THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT IN TITLE I

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS THAT MADE ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

by

REBECCA CARTER GIBSON

(Under the Direction of William W. Swan)

ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether there were significant differences in the perception of certified employees of nine effective site-based management categories at eight Title I elementary schools in one school system in Georgia that made Adequate Yearly Progress. The SBM Characteristics Rating Scale, which was used to measure the perceptions of certified employees at each of the eight Title I elementary schools, was developed from research of the literature.

The SBM Characteristics Rating Scale consisted of twenty items in nine categories which were subscales of the survey. The categories were (1) Central Office Support, (2) Clarify Roles and Responsibilities, (3) Focus on Student Learning, (4) Use of the Collaborative Process, (5) Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need, (6) Development of a Belief System, (7) Build Positive Relationships with the Community (8) Strong Leadership at the School Level, and (9) Assess and Monitor Student Progress in Target Areas. Content validity was established and reliability was determined with certified employees in Title I elementary schools in counties surrounding the school system in which the eight schools in the study were located.

The results of the ANOVA found that there were no statistically significant differences among the schools in five of the SBM categories: (1) Central Office Support; (2) Focus on Student Learning; (3) Use of the Collaborative Process; (4) Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities; and (5) Strong Leadership at the School Level. There were statistically significant differences at the .05 level among the schools in four categories: Provide Knowledge and Skill in Focused Areas of Need; Development of a Belief System; Build Positive Relationships with the Community; and Assess and Monitor Student Progress in Targeted Areas.

It is recommended that the SBM Characteristics Rating Scale be administered to other Title I elementary schools with similar disaggregated subgroups but different AYP results to determine if there are statistically significant differences in perception of SBM categories at the schools. It is recommended that non-Title I schools continue to study the five categories that indicated there were no statistically significant differences with other schools to see if results are consistent. Further, it is recommended to study the four categories that indicated that there were statistically significant differences with other schools to see if results are consistent.

INDEX WORDS: Site-based management, Adequate Yearly Progress, Restructured
                schools, School-based management, School improvement, Shared
                decision-making, Title I

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT IN TITLE I

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS THAT MADE ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

by

REBECCA CARTER GIBSON

B.A., West Georgia College, 1971

M.P.A., University of Georgia, 1973

Ed.S., West Georgia College, 1986

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2005

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT IN TITLE I

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS THAT MADE ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

By

REBECCA CARTER GIBSON

Major Professor: William W. Swan

Committee: John Dayton
                     Thomas Holmes

Electronic Version Approved

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2005

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my son and daughter, Carter and Christina, for

giving me two wonderful reasons for starting this journey, and to my mother, Mary Ruth

Carter, for inspiring me to continue my journey to its completion.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the individuals who helped make this dissertation possible.

Dr. Bill Swan, whose attention to academics and detail made this journey and its product something of which I am proud.

Drs. Mel Hayden and Lucy Welzant-Hayden who were always just a phone call away and helped me by proofreading my work and analyze and understand the data.

Dr. David Gregory and Dr. Bob Heaberlin, both graduates of the University of Georgia educational leadership program, constantly reminded me that this journey would eventually end in triumph.

Catherine Waczkowski, my colleague for four years, who always reminded me that I need to finish this that I started.

Katrina Aycock, Lydia Dumas, and Carole Newell who reminded me that other people did it and so could I.

To all of the people in the Coweta County School System who helped me in numerous ways throughout this process, I thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In *A Nation At Risk*, the National Commission on Excellence in Education invoked a sense

of urgency in the American people when it stated the following:

> Part of what is at risk is the promise first made on this continent. All, regardless of race
> or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing
> their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost. This promise means that all
> children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature
> and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment, and to manage their own
> lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself.
> (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 8)

Consequently, the Education Commission of the States reported that states could most

effectively influence education reform by establishing the preconditions to enhance or build

improvement, including creating a school environment that enabled and empowered teachers and

administrators. From this report, many surmised school improvement would follow if teachers

and administrators were given greater authority, more opportunities, and more resources for

making decisions about programs at their schools and school districts (Shedd & Bacharach,

1991). These findings seemingly had a significant impact on educational institutions, especially

the public schools across America. One noteworthy impact was the creation of site-based

management in many public schools and systems in the United States (Shields, et al., 1995).

Site-based Management (SBM) is a process or structure from which shared decision making can

take place at the school site with the goal of improving student achievement (McColskey,

Mikow, & Bingham, 1998).

Against the backdrop of educational research from the 1980s and early 1990s,

Barnett and Whitaker (1996) added the concept that, in addition to *A Nation at Risk*, reform was

demanded by the general public. They cited three reasons: (1) Factors such as declining test

scores, reduced U.S. competitiveness in the global economic market, and graduates' lack of job skills all tell the general public that schools are failing to meet society's needs; (2) the roles of teachers and administrators must be redesigned to affect student outcomes or improve student achievement; (3) market forces, school choice movement, and accountability are forcing schools to change.

By 2001, the federal government and the new Republican administration were taking a more proactive role in educational reform and improving schools. With the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001, schools and districts were handed more accountability requirements to be used for monitoring student performance and continuous improvement. For instance, as a result of NCLB, schools and districts have been mandated to not only improve overall or average student performance on standardized tests, but also to improve performance among all subgroups or subcategories in the school population. One NCLB stipulation requires that school-level test data be disaggregated and reported according to the variables of race or ethnicity, limited English proficiency, socio-economic status, students with disabilities, and sex. (Jerald & Haycock, 2002; NCLB, 2001). This kind of accountability, i.e., monitoring of subgroup performance at each school, has made the school site an even greater focal point in educational reform. In addition, it has added greater responsibility, or even burden, to all school stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, parents, and the community, to take more effective action about meeting the specific educational needs of all students (Candoli, 1995; Jerald & Haycock, 2002).

Based on the research of the 1980s and 1990s, the public's outcry for greater accountability and as a response to NCLB, school leaders increasingly have implemented SBM. They hoped to significantly improve educational practices at the school site and, thus, improve student

achievement. These leaders want to empower their school staff to create conditions that will improve student achievement, foster innovations, and encourage continuous professional growth (Carnegie Forum, 1986). SBM advocates believed that it and increased professional autonomy would replace the need for bureaucratic regulations. Consequently, district leaders would increase each individual school's autonomy, in exchange for the staff assuming responsibility for results (David, 1989). For instance, research findings of the late 1990s indicated that, as schools made a transition to SBM, they fundamentally changed their capacity for improvement by increasing school stakeholder involvement, especially in school-level management (McNeil & McNeil, 1994; Wohlstetter, Van Kirk, Robertson, & Mohrman, 1997).

There are many rationales that support the value of SBM. While there is no compelling theoretical foundation explaining the relationship between decentralized school management and improved student achievement, those who advocate the practice cite that positive results occur when schools receive more autonomy and decision-making is decentralized within a district. They suggested three fundamental tenets as a basis for their advocacy: (1) Those closest to the school/students will make better decisions about educational programs than those who are removed from the teaching and learning process; (2) curricula, instructional technologies, and other programmatic educational features will be most effective and enduring when the decisions about them are made and carried out by those who feel a strong sense of ownership and responsibility for them; (3) when key areas of decision-making authority are shifted to the local level, accountability will increase (Drury, 1999; Lane, 1991; Lindle, 1996; Summers & Johnson, 1996). "Presumably, if teachers and parents exert significant influence on significant issues, other benefits, such as better quality decisions, more humane work environments, more equitable educational opportunities, and noticeable improvements in teaching and learning will follow"

(Brown & Hunter, 1998; Malen, 1999). Others (Brown & Hunter, 1998; David, 1996; Gleason, Donohue, & Leader, 1996; Robertson & Briggs, 1998; Wolf, 2002) suggested that the promise of improved student learning through SBM has not been achieved, especially in terms of current standards for student achievement.

Despite the lack of positive research data that supports a positive relationship between decentralized school management and improved student achievement, SBM as a reform innovation continues to expand in the public schools. Reasons for the continued expansion of SBM practices are numerous. It does not call for new or additional funds, or require busing of students to promote desegregation; no change in school boundaries is required to improve socio-economic balance among student populations (Brown & Hunter, 1998). Advocates of SBM have argued that bureaucracies at all levels have hampered the implementation and institutionalization of constructive initiatives. They have suggested that even though thousands of our nation's public schools have implemented SBM, the vast majority of them have central offices that have retained control of crucial decisions. Another important assertion that advocates make is that SBM only begins the process of school improvement. Schools that seriously want to change must provide their faculties with the tools they need to develop practices that would improve student achievement (Murname & Levi, 1996).

Educators at all levels realize that they must find practices and support policies that will build their own school's capacity to improve. They realize too that all school stakeholders must be involved in effective decision making on behalf of their unique students (Ponessa, 1996). They must provide support to develop knowledge about effective practices, to encourage their ability to analyze and respond to problems and needs, and to provide incentives for being collectively responsive and responsible to the children and communities they serve (Darling-

4

Hammond, 1995). Some researchers believe that teacher empowerment is the key. Glickman

(1989) wrote, "The theory of professional empowerment is that, when given collective

responsibility to make educational decisions in an information-rich environment, educators will

work harder and smarter on behalf of their clients: the students and their parents" (Glickman,

1989, p. 69).

<div align="center">Statement of the Problem</div>

The problem of this study is to determine the site-based management characteristics of Title

I elementary schools that improve student achievement and make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Schools all over the nation struggle to improve student academic achievement. Historically,

disaggregated data according to specific subgroups (race or ethnicity, limited English

proficiency, socio-economic status, students with disabilities, and sex) have shown that not all

students have achieved grade level proficiency in mathematics and reading. The federal

government, through No Child Left Behind legislation, has mandated that students in all

subgroups make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading and in mathematics. Schools must

administer tests each year to determine whether their students made AYP. This mandate is

particularly difficult for Title I schools that receive federal funds to help educate larger

percentages of students in subgroups that are at greater risk of failing.

<div align="center">Purpose of the Study</div>

The purpose for this study was to investigate whether there were statistically significant

differences in the mean perception of certified employees of nine effective SBM categories at

each of the eight Title I elementary schools in a school system in Georgia. The nine effective

SBM strategies were: (1) central office support; (2) clarify roles and responsibilities of staff; (3)

focus on student learning; (4) use of the collaborative process; (5) provide knowledge and skills

<div align="center">5</div>

in focused areas of need; (6) develop a belief system; (7) build positive relationships with the community; (8) strong leadership at the school level; and (9) assess and monitor student progress in targeted areas.

Null Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis – There are no statistically significant differences in mean perception of certificated employees of each of nine effective SBM categories which met AYP across eight Title I elementary schools in a school system in Georgia. The nine effective categories are: (1) central office support; (2) clarify roles and responsibilities of staff; (3) focus on student learning; (4) use of the collaborative process; (5) provide knowledge and skills in focused areas of need; (6) develop a belief system; (7) build positive relationships with the community; (8) strong leadership at the school level; and (9) assess and monitor student progress in targeted areas.

Justification of the Study

Schools are scrutinized by parents, businesses, state governments, and the federal government more than ever before to ascertain whether or not student achievement is improving. Since *A Nation At Risk* was published in 1983, schools have struggled to put in place programs and processes that will improve student achievement. One such process has been SBM. Beginning in the 1980s, schools adopted SBM as one of the processes because it held the promise of supporting their efforts to improve student achievement. A study in 1994 revealed that nearly two-thirds of the schools in the study had implemented SBM (McColskey, et al., 1998). Unfortunately, the primary goal of SBM, to improve student achievement, did not materialize (Malen, 1999; McNeil & McNeil, 1994).

Educational researchers, who have stated that SBM can be effective as a process that is part of systemic change for schools and school districts, also stated that the improvement in student

achievement resulting from systemic change could take years. Although the compilation of data

on systemic change could take years, the characteristics of SBM schools that have already

improved student achievement could provide other schools with a knowledge that they might use

to improve their SBM process. Malen (1999) observed:

> We could capitalize on understandings gleaned from studies that zoom in on how
> principals, teachers, and parents create safe places, hospitable spaces where people
> can speak their minds, address salient issues, and tether more democratic governance
> processes to substantive educational improvements. (p. 216)

Constraints/Limitations of the Study

The sample included the principal, the leadership team, and the faculty in each of eight

elementary schools that have been designated Title I school-wide in one suburban west Georgia

public school district. Therefore, generalizations of the research findings are limited to this

school district or similar school districts.

Definition of Terms

The following are definitions of terms used in this study:

Adequate Yearly Progress – A measure of year-to-year student achievement on statewide

assessments.

Elementary – Schools with grades from pre-kindergarten through fifth grades.

Leadership Team – A formal structure based at the school site that makes decisions

concerning its policies and procedures and that consists of representatives from the various

elements of the school community based on parameters set by the central office.

School Building Leadership Team (SBLT) – The leadership team that is in place and is an

integral part of every school in the school system in this study.

Site-Based Management (SBM) **-** A process and structure from which shared decision making can take place at the school site with the goal of improving student achievement (McColskey, et al., 1998).

