		
<b><u>USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES</u></b>		
5. The teacher diagnoses pupils' performance abilities		
6. The teacher clearly states the purpose of the instruction to the pupil		
7. The teacher provides adequate explanation of the learning before pupils are expected to put the learning into practice		
8. The teacher provides pupils with the opportunity to practice the learning before making assignment or testing		
9. The teacher provides additional practice to pupils through related seat work or homework		
10. The teacher plans a variety of learning opportunities for pupils		
11. The teacher selects materials that are appropriate for the lesson taught		
12. The teacher uses the grade level expectancies to develop instructional objectives		

Factors	Rating (AS, S, or NI)	Commendations or Need for Improvement (Use additional pages if needed)
<b><u>USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES (con't)</u></b>		
13. The teacher uses various techniques to motivate pupils		
14. The teacher individualizes the groups for instruction when and where appropriate to meet the needs of pupils.		
<b><u>ADHERENCE TO CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES</u></b>		
15. The teacher follows the adopted course of study to plan instruction		
<b><u>ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF A SUITABLE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</u></b>		
16. The teacher provides a safe physical environment		
17. The teacher implements a discipline plan and promotes fair and consistent practices to maintain classroom control		
18. The teacher demonstrates acceptance of all students, including those with special needs, by creating a positive learning environment		
19. The teacher encourages pupil time on task on appropriate activities		
20. The teacher encourages pupils to achieve a high success rate on work assigned		
<b><u>ADJUNCT DUTIES</u></b>		
21. The teacher assumes adjunct duties as equitably assigned to the staff		
22. The teacher participates in applicable professional growth activities		
23. The teacher adheres to the rules and regulations of the school and District including the Teacher Code of Ethics		
24. Non-management certificated personnel other than classroom teachers perform the duties described in their job description		

**OTHER REMARKS:**

---



---



---

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluators

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluatee (Signature of Evaluatee doesn't necessarily signify agreement)

\_\_\_\_\_  
D