DOCUMENT RESUME

EA 025 139
Edirisooriya, Gunapala; And Others
Lessons from a First Year Evaluation of a School
Restructuring Pilot Project.
Apr 93
64p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
Speeches/Conference Papers (150) Reports - Research/Technical (143)
MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
*Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education;
Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; *School
Based Management; *School Restructuring
*Baltimore City Public Schools MD

This paper examines the strengths and weaknesses of the first-year implementation of the school restructuring pilot project in Baltimore City Public Schools. Implemented in 10 elementary, 2 middle, and 2 high schools, the project sought to implement school-based management to enhance student achievement. Data were collected from a survey of teachers, school administrators, support staff, parents, community members, and students, which yielded 534 responses. Response rates were low for students, parents, and the community. Although respondents recognized the essential features of school restructuring, they also tended to agree on the need to readjust restructuring strategies. A major weakness in the project was the lack of monitoring/feedback mechanisms and lack of training in the essential aspects of restructuring. In general, school-restructuring team members had more positive attitudes toward school restructuring than did nonteam members. It is recommended that restructuring not be implemented using a "business as usual" approach. Appendices contain frequency distributions and one statistical table. (Contains 12 references.) (LMI)

****	******	**********	********	*******	*******	********	*****
*	Reproductions	supplied by	EDRS are	the best	that can	be made	*
*	-	from the	original	document	•		*
****	*****	*****	*********	*******	*******	*******	****



ABSTRACT

LESSONS FROM A FIRST YEAR EVALUATION OF A SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT

Gunapala Edirisooriya Lawrence F. Howe Department cf Research and Evaluation

Denise G. Borders Division of Educational Accountability

> Jeanette Evans Office of Chief of Staff

Baltimore City Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Office of Educational Research and Improvement EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

C Minor Changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

 Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy "PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ediricoo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting in Atlanta

April 1?-16, 1993

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this paper is to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the first year implementation of the school restructuring pilot project in Baltimore City Public Schools. According to our analysis, the school restructuring idea enjoys widespread support among the school community. The respondents have recognized many essential features of school restructuring: school community representation and participation, shared decisionmaking, a long-term vision for the school, communication and feedback mechanisms, freedom to exercise their discretion on school-related policy issues, and the long-term commitment of all players in restructuring. However, the school communities in this school restructuring pilot project are not entirely satisfied with many aspects of the current restructuring efforts. Logistic regression analyses show that perceptions of respondents differed on some aspects of school restructuring depending on whether they were school restructuring team members or not.

According to some reports, the *business as usual* approach, is quite incompatible with school restructuring. Whether the decisions are made at the central office, or at the school site becomes irrelevant if school-based management continues *business* as



===>

usual. The school restructuring approach provides a unique opportunity for each school to respond to various issues according to the individual school's circumstances. The business as usual approach indicates a failure on the part of the schools to utilize that opportunity to their advantage. The respondents' overwhelming demand for further training in every aspect of school restructuring may provide some clues for this failure. These observations reflect all participating schools in the pilot project although some exceptions may apply to individual schools.

These data provide ample support for a number of aspects of our educational reform thrust. School communities have come to recognize the need for educational reforms. They also believe that school restructuring driven by school-based management has the potential for solving many of the identified problems. However, the evidence indicates that re-examination and further development of every aspect of school restructuring is necessary if we are to expect any significant improvement in student achievement.



LESSONS FROM A FIRST YEAR EVALUATION OF A SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT¹

Introduction

In response to the demands for educational reform from many quarters, in the 1991-92 school year, Baltimore City Public Schools (BCPS) embarked upon an experimental 3 year school restructuring pilot project. This experiment is being implemented in 14 schools. Included among them are 10 elementary schools, 2 middle schools, and 2 senior high schools. The schools in this project are representative of school system demographic characteristics. *School-based management* (SBM) is the guiding principle. Enhancement of student achievement is the main objective of this

1



¹We thank Ruth Katzenellenbogen and August Treff for their valuable assistance in preparing this paper, and we are responsible for any remaining errors.

NOTE: This paper is intended to promote the exchange of ideas among researchers and policy makers. The views expressed here are those of the authors and no official support by the Baltimore City Public Schools is intended or should be inferred.

project.² The project proposal specifies the evaluation of the project annually. In June 1992, a questionnaire/survey was conducted to collect data for evaluating the first year implementation of the pilot project,³ and an evaluation report was issued in January 1993. The main objectives of this paper, a byproduct of the evaluation report, are to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the restructuring effort, and to examine the congruence of opinion between two categories of respondents: the respondents who were members of the school restructuring teams (SRT), and the respondents who were not members of the school restructuring teams.

²According to the pilot project proposal,

³The main objectives of the evaluation comprised the following;

To determine:

- whether all stakeholders in children's education were involved in school restructuring
- whether the School Restructuring Teams (SRT) have a clear understanding of their goals and objectives
- whether the SRTs have well conceived plans to achieve their objectives
- whether the SRTs have established monitoring/feedback mechanisms in implementing their school restructuring plans.



G

[&]quot;The basic monumental objective of School Restructuring is to enhance student achievement. The degree to which this is possible is dependent on how we educate our children, and on the ability of the local school to set its goals for children, garner support from stakeholders, increase the flexibility of local school educational initiatives, and channel resources directly to the educational process" (Baltimore City Public Schools, 1990, p. 1).

Data Description

Respondents to this questionnaire included school teachers, school administrators, support staff, parents, community, and students. Of the 534 response sheets returned, 29 were discarded for invalid response patterns. Of the participating 14 schools, 10 elementary schools, 1 middle school, and 2 senior high schools returned 311, 37, and 157 valid questionnaires respectively; one middle school did not return any surveys. Response rates varied among the schools. The school restructuring approach emphasizes the involvement of student, parent, and the community in children's education. Hence, their input is vitally important for the evaluation of the pilot project. However, the number of surveys returned by students, parents, and the community was far from satisfactory.⁴

The questionnaire was designed to collect data on the following aspects of the restructuring process: respondents' professional background, the (SRT), community involvement, decision making process, restructuring strategies, outcome evaluation methods, training for restructuring, relationship between central office and school, waiver process, and an overall evaluation of the school restructuring efforts. The questionnaire was structured in

3



⁴The total rumber of surveys returned by this category of respondents was 59, and two thirds of it came from one school. Three schools did not return any surveys completed by students, parents, or the community of the schools.

such a way that a set of related items stimulated responses for each category of information. The survey instrument was comprised of 73 items; all the items called for structured responses, except for one open-ended item. Most of the structured response items were 5 point Likert-scale items (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

Data Analysis

Data analyses utilized in this paper include one-way and twoway analyses of item frequency distributions, and the logistic regression method. One-way analysis refers to the analysis of item frequency distribution with no reference to the characteristics of the respondents.⁵ Two-way analysis refers to the analysis of item frequency distribution with reference to the respondents' membership in their SRTs.⁶ Whether there was a congruence of opinion between the SRT members and the non-SRT members was tested by utilizing the logistic regression method.⁷ In cases where the null hypothesis was rejected, we enumerated the difference between the two groups. If responses were invariant of the SRT membership status, then the discussion was limited to one-way analysis only.

4



⁵One-way analyses of item frequency distributions are summarized and presented in Figure 1 in Appendix A.

⁶Two-way analyses results are summarized and presented in Figure 2 in Appendix A.

⁷The logistic regression analysis results are summarized in Table 1 in Appendix A.

The CATMOD procedure in SAS software was used for conducting the logistic regression analysis; an α rate of 0.05 was set for the rejection of null hypothesis. Null hypothesis tested in each regression analysis is that there was no difference of opinion between the SRT members and the non-SRT members on a given statement.

One-Way Analysis

information collected on respondents' professional The employment category, years of includes: background teaching/principalship experience, and their previous experience in Of the respondents, 290 (58%) were school-based management. teachers; 104 (21%) were professionals/paraprofessionals; 56 (11%) were students/parents/community; 31 (6%) were teachers categorized as department head, master teachers and so on; and 21 (4%) were principals/assistant principals.⁸ Among the teachers who responded to the questionnaire nearly 70 percent had more than 15 years of teaching experience. Over 65 percent of the respondent teachers have been teaching in the BCPS system for more than 15 The number of years of experience of principals and years. assistant principals varied somewhat evenly from less than 5 years to more than 25 years. Over 80 percent of the respondents had some in a school-based management environment. prior experience

5



⁸Three respondents did not indicate their professional background.