Summary

Chapter I included an overview of the area being investigated, discussion and importance of this study, the statement of the problem, the hypothesis, justification of the study, constraints/limitations, and the definition of terms. Chapter II includes a review of the literature and research that is related to the study with sections on leadership teams, characteristics of effective site-based management teams, and strategies of effective site-based management teams. Chapter III contains the research design and a description of the population. It also contains a description of the procedures used for the collection and treatment of the data. Chapter IV contains the analysis of the data from leadership teams, teachers, and principals. Chapter V contains the summary of the study and conclusions based on the analysis of the data. Recommendations for future study are also discussed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter includes four sections: (1) introduction to site-based management; (2) leadership teams; (3) characteristics of effective site-based management; and (4) strategies that develop effective site-based management teams. The literature indicates that leadership teams, which may be the governing bodies for site-based management, have become an integral part of the restructuring movement in public schools for two decades since the widely disseminated 1983 publication, *A Nation At Risk*. In it, the National Commission on Excellence in Education called for principals and superintendents to play crucial leadership roles in developing school and community support for the reforms it proposed, and for school boards to provide them with the professional development and other support they require to carry out their leadership role effectively.

Public school systems responded by creating leadership teams in schools and school districts across the country. In a survey of a nationally representative sample of school districts, two-thirds of the districts reported having started school-based reform efforts with leadership teams (Shields et al., 1995). Even though leadership teams have been established and are in operation in our public schools, limited research has been conducted which relates the strengths of leadership teams to student learning (Wohlstetter, et al., 1997).

Today, public schools are in the middle of an age of accountability. "Policy analysts at the federal level and the state level continually assert that the schools are no longer producing the type of educated students needed to sustain our country and, therefore, that the nation is in peril" (Enderlin-Lampe, 1997). *A Nation At Risk* (1983) challenged schools, parents,

9

businesses, and communities to collectively improve public education for all students. Georgia's A-Plus Education Reform Act of 2000 sought to improve student achievement by overhauling the education system. As a result of this new law, a new agency would . . . measure individual school performance, publish results by race and class, reward improving schools, and require interventions for 'failing' schools. In addition, new curriculum-based standardized tests will measure student achievement in every grade. State law will hold teachers and schools accountable using the results of the standardized tests. (Kintisch, 2000, p. 2)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 challenges school leaders to improve student achievement according to the following subgroups: race/ethnicity, gender, English language proficiency, disability, and low-income status. Prior to this, schools had not been required to report student achievement data on disaggregated groups. Federal mandates, state standards, and local board of education requirements have placed more demands on the time and energy of school officials than ever before, and schools need to dedicate their time to developing successful practices that are research based (Jerald & Haycock, 2002).

<div align="center">Site-Based Management</div>

During the past two decades, SBM has been defined and explained. One fundamental concept that has been maintained with site-based management is that it is the devolution of authority.

Under this system of governance, schools, in effect become deregulated from the central office. The basic message is one of expanded local control and influence with schools being given greater responsibility for their own affairs. The strategy of improvement is bottom up change. School-based management is thus primarily an alteration in organizational arrangements in school systems. Authority and influence pass from higher to lower levels of organization. (Murphy, 1997, p. 39)

McColskey, et al., (1998) defined SBM as a process and structure from which shared decision-making can take place at the school site with the goal of improved student performance. It is a shared process in which parents, teachers, the principal, and the school staff are all involved in making many of the decisions for the local school. It is "a change in the school

governance structure that increases and, in fact, concentrates authority at the school level"
(Kopczynski, 2000, p. 229). David (1989) asserted this equation: school-based management =
autonomy + shared decision-making. This means that (1) the school is the primary decision-
making unit as decisions should be made at the lowest possible level and (2) change requires
ownership that comes from the opportunity to participate in defining change and the flexibility to
adapt it to individual circumstances.

Drury (1999) defined SBM as "a reform aimed at restructuring public education through the
realignment of power relations and at the district and school levels" (p. ix). Advocates of SBM
provide three tenets about the educators and parents who are involved in the process. First,
educators already have the requisite information and knowledge to improve student achievement.
Teachers and parents who are closest to the students and know their characteristics can make
better decisions about their educational programs than those professionals who are removed from
the students in their school. Second, increased commitment to improved educational programs
will be the immediate result of staff involvement in decision-making. School personnel have
more ownership in making the educational programs work. And third, because it happens at the
school site, SBM will produce greater accountability in schools. When local school personnel
have the responsibility to make decisions about key areas of the school programs, their
accountability will increase (Drury, 1999).

Proponents of SBM have referred to it as debureaucratization of schools in that it is an effort
to modify the governance structure of schools by moving authority into the local school. They
expected two results: Improvements in school performance and democratization of control of
schools that will align the school more closely with the preferences of its participants (Mohrman
& Wohlstetter, 1994).

Reynolds (1997) explained that SBM has three essential components. First, delegate the authority to individual schools to make decisions about the educational programs of the school including staffing, budget, and programs. Second, adopt a shared decision making model at the school level with a management team including the principal, teachers, parents, and sometimes students and other community members. Third, expect that SBM will facilitate leadership in school improvement efforts.

The concept of SBM is that local parents and teachers know their students best and through cooperative efforts they can develop appropriate programs that their children need to achieve. The concept suggests that certain decisions are the purview of the local site which should, therefore, have precedence over the central office on these decisions. Decisions that are typically decentralized to the local school are those that directly affect the student such as program decisions, curriculum decisions, time allocation decisions, and instructional decisions (Candoli, 1995).

> SBM may take at least three quite different forms, most obviously distinguished by where the locus of decision-making power lies – administrators, school professionals, or members of the community served by the school. Each form of SBM can be further distinguished by the purposes it is intended to serve; basic assumptions on which it is premised; which decision areas are usually addressed; and the typical role and membership of the site council, an evitable feature common to all forms of SBM. (Leithwood and Menzies, 1998, pp. 233-234)

"Administration controlled SBM is aimed at increasing accountability to the central district or board office for the efficient expenditure of resources . . . by giving local school administrators greater authority and influence over such key decision areas as budget, personnel and curriculum" (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbeck, 1999, p.13). To accomplish this goal, the principal may consult with teachers, parents, students, and/or community representatives (David, 1996; Leithwood, et al., 1999). The goal of professional controlled SBM:

. . . is to make better use of the teachers' knowledge in such key decision areas as budget, curriculum and (occasionally) personnel. Basic to this form of SBM is the assumption that professionals closest to the student have the most relevant knowledge for making such decisions, and that full participation in the decision-making process will increase their commitment to implementing whatever decisions are made. (Leithwood, et al., 1999, p. 13)

Community control forms of SBM have two purposes: to increase the accountability to parents and the community and to increase consumer satisfaction. The basic assumption for community control forms of SBM is that the school curriculum should reflect the preferences of parents and the local community (Candoli, 1995; Leithwood et al., 1999; Mohrman & Wohlstetter, 1994). Collectively, researchers acknowledge that the meaning of SBM varies in terms of participants and scope but that overall "it involves changing school governance, moving in some way from a top-down approach to a bottom-up approach" (Midgley & Wood, 1993).

SBM is a political reform that was initiated to broaden the decision-making base, either within the school, the larger community, or both (David, 1996). In this approach, the school-based management gives the local school participants – educators, parents, students, and the community at large – power to improve their school. It modifies the governance structure by moving authority to make decisions to the local school. By moving governance and management decisions to local stakeholders, those with the most at stake are empowered to do something about how the school is performing (Mohrman & Wohlstetter, 1994). Another definition using the political approach suggested that, when individual schools are charged with the total development of educational programs aimed at serving the needs of the children in attendance at the particular school, the school personnel will develop cogent programs because they know the students and their needs (Candoli, 1995).

Enderlin-Lampe (1997) asserted that SBM as a reform is erroneous. Instead, SBM is a methodology for school management. It should not be seen as a complete answer to our nation's

educational problems, but it can make change easier by shifting decisions about resource

allocation from centralized bureaucracies to school-based teams (Murnane & Levy, 1996).

Nationwide, many educators have been confused on this issue. As a reform in and of itself,

teacher participation in the SBM change initiative would center on an alternative strategy for

school management and decision making which would not necessarily include improving student

achievement (Enderlin-Lampe, 1997; Midgley & Wood, 1993).

It is difficult to generalize SBM because the definitions, explanations, and theories about it

are complex; the motivation for decentralization is not uniform; and proposals and actual

practices often vary greatly across school sites – even within districts (Beck & Murphy, 1996;

McNeil & McNeil, 1994). An analysis of the definitions shows that they all share three features.

First, there is shared governance at the local school level. Second, it consists of parents,

teachers, administrators, and community and/or business leaders. And third, the leadership team

makes decisions that affect the local school because they know their students better than those

who are removed from the local school setting. Additionally, Mohrman and Wohlstetter (1994)

suggested that there is much, much more to SBM than just its common features. They stated that

“. . . SBM is not simply a set of decisions about the governance system; rather, it is the creation

of a whole set of organizational design features that enable the school-level participants to

greatly enhance their influence and their involvement in the creation of high-performing schools”

Mohrman & Wohlstetter, 1994, p. 13).

Benefits/Advantages of Site-Based Management

Proponents of site-based management frequently cite its benefits to educators. Reynolds

(1997) listed four:

The quality of decisions about educational programs will improve if the decisions are made
by the persons with the greatest knowledge about a school and its students. (2) Change is

constant and requires that individual schools are increasingly flexible and responsive. (3) Change mandated from the top does not work. (4) Participation in decision making will result in higher levels of commitment, effort, and morale. (p. 2)

Reston, Brown, and Cooper (2000) found that school leadership, school climate, student achievement, and community involvement could all improve with SBM initiatives. As a result of the study, they believed that the positive benefits of SBM may be worth considering for more of our public schools.

With the site-based decision-making model, staff members have the opportunity to provide their input into the decisions that affect them at the school site (Reston, Dietrich & Bailey, 1996). Also, the chances are that sound decisions will be made by those who are informed about and care about the issues and who know the context in which the decisions will be carried out (David, 1996). Teachers who make decisions at their school sites are empowered to focus on enhancing their roles as educational professionals.

. . .teachers know best what their students need and are best situated to combine subject matter knowledge and judgmental capacity to decide how their students may best be approached. . . The key assumption is that teachers know better what their students need than do state and local bureaucrats and parents. (Hess, 1992, p. 2)

A key to student achievement is the classroom teacher who is responsible for providing the essential educational experiences to her/his students.

The primary roles that the teacher ought to play in service to children are enhanced by the development of the teacher's intellectual power and professional socialization. Such roles include: (1) the teacher as a member of an intellectual learning community, both general and specialized; (2) the teacher as stakeholder in the community that he or she serves; (3) the teacher as community advocate and not merely as student advocate; and (4) the teacher as participant in goal setting for children and their communities. (Hilliard, 1991, p. 36)

SBM can be a means for getting teacher and administrative buy-in for instructional changes and for action research as self-correcting means for the instructional decisions they make. Schools that are members of the League of Professional Schools, an organization that

15

stresses SBM or shared governance, believe that schools focus on school improvement regimens including curriculum, student assessments, and professional learning (Harkreader & Henry, 1997; Leithwood & Menzies, 1998). Additionally, SBM could be promising as a means of reducing central office costs, democratizing the school work place, creating more opportunity for the exercise and further development of teachers' capacities, and increasing schools' accountability to their local communities (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998).

Problems/Disadvantages of Site-Based Management

Schools and school systems have experienced significant confusion regarding what types of decisions teachers, administrators, parents, or board members should make. For example, in 1992, the Wisconsin Legislature passed the Management Restructuring Program, which was designed to decentralize school board powers and duties and to promote shared decision making in the local districts. Although the school systems implemented SBM and provided school officials with three one-hour orientation/ informational meetings, they made no provisions to provide substantive assistance to administrators and teachers (Enderlin-Lampe, 2002; Johnston & Hedeman, 1994). In addition, parents entered into their new roles on the leadership team with little or no training and were generally uncertain about participating in the SBM process. Because their roles and expectations were not made clear, many teachers who took an active role and participated fully experienced frustration and failure (Enderlin-Lampe, 2002; Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser, 2001; Summers & Johnson, 1996). In some cases, local sites, that could have possibly developed viable decision-making structures that would have been suitable for their situation, were required by their states and districts to use externally imposed decision-making structures that were less desirable (Brandt, 2001).

A concern for educators is the lack of time to serve in the assigned capacities and in the leadership teams (Geraci, 1996; McColskey, et al., 1998; Summers & Johnson, 1996; Wagstaff, 1995). Participants need to be able to dedicate more time for the roles and responsibilities of an SBM initiative to be able to understand and inculcate it into the culture of a school district (Reston, et al., 2000). Most members of the leadership team have full-time responsibilities that make it impossible for them to give SBM the effort it needs to really be successful. For many leadership teams, meetings are held during the early mornings or after school, both of which are inadequate (Geraci, 1996; Johnston & Hedeman, 1994).

The work increased for active participants in SBM initiatives. Frequently, teachers are burdened with the minutiae of daily governance without being relieved of other responsibilities. Instead of the teacher's job being redefined, it was instead extended and expanded (Cohen, 2002; Kleckler, Austin, & Burns, 2002; Latham, 1998; Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Wagstaff, 1995). The teacher might not have any formal training and little or no professional experience in SBM and may have little inclination to accept the leadership team responsibility. Additionally, there is little evidence in the literature that teachers were willing to assume the additional workload without job restructuring or work incentives (Winter, Keedy, & Newton, 2000).