However, the majority of them thought that prior experience had little relevance for the present context of school restructuring they were engaged in. This sample represents a cross section of the stakeholders in the education of children in BCPS. Of the respondents, about 25 percent of them were school restructuring team members.⁹

overwhelming majority (nearly 75 percent) of **all** Añ respondents expressed no doubt on the need for the representation of all stakeholders in the SRTs. Nearly three fourths of all the respondents agreed that full representation of the school and the community in the SRT would be helpful. Moreover, a good majority of the respondents agreed on the various ways in which the full representation of the community in the SRT can be useful: to strengthen the SRT efforts to improve student outcomes, to understand student-related issues better, to minimize conflict within the SRT/school, to minimize the intensity of conflicts between the school and the community, and to lead school-based to a success. A majority thought that the school management principal's administrative style was a contributing factor in bringing the school staff and the community together for their

6



⁹The distributions of professional background of all the respondents and of SRT membership categories by professional background seemed to match except for two categories: paraprofessional or professional and assistant principal or principal.

school restructuring efforts.

There was a general agreement among the respondents who expressed an opinion (73 percent) that the SRT members were adhering to the SRT decision making process. The majority of the respondents who were familiar with their school restructuring strategies were in agreement with those strategies (77 percent); they thought that their schools were implementing appropriate strategies for achieving their SRT goals; the majority of them did not consider school restructuring efforts as an example of the wrong diagnosis of the problems with our schools; and they did not think that a particular group of people were trying to establish its own style of administration under the guise of school restructuring.

About one third of the respondents did not know whether the SRT objectives were realistic. But, an overwhelming majority of the respondents who expressed an opinion thought that the SRT objectives were quite realistic, and they expected their restructuring efforts to be successful. More than 50 percent of all the respondents thought that the SRTs had a clear understanding of the direction in which their schools were heading. But, of course, this is not necessarily true for the total school community.



7

They agreed that lack of resources could hinder their school restructuring efforts. There was very little disagreement on the question: who should be responsible for student outcomes in their schools under school-based management. Everyone should be responsible was the answer: the principal, the staff, and the SRT. Of the two thirds of the respondents who expressed an opinion, about 60 percent considered their school a fine example of effective school-based management.

success of school restructuring depends on each The stakeholder feeling fully operational. In order to ascertain this, the perceived training needs of the stakeholders was explored. About one fifth of the respondents found it difficult to say they received sufficient training to participate whether effectively in their school restructuring efforts. Among the others the majority (about 55 percent) thought that they had received sufficient training for that purpose. Furthermore, the respondents were asked to indicate whether their SRTs and staff are in need of further training in various types of skills useful in school-based management. Those areas mentioned were: planning decision-making skills; trouble shooting skills; shared techniques/skills; plan implementation and monitoring skills; identifying data requirements and understanding the interpretation and implications of data analysis; and udgeting, financial planing, and budget forecasting. The response patterns were



===>

12

somewhat similar. About one third of the respondents could not say whether there was a need for training in these skill areas. Among those who expressed an opinion on the need for training about 75 percent of them stated that there was a need for further training in each of these areas.

About half of the respondents didn't know whether schools enjoyed sufficient freedom from the central office to exercise discretion in resolving issues at their schools. Of the others, about three fourths agreed that they had sufficient freedom from the central office to exercise discretion in restructuring their schools. However, about 60 percent of the respondents stated that they still receive directives from the central office that inhibited their restructuring efforts. A similar response pattern was exhibited for the statement: who has the final authority in deciding certain issues is not clearly defined. Also, about 70 percent of the respondents stated that they did not have the required information at the school-site to make certain decisions.

The pilot project recognized the fact that if school restructuring is to succeed, then schools should have the authority to exercise their best judgment in resolving school-related issues. If the state and school board policies and union contracts create unnecessary obstacles to the school restructuring efforts, then waivers of stipulations dictated by such policies and contracts



9

were expected to grant to participating schools in order to speedup the decision making process. The survey collected information on the respondents' understanding of waiver process, and the use of it. About two thirds of the respondents didn't know whether their school had applied for waivers. It is striking and troublesome to note that nearly one third of the SRT members also did not know whether their SRTs have applied for waivers. This adds further evidence for the lack of communication, participation, or feedback within the school community. Nearly three fourths of the respondents found it difficult to cast any opinion on the other aspects of the waiver process. No definite conclusion could be drawn from those who expressed an opinion on the level of satisfaction with the waiver process. About 50 percent stated that they were satisfied with the waiver process, and the other 50 percent disputed that. Respondents were unhappy with paper work and time lag related to the waiver process. Of the respondents who expressed an opinion, about 60 percent thought that the amount of paper work involved with the waiver process was too time consuming. Similarly, about 80 percent thought that the time lag related to the waiver process posed a real problem.

The survey solicited respondents' ratings on various aspects of the restructuring efforts. 52 percent of the respondents rated the commitment of the SRT to the school restructuring efforts as better than average or excellent. In contrast, only 12 percent of

10



the respondents rated the commitment of the SRT to the school restructuring efforts as inadequate or below average. The cooperation among the members of the SRT was rated as better than average or excellent by 48 percent of the respondents whereas 14 percent of the respondents thought that the cooperation among the SRT members was below average or inadequate. The SRT decision making process at their schools was rated by 25 percent of respondents as good or excellent while 19 percent thought that the SRT decision making process was not working satisfactorily. The required training for the SRT was rated good or excellent by 30 percent of the respondents while 19 percent indicated that the training they received was below average or totally inadequate.

Support from the central office for their restructuring efforts was rated good or excellent by 28 percent while 20 percent of the respondents thought that the support from the central office was inadequate. Support from the school staff for restructuring efforts received a somewhat higher approval rate (40 percent) of good or excellent. Only 18 percent of the respondents were dissatisfied with the support from the school staff for their restructuring efforts. 36 percent of the respondents thought that the implementation of their SRT plan was better than average or excellent while 19 percent of the respondents registered their dissatisfaction with the implementation process of the SRT plan. The SRT leadership was rated good or excellent by 45 percent while



11

19 percent of the respondents indicated their dissatisfaction with the SRT leadership.

Two-Way Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

One-way analysis of item frequency distribution provided no conclusive evidence on whether school staff was truly represented in their SRTs. However, two-way analysis of this issue, by taking into account the SRT membership status revealed a different scenario. The coefficient estimate of the membership parameter yielded an odds ratio of 0.5. So, the SRT members were half less willing to agree than the non-SRT members with the statement that the SRTs were not truly representative of diverse groups of staff in their school. Chi square probability associated with the membership coefficient estimate was 0.0%. Therefore, we rejected the null hypothesis that there was no difference of opinion between the SRT members and the non-SRT members on this issue.

Generally, respondents agreed that the community's perceived apathy towards its children's education is insurmountable. Among those who expressed an opinion on that issue nearly 60 percent believed that it was a difficult task, and about 40 percent thought it could be overcome. The two-way analysis showed that the SRT members differed with the non-SRT members on this issue. According to the logistic regression analysis, the SRT members were less likely to agree with this statement than the non-SRT members:



12

likelihood ratio estimate was 0.6, and Chi square probability associated with the membership parameter estimate was 3.25%. Therefore, we rejected the null hypothesis that the SRT members and the non-SRT members did not differ in their opinion on the statement that the community's perceived apathy towards its children's education was insurmountable.

One-way analysis showed little evidence to suggest that the SRTs were dominated by a particular group of people. 37 percent of the respondents expressed no opinion one-way or the other; of those who expressed an opinion, 51 percent thought that their SRTs were dominated by a particular group of people. On this issue, opinion differed between the SRT members and the non-SRT members. The estimated odds ratio was 0.5; so, the SRT members were half as likely than the non-SRT members to accept that the SRTs were dominated by a certain group of people. Chi square probability associated with the membership parameter estimate was 1.00%. Therefore, we rejected the null hypothesis that both the SRT and the non-SRT members' opinions converged on this issue: the SRTs were dominated by a certain group of people.

The respondents as a whole does not give us any indication as to whether they were in agreement with the direction their SRTs were taking on a variety of issues. However, when we analyzed the responses by taking into account the membership status we noticed



13

a difference. The SRT members were less likely than the non-SRT members to be disgruntled with the direction the SRTs were taking on numerous issues; the estimated odds ratio was 0.4. The Chi square probability associated with the estimate of the membership parameter was 0.0%. So, we rejected the null hypothesis that there was no difference between the SRT members and the non-SRT members in their opinion on the direction the SRTs were taking on numerous issues.

One-way analysis indicated that about one third of the respondents had no opinion as to whether the overwhelming majority of their school and community had a very clear understanding of the direction in which their schools were heading. But, the majority of those who expressed an opinion on that issue answered in affirmative, in the ratio of 57 to 43. On this issue, there was a significant statistical difference of opinion between the SRT members and the non-SRT members. The SRT members were 2 times more likely than the non-SRT members to agree that their SRTs had a clear understanding of their long term goals. The membership parameter estimate had a Chi square probability of 0.0%; therefore, we rejected the null hypothesis of no difference of opinion between the SRT members and the non-SRT members on this issue.