For elementary school principals participating in SBM initiatives, the workload increased. The principals reported that they had the added paperwork involved in launching the initiative and in providing the various levels of government with the information they sought. For example, as a result of instituting SBM, the workload for elementary principals increased from 48 hours to 60 hours in one year (Latham 1998; Leithwood & Menzies, 1998).

Studies show that members of SBM initiatives do not always focus on student achievement which is the very heart of the reason for its existence (Geraci, 1996; Malen, 1999; Summers &

Johnson, 1996). Teachers, administrators, and parents in one SBM school reported in a survey that they were satisfied that the process (efficacy) had produced its intended effect and that the school had yielded benefit from their experience (productivity). What was problematic in this study is that the findings indicated that efficacy and productivity of the members were related to non-instructional issues and not related to issues that could directly affect student achievement (Johnson & Logan 2000; Midgley & Wood, 1993). "Decisions in schools may be made by different people but they may not be decisions that affect teaching and learning. Effective site-based management requires more than just the existence of school improvement team with budget authority" (McColskey, et al., 1998, p. 2). The idea that teachers, administrators, and parents did not focus on student outcomes – the very heart of SBM – was not surprising because the majority of participants reported that they had not received formal training and had had no professional experiences in effective SBM techniques (Vann, 2000). Kirby (1992) found that there were several barriers to changing traditional educator roles including lack of definition and clarity of the change effort, inadequate or inappropriate resources, lack of hierarchical support, the principal's or central office's fear of losing power, teacher reluctance to change roles and responsibilities, lack of skills, lack of trust, and failure to understand the change process.

Studies showed that SBM initiatives have produced little or no effect on teaching and learning (Fullan & Watson, 2000; Hannaway, 1996; Malen, 1999; Wagstaff, 1995). The primary goal of SBM, to improve student achievement, has not materialized (Malen, 1999; McNeil & McNeil, 1994). Additionally, studies show that even though teachers and principals are highly in favor of restructuring (SBM), they have not been able to make the connections between the new governance structures and the teaching-learning process (Fullan & Watson, 2000).

There is consensus in the literature that districts and schools, for various reasons, seldom fully implement SBM systems (Bauer & Bogoth, 2001). Some schools may have tried SBM as a reform strategy in the 1980s, lost confidence, and abandoned it when it did not raise student achievement (Bauer & Bogoth, 2001; Brandt, 2001; Kleckler, et al., 2000). Even in studies where teachers and parents welcomed the changes and where a large percentage of teachers had participated and supported SBM, comparison scores on achievement tests between students in the programs and a control group revealed no significant differences in reading, math, or spelling (Latham 1998; McNeil & McNeil, 1994; Midgley & Wood, 1993).

As a result of her research, Wohlstetter (1995) determined four basic reasons why SBM fails. First, SBM was adopted as an end in itself. SBM is a process – a form of governance – or a means through which school-level decisions makers can implement various reforms that can improve teaching and learning. Second, principals work from their own agendas. Third, decision making power is lodged in a single council. Fourth, business in the classrooms proceeded as usual because instead of restructuring the school for change, the school simply layered SBM on top of what they were already doing. Meetings, therefore, were poorly attended and there were feelings of isolation among teachers.

<div align="center">Leadership Teams</div>

The leadership team is advanced as the vehicle for participatory governance, as a mechanism that will enable the school (teachers and parents) to have significant impact on significant issues. The underlying assumption is that the leadership team would be granted the authority in areas that are central to the school or to the participants (Malen, 1999).

Although the composition of leadership teams varies greatly, schools generally seek representation from each element of the school community (Candoli, 1995). The leadership

<div align="center">19</div>

team could include a representative from each group of certified staff, the principal, classified

staff representative, parents, a student, a business representative, and a community representative

(Chrispeels, Castillo, & Brown, 2000; David, 1996). Malen (1999) described two types of

leadership teams: (1) those that include teachers, principals, and parents, and (2) those that

include only teachers and principals. Each type of team has is own issues. In schools that have

parent representation on the leadership team, there are conflicts regarding the proper role of

parents. In this type of protective politics, the teachers may align with the principal to keep key

issues in the purview of professionals. In schools that have teams composed of teachers and the

principal, conflicts can arise regarding who ultimately has the right to make changes – the

principal or the teachers (Malen, 1999).

> A pattern is produced in part, by the principals' ability to control the agenda content, meeting
> format, and information flow and by their ability to recruit supportive teachers as council
> members, form coalitions with teacher allies, or overturn troubling decisions by not
> implementing them. But the pattern is also the result of teachers' reluctance to challenge the
> principal's definition of the situation, a reluctance shaped by many factors but rooted in the
> fear of social and professional sanctions that may be applied by principals and peers alike.
> (Malen, 1999, p. 212)

The leadership team is charged with making certain decisions affecting the school and its

students (Candoli, 1995). "The role of the site council is most often to make decisions or to

make recommendations to the principal. However, the extent of decision-making authority

delegated to site councils can vary considerably" (Kopcznski, 2000, p. 230). Leadership teams

identify the broad range of school policies, practices, and procedures that define the purpose of

their schools; thus, they influence their students' approaches to learning. Leadership teams also

decide which policies and practices they want to examine and change (Midgley & Wood, 1993).

Leadership teams are usually mandated into existence by the state department of education

or the local board of education. For example, in California, the leadership teams represent an

aspect of SBM that is teacher-lead and its decisions are oriented to curriculum and school reform (Chrispeels, et al., 2000). The North Carolina State Board of Education developed the School-Based Management Accountability Program in which one goal was to increase local flexibility and control while at the same time tightening the accountability requirements for individual schools (McColskey, et al., 1998).

The leadership teams make management decisions over a wide range of concerns. Some of the common elements that leadership teams decide include school-based budget control, school-based determination of curriculum (within state standards), collaborative goal-setting, and planning, and parental and community involvement (Dee, Henkin, & Pell, 2002). Another common area of authority for leadership teams is choosing personnel (Kopczynski, 2000). Under the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA), the leadership teams (School-Based Decision Making Councils) have responsibility over several policy areas including: curriculum, staff assignment, student assignment, school instructional practices, discipline, extra-curricular programs, and alignment with state standards.

The roles and responsibilities of teachers, administrators, parents, community representatives, and students on leadership teams are all new. Leadership team members must receive training in a variety of areas before beginning the role and responsibility of being the decision-making entity for site-based management (McColskey, et al., 1998). In California, the school leadership teams "receive training to work together to improve teaching and learning at their schools with the goal of affecting student outcomes" (Chrispeels et al, 2000, p. 20).

The leadership teams have been empowered, but what does it really mean? Empowerment means much more than the process of an administrator giving power to teachers. Empowerment is a process that involves mutual respect, dialogue, and invitation. Also, it implies recognition

21

that each person enjoys talents, competencies, and potential that can be used in ways to benefit everyone in the school setting (Kahrs, 1996). Administrators recognize that teachers play a critical role in searching for new ideas, and in the process of designing, implementing, and institutionalizing innovations. In the SBM model, leadership teams transform themselves and assume changes in leader-teacher relationships in terms of sharing authority and redistributing responsibilities (Dee, et al., 2002).

In Comer's School Development Program, the leadership team (School Planning and Management Team) is the central organizing body of a school. The building principal usually leads the leadership team which includes teachers, parents, and support staff representatives. Comer established the School Development Program in 1968 and it has experienced success by improving student academic achievement in schools across the nation. The SPMT, the leadership team in each school, is the centerpiece of the program because it develops and monitors a Comprehensive School Plan for academic, social climate, and staff development goals of students and adults in the school (Comer, Haynes, Joyner, & Ben-Avie, 1996; McDonald, et al., 1999).

The faculty and staff of Clear Lake Elementary School attributed much of the success with their school wide behavior plan and, ultimately, their school's capacity to provide quality instruction and behavior management, to the work of their leadership team. As Colvin & Fernandez (2000) stated

> The team has always been representative of the various groups of professionals comprising the faculty (administration, general education and special education teachers, support staff, and classified staff). The school established a policy that membership on the team should vary from year to year. In this way, staff burnout will be lessened and more staff have the opportunity to become significant players in sustaining the effective behavior support system. (p. 252)

Characteristics of Effective Site-Based Management

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education stated in their report, *A Nation At Risk*,

> Our goal must be to develop the talents of all to their fullest. Attaining that goal requires that we expect and assist all students to work to the limits of their capabilities. We should expect schools to have genuinely high standards rather than minimum ones, and parents to support and encourage their children to make the most of their talents and abilities. (p.13)

Wohlstetter (1995) suggested that the creation of school-site councils, typically the first step in implementing SBM, would not automatically result in improved performance; rather, it must be augmented with a range of school, district, and state level strategies that facilitate interactions involving various stakeholders and that provide a direction for those interactions. SBM can act as a facilitator of school improvement; however, when it is implemented narrowly as a political reform that merely shifts power from the central office to schools, SBM is an inadequate effort to improve school performance.

> The current research suggests that site-based management can be an effective tool to empower stakeholders in bringing about meaningful changes in teaching and learning. These changes will come about, however, only through the establishment of a clearly articulated vision and through the work of administrators and teachers who have adequate time and training to implement the process fully. (Holloway, 2000, p. 81)

Research suggests that the creation of a school-site leadership team is typically only the first step in implementing SBM. The formation of a leadership team will not automatically result in improvements in teaching and learning:

> SBM initiatives must be augmented by two important factors: (1) a range of organizational conditions that facilitate interactions among stakeholders and (2) ambitious curriculum and instructional reforms that provide a direction for those interactions. SBM can help facilitate school improvement, but without a clearly defined set of instructional goals, SBM maybe inadequate for improving school performance. (Wohlstetter, et al., 1997, p. 53)

Kopcynski (2000) found that although SBM has been implemented in markedly different ways and to varying degrees across school districts that she studied, and that SBM efforts varied

considerably with respect to allocation of authority, responsibility, and participation in decision-making at the school, there are a set of seven characteristics that are common to effective SBM schools. (1) Schools develop an efficient way of disseminating information about effective practices so that they can learn from other schools and from other school districts. (2) School district-level specialists focus on providing the training and technical-assistance to individual schools about budgeting, curriculum, shared governance principles and techniques, consensus building, team building, conflict resolution, and problem solving. (3) Principals share power and they encourage teachers to provide their input in decision-making. (4) Although the decision-making responsibilities are usually concentrated with the leadership team, individual faculty members know that they have a genuine opportunity to be directly involved in decision making. (5) To avoid conflict, schools clarify the roles and responsibilities that the various school participants assume at the beginning of the SBM process. (6) Provide adequate two-way communication between all elements of the school community. (7) All levels of the school system including the central office should encourage new ideas and support change.

Bellon and Beaudry (1992) concluded from their research with teachers that effective participants in SBM must have ongoing training for that type of leadership, and training for the school principal is vital because her/his leadership is vital to the success of SBM implementation. At the sites where the principals encouraged collaboration and understood the supporting role of training, teachers were more positive about site-based decision-making and change involved in the reform efforts.

School reforms are products of the cultural, political, and economic forces of the times. In the past, various attempts to change teaching and learning have often had very short-term or inconsequential effects. Changes in government do not automatically mean that changes in

teaching and learning will follow (O'Neil, 2000). Authentic schooling suggests that even applying best practices across classroom and school settings is insufficient. Rather, exposure to best practices must be followed by critique and critical study that results in teachers' personally constructing knowledge about practice, a deep understanding of the practice, and assessment of the practice's fit with their classroom and school (Enderlin-Lampe, 2002; O'Hair, et al., 1998). SBM, therefore, requires wholesale redesign of the school organization that goes far beyond changing school governance. For SBM to effectively help improve school performance, authority must be used to introduce changes in the functioning of the school that actually affect teaching and learning (Conway & Calzi, 1996; Wohlstetter, 1995). In addition, employees must have input into discussions involving budget, personnel, and curriculum to effect these changes (Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995). Responsibilities must be clearly defined and communicated prior to the implementation.

Meyers, et al. (2001) concluded from their research that effective SBM teams had three common characteristics. (1) A vision for the school, which provided a focus and direction for the school and a lens, or filter, through which team members looked to make decisions. (2) Make consensually developed decisions. This includes consensus on the school vision as well as other decisions that affected curriculum and instruction. (3) Training needed to be presented over time and it needed to include strategies for assessment of practices.

According to Cole-Henderson (2000), school institutions comprised two nested layers; the outer or school layer forms the framework within which the inner or classroom layer functions. The strength of the outer framework is determined by the presence of nine organizational or structural variables, which are effectuated by administrative and bureaucratic means. These nine variables are: "school-site management, administrative leadership, staff stability, curriculum

articulation and organization, parental involvement and support, school wide recognition, maximized learning time, and district support" (Cole-Henderson, 78). In addition, the other variables that created an atmosphere that led to heightened achievement were: "(1)Willingness on the part of school stakeholders (teachers, administrators, students, parents, and community members) to engage in collaborative planning and collegial relationships. (2) The development of a sense of community among stakeholders. (3) The establishment of clear goals and high expectations of student performance. (4) The presence or order and discipline within the school" (Cole-Henderson, 2000, p. 78).

Taylor (2002) found that SBM was effective for reaching consensus with faculties on what works, for developing school and classroom change strategies that address school and district mission statements, and for data-guided decision making all combined to aid schools to move more toward high expectations or teaching all children to agreed-upon standards. Since 1979, when Edmonds and Frederickson disseminated their identification of the characteristics of effective schools, selected schools have used their conceptual framework to improve student achievement. Since that time, the conceptual framework of the characteristics has been investigated, and seven newer, more broadly based correlates are now specified: "(1) clearly stated and focused school mission; (2) safe and orderly climate for learning; (3) high expectations for students, teachers, and administrators; (4) opportunity to learn and student time-on-task; (5) instructional leadership by all administrators and staff members; (6) frequent monitoring of student progress; and (7) positive home/school relations" (Taylor, 2002, p. 379).

Research on school effectiveness supports the importance of a positive school environment, often referred to as the climate of a school, where effective teaching and learning occur. The school climate is comprehensive and it is composed of culture, physical plant, organizational

structure, social relationships, and individual behaviors (Reston, et al., 1996). Proponents of school climate believe that how teachers interact when they are not in their classroom may be critical to the future of school restructuring and to the effects of restructuring on students (Louis, Mark, & Kruse, 1996).

Dee et al., (2002) concluded that SBM can support organizational innovation and teacher empowerment which, in turn, could improve student achievement. The results from their study suggested that schools characterized by formalization (specificity of organizational rules and procedures), open communication systems, and extensive teacher autonomy (determine their own work processes, methods, and schedules) support teacher education and empowerment. Their study also suggested other approaches that schools could use to strengthen organization innovation and support site-based management. They were: (1) establish channels of communication between the site council and school personnel; (2) develop curriculum teams for instructional decision making; and (3) implement collaborative skills training; and (3) specify expectations and responsibilities for teamwork.

Successful SBM that results in improved student achievement must have a number of elements present including power over budget and personnel, a teaming structure within the school that supports a professional culture, school-based information, strong support for teacher professional development, rewards and sanctions, and an emphasis on curriculum and instruction (McColskey, et al., 1998). Successful SBM schools create opportunities for teachers to collaborate. In these schools, teachers take collective responsibility – not individual responsibility--for student learning. This collective ownership and responsibility for all aspects of the school environment should result in high quality student learning and motivation (McColskey, et al., 1998).

David (1995) pointed out that leadership teams in the school community tended to have a number of internal characteristics in common. The most notable were:

> A well-thought-out committee structure. . .there is a good match up between the types of decisions to be made and the most appropriate people to debate and resolve those issues. . . . (2) Enabling leadership. Strong councils were usually led, though not always chaired, by strong principals who exercised leadership by mobilizing others. . . . (3) Focus on student learning. . . . strong councils consciously connected non-instructional decisions with conditions that maximized learning opportunities. . . . (4) Focus on adult learning. . . council members need new skills, assistance and practice in asking hard questions and gathering evidence about what is and is not working. (5) School-wide perspective. Functioning councils focus on the collective interests of the parties, devoting their energy to school goals and direction, coordination and communication, and allocation of resources and equity" (David, 1996, p. 7).

In addition, most successful SBM efforts require support from their district or state agencies, including the following: (1) long-term commitment (sustained commitment is essential), (2) curricular guidance that provides a substantive framework from which schools can make appropriate assessments), (3) opportunities for learning and assistance that adults need to change classroom practices and to become effective SBM schools; and (4) access to information that is needed to make decisions about everything from budget to performance data (David, 1996).

After conducting an extensive management-team research project in 1996 that involved more than 500 members of 72 management teams in business and government, McIntyre (1999) determined five success factors that appeared to be critical for the development of a true leadership team: strategic goals, extensive networks, collaborative relationships, effective information processing, and focused action. The five successes are as follows:

Success Factor 1: Strategic Goals. Goals are designed to move the organization toward a desired future state. The teams determine strategic goals by monitoring changes and trends in the external environment, evaluating internal operations, and identifying critical priorities that must be addressed if the organization is to succeed.

Success Factor 2: Extensive Networks. Because their primary function is to make decisions, management teams must have access to reliable sources of relevant, useful, and up-to-date information about every aspect of a business – from both inside and outside the organization.

Success Factor 3: Collaborative Relationships. If an organization uses work teams, the example of teamwork set by managers is especially important, since relationships in the management group will often be mirrored by employees. The most significant factors in building collaborative relationships appear to be trust, respect, and successful conflict management.

Success Factor 4: Effective Information Processing. To make decisions, a management team must effectively process the information received through networking activities. Team members who viewed their leader as effective also had positive perceptions of the group's ability to use information well.

Success Factor 5: Focused Action. Clearly describe the outcomes the teams hope to achieve, determine how the results will be measured, develop specific actions, and institute feedback mechanisms to determine whether a plan is on target.

Sustaining reform in a school depends in part on the staff's ownership of the changes, and ownership revolves around the degree in which the staff has a meaningful role in determining what reforms will be implemented. In the most promising examples of reform, schools had established a structure and process for involving staff in the decision-making process. The decisions that teachers made worked most effectively when they were tied most directly to the quality of the school's curriculum and instructional program (Shields, et al., 1995). Therefore, from their studies, school-level conditions that enabled teachers' and administrators' efforts to pursue promising reform strategies were (1) Catalytic and sustaining leadership. (2) Knowledge

about and skills related to the change process, new instructional strategies and challenging curricula. (3) Ongoing assessment and sharing of information about school performance. (4) Adequate resources; and (5) Parent and community support (Shields, et al., 1995).

Murphy, Evertson, and Radnofsky (1991) surveyed 14 elementary and secondary teachers on the important characteristics which were needed to have successful restructured, SBM schools. They found five common factors: (1) Improved communication and collaboration among all stakeholders. (2) Professional development for teachers, administrators, and parents so that they all could learn how to lead. (3) More time to do all that was required of them including instruction, meet with parents, prepare for lessons, observe one another teach, attend workshops, and meet with students individually. (4) Focus on students. (5) Freedom to teach what they thought would be best for their students. Although the teachers almost paid no attention to the expenditures associated with their suggestions, they did see the link between their empowerment and outcomes for students.

Using an organization lens, researchers explored the differences between actively restructuring and struggling schools. This organizational lens was developed in part from research conducted in the private sector which suggests decentralized management works best when four organizational resources were available to the decentralized unit. The areas were: (1) Power to make or influence decision. (2) Knowledge and skills to perform effectively, including good decision-making and problem-solving skills. (3) Information upon which good decisions can be made. (4) Rewards for performance. The researchers further hypothesized that three additional organizational conditions were also critical for explaining the differences between actively restructuring schools and struggling schools. First, an instructional guidance mechanism, a school vision or mission statement, and district or state guidelines focused on

instructional improvement. Second, leadership that provided cohesion and focus to restructuring efforts. And third, resources needed to carry out the changes taking place (Wohlstetter, et al., 1997).

After their research of the literature, Beck and Murphy (1996), identified three characteristics for successful SBM sites: (1) evidence of student learning/academic achievement; (2) teaching practices that provide opportunities for active, engaged learning for all with assessments that match instructional purposes; and (3) parental involvement that support the academic mission and indicating the development of an inclusive democratic community. They studied Jackson Elementary School in Los Angeles, California and concluded that several forces operating in tandem contributed to its success. The school had a commitment to learning that permeated the culture and structure of the school. The principal was a strong and focused leader who continually supported and guided collaborative governance and worked to create a climate that supported powerful conceptions of learning. The school understood that it was a part of a larger community (or set of communities) that shaped its interactions with those outside the school walls. The researchers concluded that SBM did not cause Jackson Elementary to be a successful school; however, they learned to appreciate the SBM's usefulness for a school with certain characteristics (like Jackson Elementary School). That is, if the goal of devolving power to a local site (SBM) is to improve student learning, then reformers should be reasonably certain that the will to make changes, the knowledge about promising directions, and leadership, community support, and resources for extensive and intensive stakeholder development are present (Beck & Murphy, 1996).

Chrispeels, et al., (2000) summarized the research on the effectiveness of site-based management and identified a number of factors that influence the effectiveness of leadership

teams. The factors mentioned most frequently were (1) clarity of roles and responsibilities; (2)

support from the district; (3) collaborative and supportive principal leadership; (4) positive

relations with the school-community; (5) training in how to function as a team and resolve

conflicts; (6) knowledge of budgets, planning, and pedagogy; and (7) a focus on students and

issues of teaching and learning.

Comer (1996) has concentrated his work on promoting a focus on child development as a

way of improving schools. The purpose of his School Development Project ". . . was to apply the

principles of psychiatry and the behavioral sciences to the vexing problems of inner-city

education. . . The original program served two elementary schools, both in low-income, heavily

black areas and both with abysmal records in the areas of academic achievement, attendance, and

student behavior" (Goldberg, 1997, p. 558). Comer gave each of the adult stakeholders –

parents, teachers, administrators, and custodians – an opportunity to establish the governance and

management in each of two school buildings (Goldberg, 1997).

> As the School Development Project progressed, Comer and his staff learned that the original
> idea that has in many places evolved into school-based management was not comprehensive
> enough. They discovered nine operational elements. . . . Three "mechanisms" undergird the
> program in any school: a governance and management team, a mental health or school
> support team, and a parents' program. The management team creates and supervises three
> critical educational operations: a comprehensive school plan, an assessment program, and a
> staff development program. In addition, there is a three-part philosophy that pervades all the
> work: no fault (concentrate on solving problems) no decisions except by consensus, and no
> paralysis (no naysayer can stand in the way of a strong majority). The entire community
> learns that the essential culture must be "a cooperative, learning, trying, experimenting
> attitude rather than an obstructive, adversarial relationship." (Goldberg, 1997, p. 559)

Observers of the Comer School Development Program have found that students improve in a

whole range of areas including achievement on standardized test scores and classroom grades.

Given the similarities between the Comer School Development Program and site-based

management, the different results are striking (Squires & Kranyik, 1996). "Simply designing and

placing a shared decision-making structure in a school setting is unlikely to be effective unless there are supportive components. These include clear delegation of authority to site participants to carry out school improvement plans, provision of adequate resources, and the development of belief systems and organizational norm to promote inclusiveness and collaboration" (Squires & Kranyik, 1996, p. 30). Researchers believe Comer's program has succeeded because it supports a change in the school culture and it focuses on children's development – their total development, not just their speech, language, and intellectual capabilities (Comer, et al., 1996; Squires & Kranyik, 1996). Squires and Kranyik (1999) conducted a study of Comer's School Development model in two schools. Although the evolution at the two schools differed, both schools evolved with similar norms, which were: (1) Focus on students' instructional and developmental needs. (2) Use data to understand problems and evaluate solutions. (3) Link staff development to student learning. (4) Use group process of collaboration. (5) Advocate facilitative leadership more than directive leadership.

The school planning and management team coordinates the work of two other teams, establishes policy guidelines around curriculum and instruction, and helps to plan and coordinate school operations. Always, the criterion for decisions is what is best for children (Comer, et al., 1996; McDonald, et al., 1999; Squires & Kranyik, 1996). The teams operate with three guiding principles: (1) No-fault problem solving is oriented to the future; that is, instead of dredging up past failures, the team seeks to discover what can be done to prevent the problems from being repeated. (2) Consensus decision-making eliminates voting, decisions made exclusively by the principal, and a general win-lose syndrome. All participants are invited to contribute so that a full range of opinions is heard. (3) Collaborative decision making ensures that all stakeholders,

including parents, teachers, other school staff, students (if appropriate), and community members will be heard (Comer, et al., 1996; McDonald, et al., 1999; Squires & Kranyik. 1996).

SBM is difficult and time consuming to implement and to manage, and early research seemed to show that student achievement had not improved over the short term. However, later research on reform literature suggests that what is needed is for SBM and our most powerful conceptions of learning and teaching to work together (Murphy, 1997).

<div align="center">Strategies for Effective Site-Based Management Teams</div>

Poorly designed education decentralization can produce little or no effect on teaching and learning (Hannaway, 1996). Decisions in schools may be made by different people but they may not be decisions that affect teaching and learning (McColskey, et al., 1998).   The current research suggests that SBM can be effective to bring about meaningful changes in teaching and learning (Holloway, 2000).   Changes will come about when schools put effective strategies into practice. Holloway (2000) suggested two strategies for schools: (1) establish a clearly articulated vision and (2) provide the leadership team with adequate time and training to implement the process fully. Also, school districts must nurture and support leadership teams by giving all the team members a clear picture of goals and processes of site-based management and by aiding them in developing communication and decision-making skills (Holloway, 2000).

For SBM to help improve school performance, the school authority over budget, personnel, and curriculum must be used to introduce changes in the functioning of the school that actually affect teaching and learning. The school's strategy for using its authority must include strategies for decentralizing three other essential resources. (1) Professional development and training for teachers and other stakeholders in managing and solving problems in curriculum and instruction. (2) Information about student performance, about parent and community satisfaction, and about

school resources to help school people make informed decisions. (3) Rewards to acknowledge the increased effort SBM requires and to recognize improvements in school performance (Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995; Wohlstetter, 1995; Wohlstetter, et al., 1997).

In her research, Wohlstetter (1995) discovered six strategies that schools have used to establish successful site-based management schools. (1) Establish many teacher-led decision-making teams to create a broad range of school-level constituents in the decision-making process. (2) Focus on continuous improvement with school wide training in functional and process skills and in areas related to curriculum and instruction. (3) Create a well-developed system for sharing school-related information with a broad range of constituents. (4) Develop ways to reward staff behavior that helps achieve school objectives. (5) Select principals who can facilitate and manage change. (6) Use district, state, or national guidelines to focus reform efforts and to target changes in curriculum and instruction.