According to one-way analysis, an overwhelming majority (2:1) of the respondents who expressed an opinion stated that they were



14

concerned about the lack of feedback between staff on their school restructuring implementation process. But, the SRT members were 0.5 times less likely than the non-SRT members to accept that the lack of feedback was an issue of concern. Chi square probability associated with the SRT parameter estimate was 0.0%. Therefore, we rejected the null hypothesis that there was no difference of opinion between the SRT members and non-SRT members on the issue concerning lack of feedback.

Discontent with the support from the local community was expressed by 42 percent of the respondents. Only 24 percent thought that support from the local community was good or excellent. However, this approval rate varied significantly between the SRT members and the non-SRT members. The SRT members were more happy than the non-SRT members with the support from the local community--the SRT members were 2 times more likely than the non-SRT members to be satisfied with the support from the local Chi square probability associated with the SRT community. parameter estimate was 0.0%. Therefore, we rejected the null hypothesis that there was no difference of opinion between the SRT members and the non-SRT members on this issue.

The approval rating for students' awareness, enthusiasm, and support of the restructuring efforts was remarkably low; 54 percent of the respondents were dissatisfied with this aspect while only a



15

16 percent of the respondents gave a good or excellent rating. Moreover, the respondents' perception of student support varied widely between the SRT members and the non-SRT members. Students' support of the restructuring efforts was 3 times more likely to be rated good or excellent by the SRT members than non-SRT members. Chi square probability associated with the SRT parameter estimate was 0.0%. Therefore, we rejected the null hypothesis that there was no difference of opinion between the SRT members and the non-SRT members on the issue of students' enthusiasm, support, and awareness of school restructuring efforts.

Two-way analyses suggest that the SRT members and the non-SRT members do not see eye-to-eye on some important aspects of school restructuring. Lack of congruence between all the players involved in school restructuring sends a strong message: there is lot more work to be done. Because, as Fred M. Newmann (1992) pointed out,

Schools that practice SBM (school-based management) and SDM (shared decision making) gain "empowerment," but they too face several problems. Conflict within a school staff over educational goals can lead to stalemates and compromises that serve no students well. Teachers may not value parents' input when they feel parents lack important professional knowledge. If teachers and parents lack skills of group work and productive discourse within democratic structures, governance meetings add inefficiencies and breed distrust. (p. 2), (italics added.)

Review of the Respondents' Comments

The questionnaire asked the respondents to furnish other



pertinent information about their restructuring efforts. 79 respondents utilized this opportunity. Analysis of these comments revealed new information and added further evidence to our findings The most frequently cited from the structured-response items. complaint was the lack of communication and feedback among all the stakeholders in children's education, especially staff, community, and students. As one respondent has succinctly put it: "peoples' hearts will not be in a process for change when they feel that their ideas and opinions or themselves are not valued." Some respondents were concerned about the lack of understanding or misunderstanding of school restructuring efforts; for example, "I got the impression that the school restructuring/school-based management efforts are geared toward raising test scores of the bright students in our Chapter 1 program."

According to their comments both the SRTs and the non-SRT staff share responsibility for the perceived lack of cooperation between them. One respondent complained, "The perceived attitude of many is that this is just another of those many programs from above," and another respondent stated, "Some members have been heard to refer to the team as we and to the staff in general, as you all." Some were unhappy about the business as usual approach, and one complained in great detail, for example,

"Old practices are still adhered to. Absences are excessive; they have 50 and 60 absences a year. Yet students are making excellent grades. Students are given



17

21

100 points two or three times a quarter for bringing their required textbook to school periodically. Such practices lead to inflated grade averages and should not be a part of any restructuring process. Policies are not adhered to: students who have 25 or more illegal absences are supposed to be denied summer school. But students are permitted to go; attendance record is waived. This system will never improve. Every effort is a lost cause before any process gets started."

The business as usual approach is fully incompatible with the expectations of the school restructuring efforts. Among the problems cited are the lack of resources at the school level, the inadequacy of preparation and training for school restructuring activities, the lack of attention to reforming classroom instructional methods, and the adverse impact of transferring teachers on the restructuring efforts.

Some respondents spoke to a need to endure restructuring efforts since BCPS could not afford to continue with the business as usual approach, for example, "I am happy with restructuring and school-based management, and I would not want to go back to the old ways." There were many who complimented their school restructuring efforts. To cite a few examples: "Our restructuring team has done a fine job," "So far, school restructuring has worked well in our school," and "Thanks to the restructuring team at our school for the work they have accomplished."

ERIC Pruil Text Provided Byr ERIC 18

Conclusion

Respondents to this questionnaire included a cross section of all stakeholders in the education of children in the BCPS system. Teachers, principals, and the professional staff had fairly considerable experience in their professional area of expertise. An overwhelming majority of the respondents have recognized the need for the participation of all the stakeholders in children's education at every stage of planning, decision making, and implementation of school restructuring activities. The survey indicated that decision making driven by consensus building is an essential feature of school restructuring. Respondents believed that a long term vision for their schools was necessary for the success of the school restructuring efforts. However, although they recognized the essential features of school restructuring, they also tended to agree on the need for re-adjustment of restructuring strategies. A major drawback in the present school restructuring activities is the lack of monitoring/feedback mechanisms in implementing their restructuring plans; for example, one third of the SRT members themselves didn't know whether their SRTs had applied for waivers. The need for further training in the essential aspects of restructuring is clearly evident.¹⁰ In general, the SRT members have a more positive attitude towards



23

¹⁰Other school districts which have implemented school restructuring pilot projects have also recognized the need to provide appropriate training for school restructuring activities, for example, see Collins & Hanson, 1991, p. 34.

their school restructuring efforts than the non-SRT members.

School communities have come to recognize the need for educational reforms. Many also agree that school restructuring driven by school-based management has the potential for solving many of the identified problems. However, school communities seemed to agree that a re-examination of every aspect of school restructuring is necessary, if any significant improvement in student achievement is to be materialized.¹¹ Our findings agree with Kenneth A. Tye's assessment of the nationwide school restructuring efforts, for example:

"The current restructuring movement is the most significant and serious attempt at school reform of the past quarter century. Like most education reform movements, however, it is at risk because many of its advocates oversimplify it and hardly consider the serious underlying issues that must be dealt with if it is to be successful" (Tye, 1992, p. 14).¹²

¹¹This is not intended to discount the efforts of those who are involved with school restructuring. In fact, one perspective of school restructuring stresses the need for continuous readjustments of strategies. According to this interpretation, "Restructuring is a process, not a product. An organization (school district or school) never reaches the final state of being restructured. The process is dynamic." (NASSP, 1990, p. 1).

¹²And also see, Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools (1992) on its national assessment of the extent of school restructuring. It concluded that,

This information indicates that, in spite of plentiful rhetoric and extensive initiatives by districts, states, and national organizations, the restructuring movement has yet to touch the mass of American schools in any significant way. Even in the most selective sample, less than half of those restructured schools are pursuing



History has shown us repeatedly that lack of an integrated approach to change is doomed for failure. If, by school-based management, we simply mean the shift of locus of control of schools from the central office to the school site and continue to adhere to same practices, business as usual, then it would be unwise for us to believe that school restructuring is going to be successful. A basic premise of school restructuring/school-based management is that the central office is insensitive and incapable of responding to diversity among schools and within schools. Therefore, the school restructuring/school-based management approach provides a unique opportunity for each school to launch a concerted effort to improve its student outcomes. Fred M. Newmann (1992) has succinctly put the rationale behind the SBM principle,

When schools must respond to extensive regulation by distant authorities, education at each school suffers, because local administrators, teachers, and parents who know the students best have little influence on what happens in school. (p. 2).¹³

Furthermore, any school operating under the school

¹³Jane L. David (1989, p. 52) also has stressed this point: "The goal of school-based management is to empower school staff by providing authority, flexibility, and resources to solve the educational problems particular to their schools."



major elements of restructuring. In the larger sample, elements of restructuring are pursued much less frequently. In considering initiatives in the future, policy makers amy want to consider why so few schools seem to have changed significantly in response to all the initiatives thus far. (p. 6)

restructuring/school-based management approach should seriously look at changing its practices to accommodate the needs of technical, political, and cultural dimensions of the school (Rossman & Anthony, 1992, p. 12).¹⁴ In their evaluation of a school district's restructuring activities, Dianne L. Taylor and Charles Teddlie (1992, p. 18) have identified the technical aspect of restructuring as an area in which school restructuring strategists have paid very little attention.¹⁵ Therefore, we strongly recommend a closer examination of the school restructuring strategies. Our recommendations are enumerated in Appendix A.