In schools where SBM worked, professional development was a very high priority. The professional development activities were oriented toward building a school wide capacity for change, creating a professional community, and developing a shared knowledge base (Wohlstetter, 1995). By focusing professional development on inquiry into teaching and learning rather than the transmission of canned techniques or the implementation of newly prescribed texts, tests, or management and governance structures), they have helped to focus attention on the outcomes of real changes for children and their learning. This has also turned out to be a key lesson for supporting productive, long-lasting, and ultimately transformative work on school change (Darling-Hammond, 1995).

If reform plans are to be made operational – thus enabling teachers to really change the way they work – then teachers must have opportunities to discuss, think about, try out, and hone new

practices (Beck & Murphy, 1998; Lieberman, 1995). SBM implies a large-scale change in the character of the school as an organization that can only be implemented in conjunction with a clear intent to use educational knowledge to improve school performance and to create a collaborative teacher culture so that the local school is capable of designing itself (Mohrman & Wohlstetter, 1994). This means that they must be involved in learning about developing and using new ideas with their students. They can do this in a number of ways: (1) by building new roles (e.g. teacher leader, peer coach, teacher researcher); (2) by creating new structures (e.g., problem solving groups, decision-making teams); (3) by working on new tasks (e.g., journal and proposal writing, learning about assessment, creating standards, analyzing or writing case studies of practice); (4) by creating a culture of inquiry, wherein professional learning is expected, sought after, and an ongoing part of teaching and school life (Lieberman, 1995).

In a national study (500 interviews, 44 schools, 13 districts) commissioned by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (U.S. Department of Education), Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1996) focused on how site-based management can be accomplished more effectively. They recognized that even within a single district, some schools made SBM work and others did not. Successful sites dealt with the structural, power/leadership, and training/professional development issues underlying implementation. (1) They established multiple, teacher led decision-making teams that increased involvement and decreased the work for any one teacher. (2) They developed ways to involve and encourage staff in achieving school objectives. (3) They focused on continuous improvement with school wide training in leadership skills, teamwork, team planning, curriculum, and instruction. (4) They created a well-developed system for sharing school-related information among a broad range of constituents. (5) They selected

principals who could facilitate and manage change. (6) They used district, state, and/or national guidelines to focus reform efforts and to target changes in curriculum (McColskey, et al., 1998).

One strategy to improve the effectiveness of SBM was to establish professional learning communities. Professional learning communities are defined by movement toward five elements of practice: shared values, focus on student learning, collaboration, deprivatized practice, and reflective dialogue (Louis, et al., 1996). In their assessment of SBM, Reston et al. (2000) suggested that an important strategy for the effective SBM initiative is to create a well-developed system for sharing information among a broad range of stakeholders. The implication is that training and professional development are keys to success of an SBM initiative.

Mohrman and Wohlstetter (1994) believed that creating new governance structures is not enough. Instead, they list five principles of change. (1) SBM interventions will have to be seen as part of a more fundamental change. The focus must be on changes that transcend the more limited spotlight on the governance structures alone. (2) SBM cannot be adopted as an innovation or a program; rather, it is a systematic change that requires a transition to a new way of managing and a new logic of organizing. All participants must develop the knowledge and skills that will be needed in the new system. This means that broad knowledge of schooling as well as understanding of organizational issues will be required for the school to redesign itself to be more effective. (3) If school-based management is to result in improved school outcomes, it must be implemented in the context of goals for the educational process. The goals must be intentionally linked to the implementation of SBM with the transition toward an educational program that focuses on higher order thinking, conceptual understanding, and powerful communication for all students. (4) The district role is critical. Individual schools can be innovative, but they cannot sustain innovation and continuous improvement without the district

creating and maintaining the conditions for school-level improvement. (5) The transition to

SBM is a deep change, one that entails changes in attitude, assumptions, and behaviors. The role

of the whole community in implementing SBM and stimulating activities to improve school

outcomes needs to be done carefully (Mohrman & Wohlstetter, 1994).

Summary

Since the 1980s, after the publication of *A Nation At Risk*, a majority schools and school

districts throughout the nation have implemented SBM to improve student achievement. When

researchers studied the effects of SBM in the late 1980s and early 1990s, they found that the

primary reason for its implementation – to improve student achievement – had not been realized.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 and Georgia's A-Plus Education Reform Act of 2000

again called the attention the American people of the critical need to improve student

achievement for all groups of students in the public education system. Today, researchers are still

interested in SBM to improve student achievement, not as an end in itself, but as a process – a

part of systemic change – that will lead to improved student achievement. Researchers tell us

that the improvements we seek will take time and that student achievement will improve over

several years.

In the review of the related literature, researchers provided several characteristics of

SBM schools that could lead to improved student achievement. Based on the frequency that

each characteristic appeared in the literature, they have been placed in one of nine categories of

characteristics (Table 1). The nine categories were (1) central office support (Kopcynski, 2000);

(2) clarify roles and responsibilities of staff (Bellon & Beaudry, 1992); (3) focus on student

learning (Meyers, et al., 1994); (4) use of the collaborative process (Squires & Kranyik, 1996);

(5) provide knowledge and skills in focused areas of need (Chrispeels, et al., 2000); (6) develop

a belief system (Taylor, 2002); (7) build positive relations with the community ((Beck & Murphy, 1998); (8) strong leadership at the school level (Wohlstetter, et al., 1997); and (9) assesses and monitors student progress in targeted areas (McIntyre, 1999). These nine categories were used to develop the Site-Based Management Characteristics Rating Scale (Appendix B).

Table 1

Summary of Site-Based Management Characteristics

Characteristics	Kopcynski	Bellon & Beaudry	Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser	Squires & Kranyik	Chrispeels et al.	Taylor	Dee et al.	Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky	Beck & Murphy	McDonald et al.	Wohlstetter et al.	Cole-Henderson	David	McIntyre	Shields et al.
1. Has central office support.	●	●	●		●			●					●		
2. Clarifies roles and responsibilities of staff.	●	●			●	●							●		
3. Has a focus on student learning.				●	●				●			●		●	
4. Uses the collaborative process.		●	●	●	●		●	●		●	●	●		●	
5. Provides knowledge of skills in focused areas of need.	●				●	●					●		●	●	●
6. Develops a belief system (mission, vision, goals).			●			●					●		●	●	
7. Builds positive relationships with the community.	●	●			●	●			●			●			●
8. Demonstrates strong leadership at the school level.					●	●			●		●		●	●	
9. Assesses and monitors student progress in targeted areas.				●		●								●	●

40

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the research procedures of the study including a restatement of the study's purpose and a description of its design, hypothesis, population/sample, data collection, instrumentation, and procedures used to statistically analyze the data collected.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose for this study was to investigate whether there are significant differences in mean perception of certified employees of nine effective SBM categories at each of the eight Title I elementary schools which made AYP in a school system in Georgia. The nine effective SBM categories were: (1) central office support; (2) clarify roles and responsibilities of staff; (3) focus on student learning; (4) use of the collaborative process; (5) provide knowledge and skills in focused areas of need; (6) develops a belief system; (7) build positive relationships with the community; (8) strong leadership at the school level; and (9) assess and monitor student progress in targeted areas.

Research Design

Consistent with Campbell and Stanley (1963), the research design was a descriptive study of the characteristics of SBM at eight Title I elementary schools which made Adequate Yearly Progress in a school system in Georgia. Seven of the eight Title I elementary schools made AYP in all subcategories in the 2003-2004 school year. One Title I elementary school did not make AYP in one subcategory. The population included the teachers and administrators employed in the eight Title I elementary schools

during the 2003-2004 school year. The Site-Based Management Characteristics Rating Scale (SBMC Rating Scale) measured the SBM categories at each one of the elementary schools.

Null Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis – There are no statistically significant differences in mean perception of each of nine effective SBM categories at each of the eight Title I elementary schools which made AYP in a school system in Georgia. The nine effective categories are: (1) central office support; (2) clarify roles and responsibilities of staff; (3) focus on student learning; (4) use of the collaborative process; (5) provide knowledge and skills in focused areas of need; (6) develop a belief system; (7) builds positive relationships with the community; (8) demonstrates strong leadership at the school level; and (9) assess and monitor student progress in the targeted areas.

Population/Sample

The sample of the study included teachers and principals employed in the eight Title I elementary schools in the Coweta County School System during the 2003-2004 school year. The population was all Title I schools in the system since 1965.

Instrumentation

The instrumentation for this study was the Site-Based Management Characteristics (SBMC) Rating Scale (See Appendix B). The review of the literature revealed that there was not an appropriate instrument in which the degree of systemic SBM implementation from a local school perspective could be measured. The SBMC Rating Scale was developed to measure the nine variables. The nine dependent measures of the SBM categories were all subscales of the survey. They included (1) having central

office support; (2) clarifying roles and responsibilities of staff; (3) having a focus on student learning; (4) using the collaborative process; (5) providing knowledge and skills in focused areas of need; (6) developing a belief system; (7) building positive relationships with the community; (8) demonstrating strong leadership at the school level; and (9) assessing and monitoring student progress in targeted areas.

Content validity, the degree to which the SBMC Rating Scale measured the successful characteristics of SBM, was established in a six step process. (1) The characteristics of successful systemic SBM implementation at the local school sites were determined after a review of the literature. (2) The characteristics were placed in nine categories which were the subscales of the survey. (3) Specific survey items were developed for each subscale using the characteristics of successful systemic SBM implementation at local school sites. (4) Supporting data for each instrument item were presented to ten local school administrators and teachers (including members of the leadership teams and other members of the faculties) in the Meriwether County School System who use SBM in the schools. Each person must have had at least three years of professional experience in an SBM setting. (5) Each person was asked to read the excerpts and the corresponding survey items and to indicate if the concept presented in the excerpt represented the survey item. Each person was also asked to determine if each survey item was stated clearly. Space was provided for comments and input (Gay & Airasian, 2000; Seabolt, 1994). (6) They suggested (a) specific words with definitive meanings to be used instead of words with ambiguous meanings for items 2, 3, 7, 8, 15, 19, 20, and 21; (b) phrases that did not add meaning be deleted from items 6, 12, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26; (c) rephrase parts of items 9, 11, and 16; and (d) delete words that

were not needed for meaning in items 10 and 13. Their suggestions were used to refine the SBM Characteristics Rating Scale for the content reliability study.

The test-retest method was used to determine reliability of the SBMC Rating Scale. Incorporating the revisions that established content validity, the instrument was administered to local school administrators and teachers (including members of the leadership team and other members of faculties) in schools in the Fulton County School System using the test-retest method. After a two week period, the SBMC Rating Scale was administered to the same local school administrators and teachers who took it the first time. The two sets of scores were correlated to determine the reliability of the SBMC Rating Scale (Table 2).

Eight local school administrators and teachers in the Fulton County School System completed the test and the retest. A significance level of .078 or below was selected to determine the items to be included on the SBM Characteristics Rating Scale. The .078 significance level was selected so that each of the SBM categories would have at least one item included on the rating scale. All items that had a significance level greater than .078 were excluded (Table 2). The reliability study resulted in 6 of the 26 items being removed from the SBM Characteristics Rating Scale.

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

The research design of this descriptive study was a one-shot case study with multiple schools (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Descriptive statistical analyses were reported including frequency, range, mean, and standard deviation with comparisons across and among schools. A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine

whether a significant difference existed between the mean scores of the schools in the nine categories.

An alpha significance level of .05 has been selected for use in the study. The level of significance is the probability of making a Type I error when the hypothesis is rejected. A Type I error occurs when one rejects the hypothesis when it is true. With a level of significance at the .05 level, there is a chance that in rejecting the hypothesis, the decision may be incorrect five percent of the time.

An alpha significance level of .05 has been selected for use in the study. The level of significance is the probability of making a Type I error when the hypothesis is rejected. A Type I error occurs when one rejects the hypothesis when it is true. With a level of significance at the .05 level, there is a chance that in rejecting the hypothesis, the decision may be incorrect five percent of the time.

Table 2

Content Reliability for Items 1 thru 26 on the SBM Characteristics Rating Scale

Question	Correlation	2-Tailed Sig.
1	.802	.017
2	1.000	.000
3	.775	.024
4	.707	.050
5	.745	.034
6	.577	.134*
7	.655	.078
8	.149	.725*
9	1.000	.000
10	.655	.078
11	.655	.078
12	.655	.078
13	.655	.078
14	.333	.420*
15	.488	.220*
16	.745	.034
17	.417	.238*
18	.775	.024
19	.448	.220*
20	.882	.004
21	.830	.011
22	.665	.078
23	1.000	.000
24	.745	.034
25	.745	.034
26	.775	.025

_____

* = Not included.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there were significant differences in mean perception of certified employees of nine effective SBM categories across eight Title I elementary schools which made AYP in a school system in Georgia. The nine effective SBM categories were: (1) Central Office Support; (2) Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities of Staff; (3) Focus on Student Learning; (4) Use of the Collaborative Process; (5) Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need; (6) Development of a Belief System; (7) Build Positive Relationships with the Community; (8) Strong Leadership at the School Level; and (9) Assess and Monitor Student Progress in the Targeted Areas.