¹⁵ Taylor and Teddlie (1992, p. 16) speculate that the current trend on school restructuring with less emphasis on instructional methods and classroom practices and more emphasis on shareddecision making as a reflection of the perception of school as a bureaucratic unit, as opposed to a teaching-learning environment. Newmann (1992) has warned that,

Even when SBM and SDM seem to proceed smoothly, a school may still offer low quality education, if both teachers and parents at the schools are poorly informed about effective approaches to curriculum, teaching, and assessment. (p. 2)

Newmann (1993) reiterates this: Many structural changes are assumed to change individuals (e.g., teachers) by increasing their motivation (commitment) or skills (competence). The first problem is that organizational structures alone assure the development of no particular individual commitments or competencies. Unless the structures pursue an agenda of particular commitments and competencies, that is, an agenda of powerful content, there is no way to predict whether education will improve. (p. 11)



¹⁴Tye (1992, p.4) specifically refers to the need for fiscal commitment on the part of the policy makers and the need for retraining staff for restructuring schools. In the absence of these, chances for the success of school restructuring efforts would be minimal.

APPENDIX A

. . . .

RECOMMENDATIONS FIGURES

TABLES



Recommendations

Our recommendations are:

- Examine whether each SRT has strictly followed the member selection procedures as specified in the pilot project proposal. In cases where discrepancies have occurred, take the necessary steps to correct them.
- 2. Review whether serious consideration should be given to the proposal by some members that the selection of staff members to the SRTs should be made solely on the basis of ballot. Such an approach has the potential to nourish better cooperation between staff members in the restructuring efforts.
- 3. The SRTs need to come up with strategies for full participation of parents and community in the education of their children. Possibilities for soliciting the participation of volunteers and community workers in school activities could be explored.
- 4. The SRTs should come up with strategies for making the students an integral part of the restructuring efforts. A concerted effort must be made to incorporate student input on issues such as absenteeism, dropping out, disciplinary problems, tardiness, low achievement, lack of interest in learning, higher achievement, and so on.



24

- 5. Each SRT should clearly establish their goals, priorities, and strategies in congruence with the school community's aspirations. In this respect, full representation of all the stakeholders in the education of their children would be helpful. An open forum for discussion is a necessary condition for reaching a common understanding and agreement on the SRT goals, priorities, and strategies.
- 6. Each SRT should examine their communication and feedback mechanism, especially between staff and the SRT. They should also institute proper and effective procedures, for example solicitation of ideas from staff for upcoming issues, agenda items, and distribution of SRT minutes among staff and school community.
- 7. Plan and conduct training for restructuring activities in accordance with each SRT's training needs.
- 8. Efforts should be made to reduce the time lag between requesting a waiver and communicating the decision on such requests to the relevant SRT.
- 9. Various projects and programs within a school should be structured to complement one another.
- 10. The types of System-specific and school-specific data analyses which are useful for decision making at the school level should be established together with timelines for issuing such reports.



25

	26	OTAL				505			_	505			-	505			н Н	404 C			+	202 1	20%			
	PAGE	RESP																				4	, 10 %			•
									андидици								* * * * * * * *				* * * * * * * * *	-			I	C
	A 1992				*****												* * * * * *				****		50 ³			
	ATION DAT				***				··· ··· ···				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				* * * * * * *				* * * * * * * *		40%			
	ECT EVALU				*****				****				* * * * * * *				* * * * * * *				****		20%			•
	1LOT PROJ				* * *				* * *				* *				* * *				•		~~~ %0			
المينيوية. 22-ي الا	FIGURE 1 FIONS OF \$CHOOL RESTRUCTURING P	ESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY		CHER (290 =57 %)	T./PRINCIPAL (21 =4 %)	D./PARENT/COMM (56 =11 %)		E (107 =21 %)	YEARS < 15 (76 ≈15 %)	YEARS OR MORE (80 = 16 %)		IE (120 =24 %)	: YEARS < 15 (78 ≖15 %)	YEARS OR MORE (66 =13 %)	CIPAL	JE (460 =91 %)	<pre>< YEARS < 15 (14 =3 %)</pre>		VCIPAL	VE (468 =93 %)	< YEARS < 15 (13 =3 %)	YEARS DR MORE (1 =0 %)				
	DISTRIBU	CENT OF R		*=TEA	: = ASS	•=STU		NON = *	- = :	•=25	, SCP S	10N= *	C≖:	■=25	TANT/PRIN	ION= *	ິ ສ		ITANT/PRI	0N= •	ي ۳	25				
	TTEN BOENIFINGY	ATEMENT NUMBER AND PERC	OFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	•=NO RESPONSE (3 =1 %)	•=TEACHER, OTHER (31 =6 %)	¤=PARA/PROFESSIONAL (104 =21 %)	JTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENC	•=NO RESPONSE (6 =1 %)	•=LESS THAN 5 YEARS (49 =10 %)	н≡15 < YEARS < 25 (187 =37 %)	EARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN B	•=NO RESPONSE (7 =1 %)	•*LESS THAN 5 YEARS (52 *10 %)	н≖15 < YEARS < 25 (182 =36 %)	OTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE. ASSISI	•=NO RESPONSE (8 =2 %)	•=LESS THAN 5 YEARS (14 *3 %)	H ≡15 < YEARS < 25 (9 ≈2 %)	EARS OF EXPERIENCE IN BCPS, ASS	•=NO RESPONSE (9 =2 %)	•=LESS THAN 5 YEARS (9 =2 %)	₩=15 < YEARS < 25 (5 =1 %)		NOTES: + = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT	3 .0	
		ST	PR PR				TC				17				ĭ				7							

. 1 ຕ

PAGE 27	TOTAI			+	20				លី			<u>ب</u>				ŭ			20 	100%	
												•••••							··· ··· ···	80%	
	7 7 7			••••••								* * * * * * * *							 • • • • • •	+++	
	LION DALA 1			••••••								* * * * * * * * *							•	40%	
	ECT EVALUA			*******				•••••				* * * * * * * * *								20%	
	PILOT PROJ			* * * * 0				* • • •				* * *			• • •				* * *	+ %0	
FIGURE 1	ISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING F Nt of responses for each category	-BASED MANAGEMENT	*=NONE (160 =32 %)	:=3 < YEARS < 6 (30 =6 %)	•=OVER 10 YEARS (50 =10 %)	THE PRESENT SBM EX	*=NO SIMILARITIES (39 =8 %)	:=MORE SIMILARITIES (61 =12 %)	■=NOT RELEVANT (291 =58 %)		*=NO (369 =73 %)			<pre>*=DISAGREE WITH SRT (19 =4 %)</pre>	:=POOR SELECTION (14 =3 %)	==NOT APPLICABLE (350 =69 %)	CHILDRENS EDUCATION	•=NO (96 =19 %)	:=DO NOT KNOW (188 =37 %)		
	ITEM FREQUENCY OI Statement Number and Percen	TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-	•=NO RESPONSE (14 =3 %)	*=LESS THAN 3 YEARS (237 =47 %)	н=6 < YEARS < 10 (14 =3 %)	PREVIOUS SBM EXPERIENCE COMPARED TO	•=NO RESPONSE (27 =5 %)	•=MORE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %)	н=EQUIVALENT (42 =8 %)	ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE SRT?	•=NO RESPONSE (4 =1 %)	•=YES (132 =26 %)	I OPTED NOT TO BE A PART OF THE SRT	•=NO RESPONSE (8 =2 %)	*=SRT DISLIKES ME (22 =4 %)	H=PERSONAL REASONS (92 =18 %)	SRT REPRESENTS ALL STAKEHOLDERS OF	•=NO RESPONSE (4 =1 %)	*=YES (217 =43 %)		NOTES: + = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT
	FIGURE 1	PAGE 2' ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY RESPON	PAGE 2' ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT	PAGE 2' ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT **NO RESPONSE (14 =3 %) **NONE (160 =32 %)	PAGE 2' ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT ••NO RESPONSE (14 =3 %) ••NONE (160 =32 %) •*LESS THAN 3 YEARS (237 =47 %) :=3 < YEARS < 6 (30 =6 %) •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 STATEMENT ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT **NO RESPONSE (14 =3 %) **LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 %) **E < YEARS < 10 (14 =3 %)	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 STATEMENT ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOT STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOT TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT TOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT TOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT TOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 **NONE (14 =3 %) **NONE (160 =32 %) ** **LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 %) :=3 < VEARS <6 (30 =6 %)	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 PAGE 2: STATEMENT ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 PAGE 2: TOT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY PAGE 2: TOT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY RESPON TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT ***NONE (14 =3 %) ***NONE (160 =32 %) ***LESS THAN 3 YEARS (14 =3 %) ***NONE (160 =32 %) ************************************	FIGURE 1 ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT ••NO RESPONSE (14 =3 %) ••NONE (160 =32 %) ••LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 %) =•NONE (160 =32 %) ••LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 %) =•NONE (160 =32 %) ••LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 %) =•NONE (160 =32 %) ••LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 %) =•NONE (160 =32 %) ••LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 %) =•NONE (160 =32 %) ••LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 %) =•NONE (160 =32 %) ••NO RESPONSE (14 =3 %) =•NONE (160 =32 %) ••NO RESPONSE (14 =3 %) =•NO SIMILARITIES (50 =10 %) ••NO RESPONSE (27 =5 %) ••NO SIMILARITIES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) =•NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) ••NONE SIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARIT (45 =9 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSINILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMILARITES (61 =12 %) ••NONE DISSIMI	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 PAGE 2 STATEMENT ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOT STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOT TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOT SATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOT TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT **NONE (160 *32 %) TOT **NO RESPONSE (14 *3 %) **NONE (160 *32 %) **NONE (160 *32 %) **LEGS THAN 3 YEARS (237 *47 %) :*3 < YEARS < 6 (30 •6 %)	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 PAGE 2 ITTEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PLOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 PAGE 2 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL BASED MANGEMENT	FIGURE 1 ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT -NO RESPONSE (14 = 3 X)NONE (160 = 32 X) -NO RESPONSE (14 = 3 X)NONE (160 = 32 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 =47 X) :=3 < VEARS < 6 (30 = 6 X) -NO RESPONSE (14 = 3 X) :=40 VEARS (50 = 10 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (61 = 12 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (61 = 12 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (61 = 12 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (61 = 12 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (61 = 12 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (61 = 12 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (61 = 12 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (61 = 12 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (50 = 50 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (50 = 50 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (50 = 50 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (50 = 50 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) -NO RESPONSE (27 = 5 X) :=40 OR SIMILARITIES (50 = 73 X) -NO RESPONSE (4 = 1 X) :=40 OR 37 X) :=40 OR 37 X) -NO RESPONSE (4 = 1 X) :=40 OR 37 X) :=40 OR 37 X) -NO RESPONSE (4 = 1 X) :=40 OR 37 X) :=40 OR 37 X) :=40 OR 37 X) -NO (368 = 73 X) :=40 OR 37 X) :=40 OR 30 OR 3	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 TITEM FROUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 PAGE 2 TOT ITTEM FROUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 PAGE 2 TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT RESPON TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT RESPON TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT RESPONSE (14 -3 %) **NO RESPONSE (14 -3 %) **NONE (160 -32 %) **LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 +47 %) **OVER 10 VEARS (50 -10 %) **LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 *47 %) **OVER 10 VEARS (50 -10 %) **LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 *47 %) **OVER 10 VEARS (50 -10 %) **LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 *47 %) **OVER 10 VEARS (50 -10 %) **LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 *47 %) **OVER 10 VEARS (50 -10 %) **LESS THAN 3 VEARS (237 *47 %) **OVER 10 VEARS (50 -10 %) **NO RESPONSE (27 *5 %) **OVER 10 VEARS (50 -10 %) **NO RESPONSE (27 *5 %) **NO SIMILLART 11ES (50 * 12 %) **NO RESPONSE (27 *5 %) **NO (369 *13 %) **NO RESPONSE (27 *5 %) **NO (369 *13 %) **NO RESPONSE (27 *5 %) **NO (369 *13 %) **NO RESPONSE (27 *5 %) **NO (369 *13 %) <	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 TITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOT STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY Response TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT NOMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY Response TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT •••NOME (160 -32 %) ••••ONE (160 -32 %) Response •••NO RESPONSE (14 -3 %) •••NOME (160 -32 %) ••••ONE (160 -32 %) ••••ONE (160 -32 %) Response •••IO RESPONSE (14 -3 %) •••NOME (160 -32 %) ••••ONE (160 -32 %) ••••ONE (160 -32 %) Response •••IO RESPONSE (14 -3 %) •••NOME (160 -32 %) ••••ONE (160 -32 %) ••••ONE (160 -32 %) Response •••IO RESPONSE (14 -3 %) •••ONE (160 -32 %) •••ONE (160 -32 %) ••••ONE (160 -32 %) Response •••IO RESPONSE (14 -3 %) •••ONE (160 -32 %) •••ONE (160 -17 %) ••••ONE (160 -17 %) Response •••IO RESPONSE (14 -9 %) •••ONE SIMILARTITES (61 •12 %) •••••ONE SIMILARTITES (61 •12 %) ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PLLOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PLLOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT TOTAL YEARS (14 -3 %)	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY RESPONS STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY RESPONS TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT RESPONSE (14 -3 %) RESPONSE (14 -3 %) TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE ON PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY RESPONSE (14 -3 %) RESPONSE (14 -3 %) TOTAL VEARS (14 -3 %) -==OVER 10 VEARS (50 -6 %) -====================================	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 ITEM FREQUENCY OFSTREUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT RESPONSE ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	FIGURE 1 TITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOL RESTRUCTURING PLOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL VEANS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOL-HAED MANDEMINT TOTAL VEANS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOL-HAED MANDEMINT THE EXPENSION (14 -9 X) THE EXPENSION (14 -9 X) THE TOTE ONT THE RESULT (29 - 63 X) TOTE ONT TO REA PART OF THE STATION (14 -9 X) THE SCHOLERY OF THE SATICATION (14 -9 X) THE RESONS (12 - 16 X) THE RESONS (12 - 16 X) THE RESONS (12 - 16 X) THE PRESENTS ALL STACEHOLORES OF CHILDRENS EDUCATION THE RESONS (12 - 16 X) THE PRESENTS ALL STACEHOLORES OF CHILDRENS EDUCATION THE RESONS (14 -1 X) THE PRESENTS ALL STACEHOLORES OF CHILDRENS EDUCATION THE RESONS (14 -1 X) THE PRESENTS ALL STACEHOLORES OF CHILDRENS EDUCATION THE RESONS (14 -1 X) THE RESONS (12 - 16 X) THE RESONS (12 - 18 X) THE RESONS (12	FIGURE 1 TITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL, RESTRUCTURRING PLLOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL BASED MANGEMENT ************************************	FIGURE 1 FIGURE 1 TITEN FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PATA 1992 TITEN FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PATA 1992 STATEMENT NUMBER AND FERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY REGION TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGENENT NUMBER AND FERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY RESPONSE TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGENENT NUMBER AND FERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY RESPONSE TOTAL VEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGENENT NUMBER MANAGENENT RESPONSE RESPONSE NUMBER TOTA 2000 RESPONSE (14 - 5 X) NUMBER MANAGENENT RESPONSE RESPONSE ALE VEARS < 10 (14 - 5 X)

•

٠

с С

		PAGE 2	28
ITEM FREQUENCY C	FIGURE 1 DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING P	ILDT PROVECT EVALUATION DATA 1992	
STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCE	ENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY	TOIRESPON	TAL NSE
THIS TEAM IS THE BEST SRT WE COULD	FORM		1
••NO RESPONSE (2 =0 %)	<pre>STRONGLY DISAGREE (50 =10 %)</pre>		
<pre></pre>	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (220 =44 %)		
#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (97 =19 %)	•=STRONGLY AGREE (86 =17 %)		505
PRESENT SELECTION METHOD IS THE BE	ST WAY TO FORM SRT		
•=NO RESPONSE (3 =1 %)	*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (47 =9 %)		
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (53 =10 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (225 ±45 %)		
H+SOMEWHAT AGREE (102 =20 %)	<pre>•=STRONGLY AGREE (75 =15 %)</pre>		505
SRT NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF ALL DIVE	RSE GROUPS OF STAFF		
•=NO RESPONSE (5 =1 %)	<pre>**STRONGLY DISAGREE (107 *21 %)</pre>		
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (63 =12 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (173 =34 %)	●●●●■ⅡⅡⅢⅢⅢⅢⅢⅢ●●●●●●●●●●●●●●	
#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (101 =20 %)	•=STRONGLY AGREE (56 *11 %)		505
ALL STAKEHOLDERS SHOULD BE REPRESE	ENTED IN SRT		
•=NO RESPONSE (6 =1 %)	**STRONGLY DISAGREE (41 =8 %)		
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (13 =3 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (84 =17 %)		
H=SOMEWHAT AGREE (70 ×14 %)	<pre>-=STRONGLY AGREE (291 =58 %)</pre>		505
DIFFICULT TO BRING ALL STAKEHODERS	S TOGETHER		
••NO RESPONSE (3 =1 %)	<pre>••STRONGLY DISAGREE (97 =19 %)</pre>		
<pre></pre>	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (217 =43 %)	●●■IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	
u•SOMEWHAT AGREE (91 =18 %)	●=STRONGLY AGREE (26 =5 %)		505
		0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100	+ ×
NOTES: + • LESS THAN 2 PERCENT			