A survey was conducted at eight Title I elementary schools using the SBM Characteristics Rating Scale. Each certified employee who had worked at a school for more than three years was asked to respond to the 20 item rating scale (Table 3). Fifty percent or more of the certified staff at each of the Title I elementary schools responded to the survey. One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to ascertain if there were statistically significant differences among the certified employee responses across the eight Title I elementary schools.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics provided data regarding the nine effective SBM categories (and 20 items) of the eight Title I elementary schools in a school system in Georgia (Table 4). The sample consisted of 175 certified employees who had a minimum of three years of experience at the Title I elementary schools where they currently worked. Of the SBM

47

Characteristics Rating Scales that were distributed at each of the Title I elementary

schools, fifty percent or more were collected (Table 3).

Table 3

Number and % of Employees Responding to the SBM Characteristics Rating Scale

School	Number Responding	Possible Respondents	Percentage Responding
1	28	43	65%
2	20	37	54%
3	21	37	57%
4	22	34	65%
5	30	35	86%
6	11	18	61%
7	18	34	55%
8	25	49	51%

The grand mean scores from all of the schools for each of the SBM categories

showed a score 3.00 or greater which means that the respondents generally agreed that

there was the perception that the SBM characteristics were used at the schools (Table 4).

Table 4

Category and Items Analysis

Category & Items	Mean (Standard Deviation)
Category 1: Central Office Support	3.21 (.46)
Item 1: The central office provides teachers and staff with with information on research-based instructional practices.	3.02 (.61)

(table continues)

Table 4

Category and Items Analysis

_____

Category & Items	Mean (Standard Deviation)
Item 2: The central office provides learning opportunities for administrators and teacher leaders in leadership, data analysis, and other relevant topics	3.15 (.61)
Item 3: The central office develops and distributes mission and vision statements on which all people associated with the schools can focus.	3.33 (.56)
Item 4: The central office provides standard system guide-guidelines from which my school can make appropriate choices for change.	3.33 (.56)
Category 2: Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities	3.29 (.65)
Item 5: The faculty and staff understand the roles and responsibilities of the SBLT.	3.29 (.65)
Category 3: Focus on Student Learning	3.57 (.57)
Item 6: Our school improvement goals are developed and strategies implemented through consensus of the faculty.	3.57 (.57)
Category 4: Use of the Collaborative Process	3.39 (.60)
Item 7: The school improvement plan focuses on strategies implemented through consensus of the faculty.	3.31 (.69)
Item 8: The principal establishes committees that are led by teachers.	3.48 (.61)
Category 5: Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need	3.39 (.60)
Item 9: Professional development activities for teachers to improve instructional practices are school-wide and are tied to our school improvement plan.	3.41 (.67)

(table continues)

Table 4

Category and Items Analysis

_____

Category & Items	Mean (Standard Deviation)
Item 10: Data assessment, monitoring student progress, and research-based instructional strategies are integral parts of our ongoing professional development activities.	3.31 (.69)
Item 11: Professional training in areas related to curriculum and instruction is required throughout the school year.	3.47 (.63)
Category 6: Development of a Belief System	3.12 (.79)
Item 12: The principal encourages the mission and vision statements to be learned early and repeated often.	3.12 (.79)
Category 7: Build Positive Relationships with the Community	3.32 (.52)
Item 13: Teachers and staff communicate with parents and the community through parent newsletters and parent/ teacher conferences.	3.74 (.48)
Item 14: The principal conducts parent surveys and uses the results to improve teaching practices.	3.13 (.75)
Item 15: Teachers and staff conduct student surveys and use the results to improve teaching practices.	2.93 (.70)
Category 8: Strong Leadership at the School Level	3.51 (.54)
Item 16: The principal expects all teachers to participate in the professional learning of the school.	3.63 (.56)
Item 17: The principal encourages teachers and staff to implement research-based strategies to improve student learning.	3.46 (.64)
Item 18: The principal encourages teachers to chair and to participate on committees to improve student learning.	3.47 (.67)

_____

(table continues)

Table 4

Category and Items Analysis

_____

Category & Items	Mean (Standard Deviation)
Category 9: Assess and Monitor Student Progress in Targeted Areas	3.09 (.69)
Item 19: The SBLT assesses student needs, develops and implements a course of action, and analyzes the results.	3.14 (.72)
Item 20: The SBLT decides how results will be measured and monitors student progress to determine when/if modifications need to be made.	3.02 (.72)

_____

Inferential Statistics

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the data for each of the nine SBM

categories to determine if there were statistically significant differences across the eight

Title I elementary schools. The results were as follows:

Category 1 – Central Office Support

Inferential Test (Reference Table 5) There was not a statistically significant difference on

Category 1 in the perceptions of Central Office Support across the eight schools. The

one-way ANOVA resulted in an $F (7, 150) = 1.05$ ($p = .398$) which is not statistically

significant.

Category 2 – Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities

Inferential Test (Reference to Table 6) There was not a statistically significant difference

in Category 1 in perception of Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities across the eight

schools. The one-way ANOVA resulted in $F (7, 150) = 2.956$ ($p = .006$) but after

applying the Bonferroni post hoc analysis, it was found that there was not a statistically

significant difference.

Table 5

One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 1 – Central Office Support

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	1.359	7	.194	1.051	p = .398
Within Groups	27.705	150	.185		
Total	29.064	157			

Table 6

One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 2 – Clarification of Roles and

Responsibilities

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	8.075	7	1.154	2.956	p = .006
Within Groups	58.532	150	.390		
Total	66.607	157			

Category 3 – Focus on Student Learning

Inferential Test (Reference Table 7) There was not a statistically significant difference on

Category 3 in the perception of Focus on Student Learning across the eight schools. The

one-way ANOVA resulted in an F (7, 150) = 1.418 (p = .202) which is not statistically

significant.

Table 7

One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 3 – Focus on Student Learning

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	2.747	7	.392	1.418	p = .202
Within Groups	41.513	150	.277		
Total	44.260	157			

Category 4 – Use of the Collaborative Process

Inferential Test (Reference to Table 8) There were no statistically significant difference

in Category 4 in perception of the Use of the Collaborative Process across the eight

schools. The one-way ANOVA resulted in F (7, 150) = 3.366 (p = .002) but after

applying the Bonferroni post hoc analysis, it was found that there were no statistically

significant differences.

Table 8

One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 4 – Use of the Collaborative Process

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	6.023	7	.860	3.366	p = .002
Within Groups	38.344	150	.256		
Total	44.367	157			

Category 5 – Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need.

Inferential Test (Reference to Table 9) There were statistically significant differences in Category 5 in perception of Providing Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need across the eight schools. The one-way ANOVA resulted in F (7, 150) = 3.559 (p = .001) but after applying the Bonferroni post hoc analysis, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between two schools: School 1 and School 6 (p = .016).

Table 9

One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 5 – Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	6.541	7	.934	3.559	p = .001
Within Groups	39.359	150	.263		
Total	45.900	157			

Category 6 – Development of a Belief System

Inferential Test (Reference to Table 10) There were statistically significant differences in Category 6 in perception of the Development of a Belief System across the eight schools. The one-way ANOVA resulted in F (7, 150) = 9.995 (p = .000) but after applying the Bonferroni post hoc analysis, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between several schools: School 1 and School 4 (p = .000); School 1 and School 7 (p = .005); School 1 and School 8 (p = .000); School 2 and School 4 (p =

.001); School 2 and School 7 (p = .042; School 2 and School 8 (p = .001); School 3 and

School 4 (p = .000); School 3 and School 7 (p = .003); School 3 and School 8 (p =

.000); School 5 and School 4 (p = .009); School 5 and School 7 (p = .009); and School 5

and School 8 (p = .000).

Table 10

One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 6 – Development of a Belief System

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	28.288	7	4.041	9.995	p = .000
Within Groups	60.648	150	.404		
Total	88.936	157			

Category 7 – Build Positive Relationships with the Community

Inferential Test (Reference to Table 11) There were statistically significant differences in

Category 7 in perception of Building Positive Relationships with the Community across

the eight schools. The one-way ANOVA resulted in F (7, 150) = 4.415 (p = .000) but

after applying the Bonferroni post hoc analysis, it was found that there was a statistically

significant difference between School 1 and School 6 (p = .016).

Category 8 – Strong Leadership at the School Level

Inferential Test (Reference to Table 12) There was not a statistically significant

difference on Category 8 in the perception of Strong Leadership at the School Level

across the eight schools. The one-way ANOVA resulted in an F (7, 150) = 2.870 (p =

.008) but after applying the Bonferroni post hoc analysis, it was found that there was not

a statistically significant difference.

Table 11

One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 7 – Build Positive Relationships with

the Community

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	6.879	7	.983	4.415	p = .000
Within Groups	33.387	150	.223		
Total	40.266	157			

Table 12

One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 8 – Strong Leadership at the

School Level

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	4.676	7	.668	2.870	p = .008
Within Groups	34.909	150	.233		
Total	39.585	157			

Category 9 – Assess and Monitor Student Behavior in Targeted Areas

Inferential Test (Reference to Table 13) There were statistically significant differences in

Category 9 in perception of Assessing and Monitoring Student Behavior in Targeted

Areas across the eight schools.   The one-way ANOVA resulted in F (7,150) = 3.200 (p =

003).   After applying the Bonferroni post hoc analysis, it was found that there were

statistically significant differences between three groups of schools: School 1 and School

3 (p = .046); School 1 and School 8 (p = .023); and School 5 and School 8 (p = .042).

Table 13
One-way Analysis of Variance for SBM Category 9 – Assess and Monitor Student
Progress in Targeted Areas

Schools

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	9.844	7	1.406	3.200	p = .003
Within Groups	65.917	150	.256		
Total	75.761	157			

Summary of the Findings

A survey was conducted using the SBM Characteristics Rating Scale at eight Title I

elementary schools. One-way analyses of variance were used to analyze the data in each

of the nine categories. Two SBM categories, Central Office support and Focus on

Student Learning had p values that were greater than .05 and, therefore, were not

significant. Seven of the nine SBM categories were statistically significant at the .05

level, and thus, post-hoc analyses were conducted. The seven SBM categories were

Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities, Use of the Collaborative Process, Provide

Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need, Development of a Belief System, Build

Positive Relationships with the Community, Strong Leadership at the School Level, and

Assess and Monitor Student Progress in Targeted Areas. The Bonferroni post hoc

analysis, which controls the overall error rate, was used and, as a result, four of the seven

SBM categories were statistically significant differences at the .05 level.

The results of the data analyses revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in five of the nine SBM categories. They were (1) Central Office Support; (2) Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities; (3) Focus on Student Learning; (4) Use of the Collaborative Process; and (5) Strong Leadership at the School Level. There were statistically significant differences at the .05 level in four SBM categories among the schools. They were Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need, Development of a Belief System, Build Positive Relationships with the Community, and Assess and Monitor Student Progress in Targeted Areas. The grand mean scores from all of the schools for each of the SBM categories showed a score of 3.00 or greater which means that respondents generally agreed that there was the perception that each of the SBM categories was used at the schools (Table 3).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there were significant differences in nine effective SBM characteristics at each of the eight Title I elementary schools in a school system in Georgia. The nine effective characteristics were: (1) Central Office Support; (2) Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities of Staff; (3) Focus on Student Learning; (4) Use of the Collaborative Process; (5) Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need; (6) Development of a Belief System; (7) Build Positive Relationships with the Community; (8) Strong Leadership at the School Level; and (9) Assess and Monitor Student Progress in the Targeted Areas.

At least 50% of the certified employees, 175 people, at each of the eight Title I elementary schools completed the SBM Rating Scale. The dependent variables were the nine effective characteristics. The independent variables were the eight Title I elementary schools.

The hypothesis was developed for the total group of Title I schools to determine if there were statistically significant differences in the SBM characteristics at each school. The results of the analyses of variance found that there were no statistically significant differences in five of the SBM categories among the schools. There were statistically significant differences at the .05 level in the four other categories.

Before SBM was implemented at the eight Title I elementary schools in this study, the schools had had histories of not making AYP. After SBM was implemented, all eight Title I schools made AYP. Of the nine SBM categories that the SBM Characteristics

Rating Scale measured, there were no statistically significant differences found in five of them. The grand mean score for each of the nine SBM categories was 3.00 or greater which indicated that the schools generally agreed that all nine had been implemented.

The five SBM categories in which there were no statistically significant differences among the schools were (1) Central Office Support, (2) Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities, (3) Focus on Student Learning, (4) Use of the Collaborative Process, and (5) Strong Leadership at the School Level. These could be the most important SBM characteristics that may be linked to improving student achievement in the eight Title I elementary schools.

The four SBM categories in which there were statistically significant differences among the schools were (1) Development of a Belief System, (2) Build Positive Relationships with the Community, (3) Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need, and (4) Assess and Monitor Student Progress in Targeted Areas. The certified employees among the eight Title I schools did not perceive these four SBM categories as ones that were needed to as great a degree as the five categories that showed no statistically significant differences.

Conclusions

The eight Title I elementary schools were consistent in their responses to five SBM categories. They were (1) Central Office Support; (2) Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities; (3) Focus on Student Learning; (4) Use of the Collaborative Process; and (5) Strong Leadership at the School Level. The consistent responses for all five categories indicate that they appeared to be necessary to change AYP in the eight Title I elementary schools. The inconsistent responses for the remaining four categories

indicated that their presence did not appear to be as necessary for the eight Title I schools to make AYP.