٤

ERIC Full Back Provided by ERIC 3

ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPC PRINCIPALS ADMINISTRA. STYLE BRINGS COMMUNITY •=NO RESPONSE (5 =1 %) *=STRONGI •=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (42 =8 %) :=DIFFIC	FIGURE 1		DAGF 2
ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPC PRINCIPALS ADMINISTRA. STYLE BRINGS COMMUNITY •=NO RESPONSE (5 =1 %) *=STRONGI •=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (42 =8 %) :=DIFFIC	FIGURE 1		1701
ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPO PRINCIPALS ADMINISTRA. STYLE BRINGS COMMUNITY •=NO RESPONSE (5 =1 %) *=STRONG(•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (42 =8 %) :=DIFFIC			
STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPO PRINCIPALS ADMINISTRA. STYLE BRINGS COMMUNITY •=NO RESPONSE (5 =1 %) *=STRONGI •=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (42 =8 %) :=DIFFICU	15 OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING P.	ILDT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992	
PRINCIPALS ADMINISTRA. STYLE BRINGS COMMUNITY •=NO RESPONSE (5 =1 %) *=STRONG(•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (42 =8 %) :=DIFFIC	DNSES FOR EACH CATEGORY		TO RESPON
•=NO RESPONSE (5 =1 %) *=STRONG(•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (42 =8 %) :=DIFFIC(TOGETHER		
●●SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (42 =8 %) :=DIFFIC	_Y DISAGREE (49 =10 %)		
	JLT TO SAY (109 =22 %)		
#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (128 =25 %) ==STRONG	LY AGREE (172 =34 %)		
COMMUNITY-APATHY TOWARDS CHILDRENS EDU. INSUR	MOUNT ABLE		
•=NO RESPONSE (8 =2 %)	LY DISAGREE (76 = 15 %)		
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (80 =16 %) :=DIFFIC	ULT TO SAY (124 -25 %)		
#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (136 =27 %) ==STRONG	LY AGREE (81 =16 %)		
FULL COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION WOULD NOT BE HE	LPFUL		
•=NO RESPONSE (5 =1 %) **STRONG	LY DISAGREE (274 ≖54 %)		
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (70 =14 %) :=OIFFIC	ULT TO SAY (98 =19 %)		• # # # #
H=SOMEWHAT AGREE (43 =9 %) ■*STRONG	iLY AGREE (15 =3 %)		
FULL COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION STRENGTHENS OUR	EFFORTS	L	
•=NO RESPONSE (7 =1 %) •=STRONG	iLY DISAGREE (31 =6 %)		
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (14 *3 %) :=DIFFIC	:ULT TO SAY (98 =19 %)		
K=SOMEWHAT AGREE (103 =20 %) ==STRONG	iLY AGREE (252 =50 %)		
FULL COMM. REPRESENTA. ENABLES TO FOCUS ON ST	.UD. ISSUE		
•=NO RESPONSE (7 =1 %) •=STRONG	ily disagree (20 =4 %)		•
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (20 =4 %) :=DIFFIC	:ULT TO SAY (90 =18 %)		
H=SOMEVHAT AGREE (138 =27 %) ==STRONG	sLY AGREE (230 =46 %)		
		++++++++++++++++++	80% 100
NOTES: + = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT			

	Q		'AL ISE				202				505	•			505				i) G			,	ç ç	* *	
	PAGE 3		TOT RESPON											+								+ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =		100	
																								80%	
		~																				··· ··· ···		60%	
		ATA 1992				пппппп				пппппп				нининин								••		-++- 0%	
		UATION D				··· ··· ···								# 				•				•		+ +	
		CT EVAL				•				··· ··· ···								••••••				•		20%	
		OT PROJE				* *				•				•				•				•		+ %0	
	-	RING PIL	£			-				~				•			6	3			(%	()			
-	FIGURE	ESTRUCTU	CATEGOR		6 =5 %)	3 =28 %)	=34 %)		(% = 2 %)	51 =30 %	=35 %)		18 =4 %)	45 = 29 %	=34 %)		86 =17 %	06 =21 %	=20 %)		136 =27	25 = 45 %	=5 %)		
		SCHOOL R	OR EACH		AGREE (2	SAY (14	EE (173	KEH	AGREE (1	SAY (15	EE (179		AGREE () SAY (1-	REE (174		SAGREE (5 SAY (1	REE (99	G PR	SAGREE (D SAY (2	REE (26		
-		ONS OF	PONSES 1	THIN SR	IGLY DIS	CULT TO	IGLY AGR	ADNG STA	AGLY DIS	ICULT TO	VGLY AGR	UCCESS	NGLY DIS	ICULT TO	NGLY AGF	PROCESS	NGLY DI	ICULT TO	NGLY AG	N MAKIN	NGLY DI	ICULT T	NGLY AG		
		STRIBUTI	T OF RES	FLICT WI	+=STRON	:=01FF1	=STRON	VELICT AN	*=STRO	:=DIFF	==STR0	SBM A SI	*=STRO	: =DIFF	■=STRO	MAKING	*=STRO	:=DIFF	==STRO	DECISIO	•=STRC	:*DIFF	■=STRC		
		JENCY DI) PERCEN	IZES CON		(%	(%	IZES CON		(%	(%	N MAKES		(* 1	%)	DECISION		14 %)	(%	WITH SRT		15 %)	~		RCENT
		EM FREQU	MBER ANC	MINIM	×)	(30 =6	28 = 25	WINIW .	(%	: (18 =4	133 =26	SENTATIO	-3 %)	E (19 =4	136 =27	HE SRT [=3 %)	E (70 =	130 =26	MILIAR	=2 %)	E (74 =	32 =6 %		IAN 2 PE
		ITI	л И	RESENTA	ie (5 =1	ISAGREE	VGREE (1	RESENTA	SE (7 =1	JI SAGREE	AGREE (1	Y REPRES	SE (13 -	DISAGREI	AGREE (WITH TI	ISE (14	DISAGRE	AGREE (RE UNFA	ISE (12	DISAGRE	AGREE (LESS TH
- <u></u> ,			ENT	DMM. REP	RESPONS	MEWHAT O	MEWHAT A	OMM. REF	RESPONS	MEWHAT C	MEWHAT	DIMMUNIT'	RESPON	DMEWHAT	MEWHAT	FAMILIAR	D RESPON	DMEWHAT	OMEWHAT	EMBERS A	O RESPON	OMEWHAT	OMEWHAT		ES: + =
•			STATEMI		0N= •	• = S0	н = SO	FULL C	0N= •	•=\$0	и = SO	FULL C		•=20	n=S (I AM F	Ĭ.	• • S(n=S(SRT M	Ž.	•	S = E		NOT
<u>IC</u>																									

33

30

. .

FIGURE 1 DUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 VO PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY RESPONSE	Г DECISION MAKING PROCESS *=STRONGLY DISAGREE (29 =6 %) 7 %) :=DIFFICULT TO SAY (256 =51 %) %) ==STRONGLY AGREE (71 =14 %) 505	ERTAIN GROUP •=STRONGLY DISAGREE (95 *19 %) 11 %) :=DIFFICULT TO SAY (182 *36 %) %) •=STRONGLY AGREE (78 =15 %) TTEWS UNWILLING TO DEBATE 10 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0	 *=STRONGLY DISAGREE (76 =15 %) *=DIFFICULT TO SAY (276 =55 %) ************************************	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (34 *7 %) =6 %) :=DIFFICULT TO SAY (225 =45 %)	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (90 =18 %) =12 %) :=DIFFICULT TD SAY (246 =49 %) «•••••••••••••::::::::::::::::::::::::	ercent
ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SC NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FC	STRICKLY FOLLOWS SRT DECISION MAKING PRDCESS Sponse (12 =2 %) *=Strongly Disag Hat disagree (35 =7 %) :=Difficult to 3 Hat agree (102 =20 %) ==Strongly agree	IS DOMINATED BY A CERTAIN GROUP ESPONSE (16 =3 %) *=STRONGLY DISA WHAT DISAGREE (55 =11 %) :=DIFFICULT TO WHAT AGREE (79 =16 %) ==STRONGLY AGRE	ESPONSE (15 =3 %) *=STRONGLY DISA WHAT DISAGREE (47 =9 %) :=DIFFICULT TO WHAT AGREE (48 =10 %) *=STRONGLY AGRE SION MAKING PROCESS IS USEFUL FOR OUR SBM	ESPONSE (16 =3 %) *=STRONGLY DISA WHAT DISAGREE (28 =6 %) :=DIFFICULT TD WHAT AGREE (123 =24 %) ==STRONGLY AGRE SION MAKING PROCESS DOES NOT LEAD TO BEST DE	EESPONSE (17 =3 %) •=STRONGLY OISA WHAT DISAGREE (59 =12 %) :=DIFFICULT TO WHAT AGREE (69 =14 %) •=STRONGLY AGRE	+ = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT

() 7

4.7

		0	
E	R	l	\underline{C}
FullT	ext Prov	ided b	γ ERIC

PAGE 32

<u>r.....</u>

FIGURE 1

505 505 505 505 505 TOTAL RESPONSE 100% 80% 60% ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 40% 20% --+----+ 80 *=STRONGLY DISAGREE (153 =30 %) *=STRONGLY DISAGREE (130 =26 %) *=STRONGLY DISAGREE (140 =28 %) :=DIFFICULT TO SAY (148 =29 %) NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY *=STRONGLY DISAGREE (139 =28 %) :=DIFFICULT TO SAY (160 =32 %) :=DIFFICULT TO SAY (200 =40 %) :=DIFFICULT TO SAY (116 =23 %) :#DIFFICULT TO SAY (196 =39 %) •=STRONGLY DISAGREE (37 =7 %) •=STRONGLY AGREE (130 *26 %) =STRONGLY AGREE (45 =9 %) =STRONGLY AGREE (39 =8 %) =STRONGLY AGREE (26 =5 %) •*STRONGLY AGREE (36 =7 %) THE WRONG DIAGNOSI SRT DECISION MAKING PROCESS DOES NOT WORK IN THIS SCHO SRT DECISION MAKING PROCESS IS A WASTE OF TIME SRT IS NOT IMPLEMENTING SUITABLE STRATEGIES EFFORTS RESTRUCTURING IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF I AM IN FULL AGREEMENT WITH THE SRT *=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (90 =18 %) •=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (49 =10 %) •=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (84 =17 %) =SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (64 =13 %) H=SOMEWHAT AGREE (153 =30 %) #=SOMEWHAT AGREE (59 =12 %) #=SOMEWHAT AGREE (65 =13 %) ? **н**=SOMEWHAT AGREE (35 =7 %) H=SOMEWHAT AGREE (50 = 10 •=ND RESPONSE (20 =4 %) •=NO RESPONSE (21 =4 %) •=ND RESPONSE (20 =4 %) •=NO RESPONSE (20 =4 %) •=NO RESPONSE (20 =4 %) STATEMENT

NOTES: + + LESS THAN 2 PERCENT

<u>.</u>	PAGE 33	TOTAL RESPONSE				505				505			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	505				505				505	100%	
	A 1992												••••••										+++ 60% 80	
	ECT EVALUATION DAT																··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ···				··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ···		.++++- 20% 40%	
	BLOT PROJE				* * * a * a 0				* * * 0 0				* * * * * *				* * * *				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		~~~~ *	
	FIGURE 1 FISTRUTIONS OF SCHOOL PESTRUCTURIN	NT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY	ON ON CEPTAIN ISSUE	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (108 =21 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (177 =35 %)	•=STRONGLY AGREE (44 =9 %)	XT DF SCHOOL RESTRU	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (164 =32 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (135 =27 %)	•*STRDNGLY AGREE (60 =12 %)		*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (165 =33 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (179 =35 %)	==STRONGLY AGREE (15 =3 %)	TED OUTCOMES	**STRONGLY DISAGREE (29 =6 %)	:=DIFFICULT TD SAY (200 =40 %)	**STRONGLY AGREE (72 *14 %)	F ITS EFFORTS	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (32 =8 %)	:*DIFFICULT TO SAY (156 =31 %)	** STRONGLY AGREE (121 =24 %)		
<i>ز</i>	C ACHAINCEAS HELL	MENT NUMBER AND PERCE	NOT AGREE WITH THE SRT DIRECTI	0 RESPONSE (18 =4 %)	OMEWHAT DISAGREE (72 =14 %)	OMEWHAT AGREE (86 =17 %)	WIELD THEIR POWER IN THE PRETE	10 RESPONSE (20 =4 %)	OMEWHAT DISAGREE (60 =12 %)	;OMEWHAT AGREE (66 =13 %)	DBJECTIVES ARE NOT REALISTIC	40 RESPONSE (18 =4 %)	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (87 =17 %)	SOMEWHAT AGREE (41 =8 %)	EFFORTS WILL ACHIEVE THE EXPECT	VO RESPONSE (18 ≡4 %)	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (54 =11 %)	SOMEWHAT AGREE (132 =26 %)	KNOWS THE LONGTERM DIRECTION OF	NO RESPONSE (20 ≖4 %)	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (40 =8 %)	SOMEWHAT AGREE (130 =26 %)		TES: + = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT
		STATE	I DO	2 • •	S=+	S=H	SOME	*	•	Сн Ш	SRT 0	•	й •	H	SRT	•	•	1	SRT	•				ON

NDTES: + = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT

	FIGURE 1							
I TEM FREQUENCY	DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING F	PILOT PROJE	CT EVALUATI	ON DATA 19	92			
STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERC	ENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY						TOTAL RESPONSE	
OUR COMMUNITY UNDERSTANDS THE LONG	TERM GOAL OF OUR SCH							
•=NO RESPONSE (20 =4 %)	+=STRONGLY DISAGREE (66 =13 %)							
•*SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (67 =13 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (173 =34 %)	•	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	··· ··· ··· ··· ···		• # # # # # # # # #		
#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (116 =23 %)	•*STRONGLY AGREE (63 =12 %)						20	S
VERY CLEAR STANDARDS ARE SET TO ME	EASURE THE SRT OUTCOM							
•=NO RESPONSE (24 =5 %)	*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (50 =10 %)							
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (58 =11 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (173 =34 %)	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	··· ··· ··· ···				
и = SOMEWHAT AGREE (121 =24 %)	<pre>=STRONGLY AGREE (79 =16 %)</pre>						ň	05
CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND OUR CONTROL N	MAY JEOPERDIZE OUTCOM							
•=NO RESPONSE (22 =4 %)	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (37 =7 %)							
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (45 =9 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (175 =35 %)	•	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	··· ·· ·· ·· ·· ··			+	
н=SOMEWHAT AGREE (144 =29 %)	<pre>=STRONGLY AGREE (82 =16 %)</pre>						ŝ	02
LACK OF RESOURCES MAY HAMPER OUR	EFFORTS							
•*NO RESPONSE (21 =4 %)	**STRONGLY DISAGREE (45 *9 %)							
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (43 =9 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (113 =22 %)	•	•				+	
#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (154 =30 %)	■*STRONGLY AGREE (129 *26 %)						5	02
LACK OF CONTINUOUS FEEDBACK IS A	BIG CONCERN FOR ME							
•=NO RESPONSE (24 =5 %)	*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (69 =14 %)					•		
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (65 =13 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (98 =19 %)	* * * * *	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	······································	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		* • •	1
∎•SOMEWHAT AGREE (126 =25 %)	•=STRONGLY AGREE (123 *24 %)							202
		*+ %0	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	

PAGE 34

1

د. ۵۰ م ا مریبه

ERIC.