The five SBM categories which were consistent across the eight Title I schools were important to the certified employees. Central office support could have provided the employees with the impetus they needed to know that the decisions they made regarding the instruction of their student populations would make a difference in their classrooms. Teachers used the collaborative process to focus on student learning which appeared to have provided them with additional information regarding strategies for instruction. Strong leadership at the school level was needed to provide clarification of employee roles and responsibilities.

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

A review of the literature found that there were nine effective SBM categories that schools used to improve student achievement. The responses from the eight Title I elementary schools in the study indicated that there were no statistically significant differences among the schools in five of the SBM categories.

Although Title I elementary schools have larger numbers of students who are at greater risk of not making AYP, the percentages and numbers of students in subgroups vary from school to school. Additional study of the SBM characteristics among Title I schools that have similar disaggregated student populations but show differences in test results for specific subgroups is recommended. The results of this type of study could further add to the body of knowledge about which SBM characteristics should be present when academic achievement in specific student subgroups is improved and the school makes AYP.

To further add to the body of knowledge of effective SBM characteristics in non-Title I elementary schools that improve student achievement, it is recommended that the schools continue to study the five characteristics that indicated there were no statistically significant differences with other schools to see if results are consistent. Also, continue to study the four characteristics that indicated that there were statistically significant differences with other schools to see if results are consistent. The results of continued study of all of the nine SBM categories should yield important information about which of them are most consistent for improving student achievement.

References

Barnett, B.G., & Whitaker, K.S. (1996). *Restructuring for student learning.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publications.

Bauer, S.C., & Bogoth, I.E. (2001). Analysis of the relationships among site council resources, council practices, and outcomes. *Journal of School Leadership*, *10*, 98-119.

Beck, L.L., & Murphy, J. (1996). *The four imperatives of a successful school.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Beck, L.L., & Murphy, J. (1998). Site-based management and school success: untangling the variables. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(4), 358-384.

Bellon, T., & Beaudry, J. (1992, April). *Teachers' perceptions of leadership training for site-based decision making.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

Brandt, R. (2001). No best way: the case for differentiated schooling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *83*(2), 153-155.

Brown, F., & Hunter, R.C. (1998). School-based management. *Urban Education, 33*(1), 95-118.

Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company,

Candoli, I.C. (1995). *Site-based management in education.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc.

Carnegie Form on Education and the Economy (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for 21st century."* Washington, DC: The Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED268120).

Cates, W.M. (1985). A practical guide to educational research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Chrispeels, J.H., Castillo, S., Brown, J. (2000). School leadership teams: A process model of team development. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11*(1), 20-56.

Cohen, R.M. (2002). Schools our teachers deserve: A proposal for teacher-centered reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(7), 532-537.

Cole-Henderson, B. (2000). Organizational characteristics of schools that successfully serve low-income urban African American students. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, *5*(1/2), 77-92.

Colvin, G., & Fernandez, E. (2000). Sustaining effective behavior support systems in an elementary school. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *2*(4), 251-254.

Comer, J.P., Haynes, N.M., Joyner, E.T., & Ben-Avie, M. (Eds.) (1996). *Rallying the whole village: The Comer process for reforming education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Conway, J.A., & Calzi, F. (1996). The dark side of shared leadership. *Educational Leadership, 53*(4), 45-49.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Policy of restructuring. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *The work of restructuring schools* (pp. 157-174). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

David, J.L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. *Educational Leadership*, *46*(8), 45-53.

David, J.L. (1996). The who, what, and why of site-based management. *Educational Leadership*, *53*(4), 2-9.

Dee, J.R., Henkin, A.B., & Pell, S.W.J. (2002). Support for innovation in site-based managed schools: Developing a climate for change. *Educational Research Quarterly, 25*(4), 36-50.

Drury, W.D. (1999). *Reinventing school-based management.* National School Boards Association: Leadership for Student Achievement.

Enderlin-Lampe, S. (1997). Shared decision making in schools: Effect on teacher efficacy. *Education, 118*(1), 150-158.

Enderlin, Lampe, S. (2002). Empowerment: Teacher perceptions, aspirations and efficacy. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 29*(3),

Fraenkel, J.R. (1990). How to design and evaluate research in education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fullan, F., & Watson, N. (2000). School-based management: reconceptualizing to improve learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11*(4), 453-473.

Gay, L.R. & Airasian, P. (2000). Educational research. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Geraci, B. (1996). Local decision making: a report from the trenches. *Educational Leadership, 53*(4), 50-52.

Gleason, S.C., Donohue, N., & Leader, G.C. (1996). Boston revisits school-based management. *Educational Leadership, 53*(4), 25-27.

Glickman, C.D. (1989). Pushing school reform to a new edge: the seven ironies of school empowerment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *72*(1), 68-75.

Goldberg, M.F. (1997). Maintaining a focus on child development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(7), 557-560.

Hannaway, J. (1996). Management decentralization and performance-based incentives: theoretical consideration for schools. In E.A. Hanushek & D.W. Jorgenson (Eds.), *Improving America's schools: The role of incentives* (pp.97-110). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Harkreader, S.A., & Henry, G.T. (1997). *A league of their own: evaluating school reform efforts.* Unpublished manuscript. Georgia State University: Atlanta.

Hess, G.A. (1995). Examining school restructuring efforts. In G.A. Hess (Ed.), *Empowering teachers and parents.* (pp.1-9). Westport, CT: Bergin& Garvey.

Hilliard, A. (1991). Do we have the will to educate all children? *Educational Leadership*, *49*(1), 31-38.

Holloway, J.H. (2000). The promise and pitfalls of site-based management. *Educational Leadership, 57*(7), 81-82.

Jerald, C., & Haycock, K. (2002). Closing the gap. *School Administrator, 59*(7), 16-21.

Johnson, P.E., & Logan, J. (2000). Efficacy and productivity: the future of school-based decision making councils in Kentucky. *Journal of School Leadership, 10*, 311-331.

Johnston, S., & Hedeman, M. (1994). School level curriculum decisions – a case of battling against the odds. *Educational Review, 46*(3), 297-308.

Kahrs, J.R. (1996). Principals who support teacher leadership. In G. Moller & M. Katzenmeyer (Eds.), *Every teacher a leader* (pp. 19-40). San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kintisch, B. (2000). Georgia adopts major school reforms [Electronic version]. *Rural Policy Matters, 2*(5), 1-3.

Kirby, P.C. (1992). Shared decision making: moving from concerns about restrooms to concerns about personnel. *Journal of School Leadership, 2,* 330-344.

Kleckler, B.M., Austin, J.L., & Burns, L.T. (2000). An in-depth analysis of decisions made by Kentucky's school based decision-making councils. *Education, 120*(4), 655-667.

Kopczynski, M. (2000). Restructuring schools through school based management: Experiences and insights from twelve districts. In S. Hakim, D.J. Ryan, & J.C. Stull (Eds.), *Restructuring education: Innovations and evaluations of alternative systems.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Lane, J.J. (1991). Instructional leadership and community: a perspective on school-based management. *Theory Into Practice, 30*(2), 119-124.

Latham, A.S. (1998). Site-based management: is it working? *Educational Leadership, 55*(7), 85-86.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times.* Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). A review of research concerning the implementation of site-based management. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(3), 233-285.

Lieberman, A.S. (1995). Practices that support teacher development: transforming conceptions of professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(8), 591-596.

Lindle, J.C. (1996). Lessons from Kentucky about school-based decision making. *Educational Leadership, 53*(6), 20-24.

Louis, K.S., Marks, H.M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 33*(4), 757-798.

Malen, B. (1999). The promises and perils of participation on site-based councils. *Theory Into Practice, 38*(4), 209-217.

McColskey, W., Mikow, V., & Bingham, S. (1998). *Reflecting on progress: Site-based management and school improvement in North Carolina.* Greensboro, NC: Southeastern Regional Vision for Education.

McDonald, J.P., Hatch, T., Kirby, E., Ames, N., Haynes, N.M., & Joyner, E.T. (1999). *School reform behind the scenes.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

McIntyre, M.G. (1999). Five ways to turn your management team into a leadership team. *Journal of Quality & Participation, 22*(4), 40-44.

McNeil,L.M., & McNeil, M.S. (1994). When good theory leads to bad practice: Some considerations in applying shared decision making to school settings. *Theory Into Practice, 33*(4), 254-260.

Meyers, B., Meyers, J., & Gelzheizer, L. (2001). Observing leadership rules in shared decision making: A preliminary analysis of three teams. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 12*(4), 277-312.

Midgley, C., & Wood, S. (1993). Beyond site-based management: empowering teachers to reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75*(3), 245-255.

Mohrman, S.A., & Wohlstetter, P. (1994). *School-based management.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Murnane, R.J., & Levy, F. (1996). What General Motors can teach U.S. schools about the proper role of markets in education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *2*(108), 108-116.

Murphy, J. (1997). Restructuring through school-based management. In T. Townsend (Ed.). *Restructuring and quality: Issues for tomorrow's schools,* (pp. 35-59), London: Routledge.

Murphy, J., Evertson, ClM., & Radnofsky, M.L. (1991). Restructuring schools: fourteen elementary and secondary teachers' perspectives on reform. *Elementary School Journal, 92*(2), 135-148.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

No Child Left Behind Act (2001). Public Law 107-110. Washington, DC: 107th Congress. Retrieved January 15, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/nclb/accountability/schools/accountability.html#1.

Odden, E.R., & Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Making school-based management work. *Educational Leadership, 52*(5), 32-36.

O'Hair, M.J., Gee, S., Dauway, M., Reitzug, U.C., Ketchum, D., & Montalvo, G. (1998, April). *Educational reform networks: Charting the path from conventional school to democratic school community.* Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Conference, San Diego, CA.

O'Neil, J. (2000). Fads and fireflies: The difficulties of sustaining change. *Educational Leadership, 57*(7), 6-9.

Ponessa, J. (1996). Home rule. *Teacher Magazine, 7*(5), 18-20.

Reston, J., Dietrich, A.P., & Bailey, E.L. (1996). School climate: common-sense solutions to complicated problems. *NASSP Bulletin, 80*(576), 16-22.

Reston, J., Brown, B.R., & Cooper, G.R. (2000). School-based management: how effective is it? *NASSP Bulletin, 84*(16), 77-95.

Reynolds, L.J. (1997). *Successful site-based management.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Robertson, P.J., & Briggs, K.L. (1998). Improving schools through school-based management: an examination of the process of change. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(1), 28-57.

Seabolt, L.E. (1994). *Characteristics of leadership teams in Georgia public schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.

Shedd, J.B., & Bacharach, S.B. (1991). *Tangled hierarchies: Teachers as professionals and the management of schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Shields, P.M., Anderson, L., Bamburg, J.D., Hawkins, E.F., Knapp, M.S. Ruskus, J. Wechsler, M., & Wilson, C.L. (1995). *Improving schools from the bottom up: from effective schools to restructuring.* (Contract No. LC90035001). Washington, D.C.

Squires, D.A., & Kranyik, R.D. (1996). The Comer program: Changing school culture. *Educational Leadership*, *53*(4), 29-32.

Squires, D.A., & Kranyik, R.D. (1999). Connecting school-based management and instructional improvement: A case study of two ATLAS schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 4*(3), 241-258.

Summers, A.A., & Johnson, A.W. (1996). The effects of school-based management plans. In E.A. Hanushek & D.W. Jorgenson (Eds.), *Improving America's schools: The role of incentives* (pp. 75-94), Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Taylor, B.O. (2002). The effective schools process: Alive and well. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(5), 375-379.

Vann, A.S. (2000). Shared decision-making committees: Power without power. *Educational Digest, 65*(6), 67-69.

Wagstaff, J.G. (1995). Site-based management, shared decision making, and science and mathematics education: a tale of two districts. *Theory Into Practice, 34*(1), 66-73.

Winter, P.A., Keedy, J.L., & Newton, R.M. (2000). Teachers serving on school decision-making councils: Predictors of teacher attraction to the job. *Journal of School Leadership, 10*, 248-263.

Wolf, D. (2002). When raising isn't rising. *School Administrator, 59*(11), 20-24.

Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Getting school-based management right. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*(1), 22-26.

Wohlstetter, P. & Mohrman, S.A. (1996). *Assessment of school-based management.* Washingon, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Wohlstetter, P., Van Kirk, A., Robertson, P.J., & Mohrman, S.A. (1997). *Organizing for successful school-based management.* Reston, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

APPENDIX A

DESIGN TO DETERMINE CONTENT VALIDITY FOR THE

SBMC RATING SCALE

Site-Based Management Characteristics Rating Scale

Responses to the following statements will be used to determine the degree to which nine research-based characteristics of effective SBM are found in Title 1 elementary schools that met AYP in a metro Atlanta school system. The characteristics of SBM have been divided into nine subgroups: (1) Central office support; (2) Clarification of roles and responsibilities; (3) Focus on student learning; (4) Use the collaborative process; (5) Provide knowledge and skills in focused areas of need; (6) Develop a belief system (mission, vision, goals); (7) Build positive relationships with the community; (8) Strong leadership at the school level; and (9) Assess and monitor student progress in targeted areas. Respondents are asked to evaluate each question based on a five point Likert scale. Please read these statements and the questionnaire item that follows. Please respond to the items in terms of (1) whether the item is stated clearly and (2) whether the items identify the elements of SBM.

Characteristic 1: Has Central Office Support

Rationale for the characteristic: Kopcynski (2000); Bellon & Beaudry (1992); Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser (2001); Chrispeels et al. (2000); Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky (1991); David (1996).

> An essential component of successful SBM efforts, emphasized by practitioners interviewed as a part of this study, was the efficient dissemination of information about effective practices. Several teachers felt that regular communication from school-district staff about "what works" could promote wider adoption of useful practices, encourage teachers to be more innovative, and improve attitudes toward SBM procedures by conveying a sense of shared SBM experience." (Kopcynski, 2000, p. 233)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
1. The central office provides teachers and staff with information on research based instructional practices.	Y	N	Y	N
2. The central office provides professional learning opportunities for administrators and teacher leaders in leadership, data analysis, and other relevant topics.	Y	N	Y	N

3. The central office developed and distributed overall mission and vision statements on which all people associated with the schools can focus.   Y   N   Y   N

4. The central office provides standards, system guidelines, and state guidelines from which my school can make appropriate choices for change.   Y   N   Y   N

If you responded with an "N" to any item, please reword the item. _____

Characteristic 2: Clarifies Roles and Responsibilities of Staff

Rationale for characteristic: Kopcynski (2000); Bellon & Beaudry (2000); Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser (2001); Chrispeels et al (2000); Dee et al (2002); David (1996).

> Roles and responsibilities should be clearly defined and communicated prior to implementation of any restructuring program. (Bellon & Beaudry, 1992, p. 14)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
5. The faculty and staff understand the roles and responsibilities of the SBLT.	Y	N	Y	N
6. Faculty and staff who are not on the SBLT are involved in the planning process (e.g. meetings, dissemination of information, and consultation for relevant information).	Y	N	Y	N

If you responded with an "N" to any item, please reword the item. _____

Characteristic 3: Has a Focus on Student Learning

Rationale: Squires & Kranyik (1999); Chrispeels et al (2000); Beck & Murphy (1996); Cole-Henderson (2000); McIntyre (1999).

> The [state] test forced us to look at curriculum and instruction because it tested such elements as summarizing, comparing, contrasting, and making judgments rather than knowledge alone. This resulted in the school teams focusing more seriously on the

teaching and learning processes as the basis for educational planning and implementation." (Squires & Kranyik, 1999, p. 249)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
7. Our school improvement plan focuses on teaching and learning processes to achieve the desired outcomes for student learning.	Y	N	Y	N
8. The leadership connects non-instructional decisions with conditions that maximize student learning opportunities.	Y	N	Y	N

If you responded with an "N" to any item, please reword the item. _____

Characteristic 4: Uses the Collaborative Process

Rationale: Kopcynski (2000); Bellon & Beaudry (1992); Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser (2001); Squires & Kranyik (1999); Chrispeels et al (2000); Taylor (2002); Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky (1991); McDonald et al (1999); Wohlstetter et al (1997); Cole-Henderson (2000); David (1996); McIntyre (1999).

> The principals also reported that the grading scales and mastery standards at each of their schools were set high to promote excellence. Moreover, teachers in all subject areas at their school required students to be effective in reading, writing, mathematics, and speaking skills. The principals generally reported that consensus had been obtained among administrators and teachers on their schools' goals and expectations and that, to further those goals, curricula, instruction, and assessment had been aligned with district and state standards. (Cole-Henderson, 2000, p. 82)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
9. The school improvement goals are developed and implemented through consensus (judgment arrived at by most of those concerned) leadership, faculty, and the staff.	Y	N	Y	N

10. The principal facilitates interaction   Y   N   Y   N
among teachers by establishing teacher-led
committees that involve a broad range of
faculty and staff including cross-grade
level groups.

If you responded with an "N" to any item, please reword the item. _____

Characteristic 5: Provides Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need

Rationale: Kopcynski (2000); Chrispeels et al (2000); Taylor (2002); Wohlstetter et al (1997); Cole-Henderson (2000); David (1996); McIntyre (1999); Shields (1995).

> Focus on continuous improvement with school-wide training in functional and process skills and in areas related to curriculum and instruction. In schools where SBM worked, professional development was a very high priority. Staff members regularly participated in training opportunities. Professional development at these schools was used strategically and was deliberately tied to the school's reform objectives. (Wohlstetter, 1995, p. 24)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
11. The SBLT participates in professional learning activities to learn team process skills.	Y	N	Y	N
12. Professional development activities to improve instructional practices are school-wide and are tied to our school improvement plan.	Y	N	Y	N
13. Data assessment, monitoring student progress, and research-based instructional strategies are integral parts of our on-going professional learning activities.	Y	N	Y	N
14. Professional training in areas related to curriculum and instruction is required throughout the school year.	Y	N	Y	N

If you responded with an "N" to any item, please reword the item. _____

Characteristic 6: Develops a Belief System (Mission, Vision, Goals)

Rationale: Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser (2001); Chrispeels (2000); Wohlstetter et al (1997); David (1996); McIntyre (1999).

> A school's vision can provide a focus and direction for the school and a lens or filter through which members of shared decision-making teams view their personal connection to the team's decision-making process. (Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser, 2001, p. 306)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
15. Our mission focuses on student learning and achievement outcomes being the major responsibilities of the school.	Y	N	Y	N
16. The principal encourages the mission and vision statements to be learned early and repeated often.	Y	N	Y	N

If you responded with an "N" to any item, please reword the item. _____

Characteristic 7: Builds Positive Relationships with the Community

Rationale: Kopcynski (2000); Bellon & Beaudry (1992); Chrispeels et al (2000); Beck & Murphy (1996); David (1996); Cole-Henderson (2000); Shields et al (1995).

> Many of the successful SBM schools were systematic and creative in their efforts to communicate with parents and the community. They relied as much on face-to-face communication as on formal documents. These schools also had a strong "customer service" ORIENTATION. Many conducted annual parent and community surveys and used the results to help set priorities for the following year. . . Parent/teacher conferences and newsletters were also used as information channels. (Wohlstetter, 1995)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
17. Parents serve as active members of the SBLT.	Y	N	Y	N
18. Teachers and staff communicate with parents and the community through parent newsletters, parent meetings, parent/teacher conferences, school council meetings, and PTO meetings.	Y	N	Y	N
19. The SBLT communicates its activities with minutes distributed to teachers and staff through grade level and staff meetings and/or faculty meetings.	Y	N	Y	N
20. The principal conducts annual parent surveys and use the results to help set priorities for the following year.	Y	N	Y	N
21. Teachers and staff conduct student surveys and use the results to help set priorities for the following year.	Y	N	Y	N

If you responded with an "N" to any item, please reword the item. _____

Characteristic 8: Demonstrates Strong Leadership at the School Level

Rationale: Chrispeels et al (2000); Taylor (2002); Beck & Murphy (1998); Wohlstetter et al (1997); David (1996); McIntyre (1999).

> The schools where SBM worked had principals who played a key role in dispersing power, in promoting a school-wide commitment to learning, in expecting all teachers to participate in the work of the school, in collecting information about student learning, and in distributing rewards. The principals were often described as facilitators and managers of change, as strong supporters of their staff, and as the people who brought innovation to their schools and moved reform forward. (Wohlstetter, 1995, p.25)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
22. The principal creates a school-wide commitment to learning by expecting all teachers to participate in the professional learning of the school.	Y	N	Y	N
23. The principal facilitates change by encouraging teachers and staff to make innovative reforms to improve student learning.	Y	N	Y	N
24. The principal delegates power by encouraging teachers to chair and to participate on committees to improve student learning.	Y	N	Y	N

If you responded with an "N" to any item, please reword the item. _____

Characteristic 9: Assesses and Monitor Student Progress in Targeted Areas

Rationale: Squires & Kranyik (1999); Taylor (2002); McIntyre (1999); Shields (1995).

   Monitoring and assessment generates useful data on program processes and
   outcomes, feeds back information to inform program modification where necessary,
   and established new goals and objectives. (Comer et al, 1996, p. 14)

Items for measuring this characteristic:

	Is the item stated clearly?		Does the item capture the essence of the characteristic?	
25. The SBLT assesses current student needs, develops and implements a course of action, evaluates the effects, and repeats the process.	Y	N	Y	N
26. The SBLT decides how results will be measured throughout the year and monitors student progress regularly to determine when/if modifications need to be made.	Y	N	Y	N

APPENDIX B

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT CHARACTERISTICS RATING SCALE

Site-Based Management Characteristics Rating Scale

Directions: Please rate each of the following SBM characteristics by circling the letter which reflects your perceptions of the School Building Leadership Team (SBLT) operations in your school in 2003-2004: Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA), and No Knowledge (NK).

Central Office Support
1. The central office provides teachers and staff with information on research-based instructional practices. **SD D A SA NK**

2. The central office provides professional learning opportunities for administrators and teachers in leadership, data analysis, and other relevant topics. **SD D A SA NK**

3. The central office develops and distributes mission and vision statements on which all people associated with the schools can focus. **SD D A SA NK**

4. The central office provides standards, system guidelines, and state guidelines from which my school can make appropriate choices for change. **SD D A SA NK**

Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities
5. The faculty and staff understand the roles and responsibilities of the SBLT. **SD D A SA NK**

Focus on Student Learning
6. Our school improvement plan focuses on teaching and learning processes to achieve the desired outcomes for student learning. **SD D A SA NK**

Use of the Collaborative Process
7. The school improvement goals are developed and strategies implemented through consensus of the faculty. **SD D A SA NK**

8. The principal establishes committees that are led by teachers. **SD D A SA NK**

Provide Knowledge and Skills in Focused Areas of Need
9. Professional development activities for teachers to improve instructional practices are school-wide and are tied to our school improvement plan. **SD D A SA NK**

10. Data assessment, monitoring student progress, and researched-based instructional strategies are integral parts of our ongoing professional development activities. **SD D A SA NK**

11. Professional training in areas related to curriculum and instruction is required throughout the school year. **SD D A SA NK**

Development of a Belief System
12. The principal encourages the mission and vision statements to be learned and repeated often. **SD D A SA NK**

Build Positive Relationships with the Community
13. Teachers and staff communicate with parents and the community through parent newsletters and parent/teacher conferences. **SD D A SA NK**

14. The principal conducts parent surveys and uses the results to help set priorities for the following year. **SD D A SA NK**

15. Teachers and staff conduct student surveys and use the results to **SD   D   A   SA   NK**
   improve student learning.

Strong Leadership at the School Level
16. The principal expects all teachers to participate in the professional **SD   D   A   SA   NK**
   learning of the school.

17. The principal encourages teachers and staff to implement research- **SD   D   A   SA   NK**
   based strategies to improve student learning.

18. The principal encourages teachers to chair and to participate on **SD   D   A   SA   NK**
   committees to improve student learning.

Assess and Monitor Student Progress in Targeted Areas
19. The SBLT assesses student needs, develops and implements a course **SD   D   A   SA   NK**
   of action, and analyzes the results.

20. The SBLT decides how results will be measured and monitors **SD   D   A   SA   NK**
   student progress to determine when/if modifications need to be made.

APPENDIX C

HUMAN SUBJECTS' FORMS

Dear Certified Employee,

I am conducting a doctoral research study through the University of Georgia, College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership to determine the level of characteristics of site-based management present in Title I elementary schools in the Coweta County School System. The title of my study is *The Characteristics of Site-Based Management in Title I Schools That Made Adequate Yearly Progress.*

Please take the time to complete the enclosed Site-Based Management Characteristics (SBMC) Rating Scale. This should take no more than fifteen minutes of your time. Your participation is voluntary and anonymous.

There are no risks to you if you complete this questionnaire. ALL RESPONSES ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE ANONYMOUS. Each questionnaire contains a school number for tracking the rate of return only. NO individual responses will be identified. The instructions for completing the Rating Scale are provided on the cover page of the scale. Please follow these directions.

If you should have any questions about the research being conducted, please contact me at (770) 254-2740 (Work) or (770) 253-3737 (Home). Thank you very much for your time and consideration. Please let me know if you would like to receive a copy of the results of my study.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Gibson

University of Georgia
Phone: (770) 253-3737
Email: rebecca.gibson@cowetaschools.org

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to the Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, GA 30602-7411: Telephone (706)542-3199; Email Address: IRB@uga.edu.

RESPONDENT INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING

THE RATING SCALE (SBMC)

- The information contains:
  1. Site-Based Management Characteristics (SBMC) Rating Scale – 20 questions; each coded with the school number to track the rate of return. Principals will not see responses – you seal. **THERE WILL BE NO WAY TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES.**
  2. Letter size envelope to seal the completed SBMC Rating Scale and return to the large envelope.

- Please respond to each of the 20 questions by circling the response that represents your perception of the SBLT in your school in the 2003-2004 school year.

Your opinion is valuable for each question.

PLEASE DO NOT SIGN OR IDENTIFY YOURSELF

- Upon completion: Seal your SBMC Rating Scale in the individual envelope and place that sealed envelope in the large return envelope provided. A designated teacher or other certified employee will seal the large envelope and send it to me through the courier.

- If you would like a copy of the summary results for your school in the 2003-2004 school year, please complete and return the attached page.

- **NO INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES WILL BE REPORTED AND NO INDIVIDUAL WILL BE IDENTIFIED.**

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE! YOU HAVE BEEN AN ASSET TO THIS RESEARCH!