43

0	
	PERCENT
	3
	THAN
	ESS
	•
	+
	NDTES

40

ITEM FREQUENCY D	ISTRIBUTIONS DF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT F	PROJECT EVALUATIO	0 DATA 195	32		
STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCE	NT DF RESPONSES FDR EACH CATEGDRY				T RESP	DTAL
WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR STUDE	NT DUTCOMES					
•=NO RESPONSE (21 =4 %)	•=PRINCIPAL ONLY (10 =2 %)					
••THE SRT (28 •6 %)	:*PRINCIPAL & STAFF (50 *10 %)	100000:::::•••*•		100000000000	• • • • • • • • • • • •	
#=PRIN. STAFF & SRT (346 =69 %)	**D0 NDT KNDW (50 *10 %)					505
OUR SCHOOL IS A FINE EXAMPLE FOR SC	HOOL BASED MANAGEME					
•*NO RESPONSE (20 =4 %)	<pre>*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (62 =12 %)</pre>					
••SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (63 =12 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (155 =31 %)		··· ··· ··· ··· ···			
н =SOMEWHAT AGREE (147 ×29 %)	●*STRONGLY AGREE (58 *11 %)					505
I HAVE RECEIVED SUFFICIENT TRAINING	3 FOR SRT ACTIVITIES					
•=NO RESPONSE (27 =5 %)	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (119 =24 %)					
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (89 =18 %)	:#DIFFICULT TO SAY (101 =20 %)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	H H H H H H H H H H H		
H=SOMEWHAT AGREE (108 =21 %)	•=STRONGLY AGREE (61 =12 %)					505
OUR SRT IS IN NEED OF TRAINING IN	PLANNING SKILL					
•=NO RESPONSE (25 =5 %)	+=STRONGLY DISAGREE (31 ≖6 %)'					
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (43 =9 %)	:*DIFFICULT TO SAY (175 =35 %)		···			
#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (142 =28 %)	•=STRONGLY AGREE (89 =18 %)					505
OUR SRT NEEDS TRAINING IN DECISION	-MAKING SKILLS					
*=NO RESPONSE (25 =5 %)	**STRDNGLY DISAGREE (48 =10 %)					
<pre>=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (35 *7 %)</pre>	:*DIFFICULT TD SAY (149 =30 %)		a :			•
#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (136 =27 %)	<pre> • * STRONGLY AGREE (112 *22 %) </pre>					505
		++++	++ 40%	++ 60%	80% 10	* %

,

. . .:::::-

ERIC Person (;**7**

Full Text Provided by ERIC				~
			B▲ G	AGE 36
	ITEM FREQUENCY DI	STRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PI	LOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992	
	STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCEN	T OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY	RES	TOTAL ESPONSE
	OUR SRT NEEDS TRAINING IN TROUBLE SH	DOTING SKILLS		
	•=NO RESPONSE (23 =5 %)	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (42 =8 %)		
	◆=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (25 =5 %)	:*DIFFICULT TO SAY (156 =31 %)	======================================	•
	µ=SOMEWHAT AGREE (139 =28 %)	<pre> •=STRONGLY AGREE (120 *24 %) </pre>		505
	OUR SRT NEEDS TRAINING IN PLAN IMPLE	MENTATION SKILLS		
	•=NO RESPONSE (23 =5 %)	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (38 =8 %)		
	•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (37 =7 %)	:=DIFFICULT TD SAY (158 =31 %)	***************************************	
	#=SOMEWHAT AGREE (145 ≈29 %)	<pre>**STRDNGLY AGREE (104 *21 %)</pre>		505
	OUR SRT NEEDS TRAINING IN IDENTIFYI	NG DATA REQUIREMENT		
	•=ND RESPONSE (24 =5 %)	+≖STRONGLY DISAGREE (41 =8 %)		
	•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (50 =10 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (172 =34 %)		+
	н ≠SOMEWHAT AGREE (123 ≭24 %)	<pre>=STRONGLY AGREE (95 =19 %)</pre>		505
	OUR SRT NEEDS TRAINING IN BUDGETING	AND FINANCIAL PLAN		
	•=NO RESPGNSE (23 =5 %)	*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (39 =8 %)		
	•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (34 =7 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (176 =35 %)		+
	и=SOMEWHAT AGREE (131 =26 %)	•=STRDNGLY AGREE (102 =20 %)		50g
	WE ENJOY SUFFICIENT FREEDOM FROM TH	IE CENTRAL DFFICE		
	•=NO RESPONSE (25 =5 %)	*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (39 =8 %)		
	•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (34 =7 %)	:=DIFFICULT TD SAY (214 =42 %)		+ •
	н ≢SOMEWHAT AGREE (139 ±28 %)	<pre>a*STRONGLY AGREE (54 *11 %)</pre>		
			0% 20% 40% 60% B0%	100%
	NDTES: + = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT			

.

5.)

Full Text Provided by ERIC

C

PAGE 37

٠

•

-

FIGURE 1

ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992

STATEMENT NUMBER AND PERCE	NT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY				TORESPO	TAL NSE
SOMETIMES, CENTRAL OFFICE DIRECTIVE	S INHIBIT OUR EFFOR					
••NO RESPONSE (23 =5 %)	**STRONGLY DISAGREE (42 =8 %)					
••SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (40 ×8 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (271 =54 %)		··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ···	··· ··· ··· ···		
#•SOMEWHAT AGREE (88 ≈17 %)	==STRONGLY AGREE (41 =8 %)					505
FINAL AUTHORITY ON CERTAIN ISSUES N	DT CLEARLY DEFINED					
••NO RESPONSE (35 =7 %)	*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (65 =13 %)					
••SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (38 *8 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (200 =40 %)	* • • • • • •	, 	- -		
H.SOMEWHAT AGREE (100 =20 %)	■=STRONGLY AGREE (67 =13 %)					505
WE DO NOT HAVE THE REQUIRED INFORMA	VIION TO MAKE DECISI					
•=NO RESPONSE (26 =5 %)	**STRONGLY DISAGREE (30 =6 %)					
•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (50 =10 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (200 =40 %)		··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ···			
M.SOMEWHAT AGREE (134 =27 %)	•*STRONGLY AGREE (65 =13 %)					C.05
HAS YOUR SCHOOL APPLIED FOR WAIVER						
•*NO RESPONSE (30 *6 %)	•=NO (20 =4 %)					
•=YES (145 =29 %)	:≖DO NDT KNOW (310 ≖61 %)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		··· ··· ··· ···	··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ···	505
I AM SATISFIED WITH THE WAIVER PROV	CESS					
••NO RESPONSE (35 *7 %)	•=STRONGLY DISAGREE (31 =6 %)					
••SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (35 =7 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (340 =67 %)	• • • • • •	··· ··· ··· ··· ···	··· ··· ··· ··· ···		
H=SOMEWHAT AGREE (47 ≈9 %)	==STRONGLY AGREE (17 *3 %)					505
			:	.+++	+ 80% 100	+ ×

NOTES: + * LESS THAN 2 PERCENT

10 ()

C1

		TOTAL RESPONSE			+•=====::	505			+ = ● = I I I I I	505			+	505			+ • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	505				202	100%	
	CT EVALUATION DATA 1992												•••• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••						-+++++++++	
	PILOT PROJE				* * * 0 0				• • •				• • • •				* • • • •				•		+ %0	
FIGURE 1	DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING	SENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY	ESS IS TIME CONSUMING	<pre>*=STRONGLY DISAGREE (19 =4 %)</pre>	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (377 =75 %)	■≈STRONGLY AGREE (18 =4 %)	OCESS IS A PROBLEM	**STRONGLY DISAGREE (13 *3 %)	:=DIFFICULT TO SAY (372 =74 %)	•=STRONGLY AGREE (42 =8 %)	RUCTURING EFFORTS	*=HIGHLY INADEQUATE (15 =3 %)	:=AVERAGE (169 =33 %)	•=EXELLENT (108 =21 %)	THE SRT	*=HIGHLY INADEQUATE (14 =3 %)	:=AVERAGE (176 =35 %)	•=EXELLENT (94 =19 %)	JR SCHOOL	**DOES NOT WORK (15 =3 %)	:=SEEMS WORKING (261 =52 %)	■*EXECELLENT (35 =7 %)		
	ITEM FREQUENCY I	ATEMENT NUMBER AND PERC	APER WORK RELATED TO WAIVER PROCE	•=NO RESPONSE (24 =5 %)	•*SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (22 *4 %)	н=SOMEWHAT AGREE (45 =9 %)	IME LAG RELATED TO THE WAIVER PRO	• = NO RESPONSE (25 =5 %)	•=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (10 =2 %)	н≡SOMEWHAT AGREE (43 =9 %)	OMMITMENT OF THE SRT TO ITS RESTR	•=NO RESPONSE (34 =7 %)	•=NOT ADEQUATE (44 =9 %)	H=ABOVE AVERAGE (135 =27 %)	COPERATION AMONG THE MEMBERS OF	•=NO RESPONSE (38 =8 %)	•=NDT ADEQUATE (53 =10 %)	H=ABOVE AVERAGE (130 =26 %)	SRT DECISION MAKING PROCESS AT OU	•=NO RESPONSE (40 =8 %)	•=WORKS POORLY (71 =14 %)	n=WORKS WELL (83 =16 %)		NOTES: + = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT

0
ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

:

PAGE 39

TOTAL Response

FIGURE 1

ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION DATA 1992 NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY STATEMENT

THE REQUIRED TRAINING FOR THE SCH. RESTRUCTURING TEAM

	100%	80%	60%	40%	-++	+ %0		
5	ני						<pre>■*EXECELLENT (41 =8 %)</pre>	¤=AB OVE AVERAGE (124 =25 %)
ų			···	··· ··· ··· ···		•	:*AVERAGE (205 =41 %)	•=BELOW AVERAGE (67 =13 %)
		•					**UNSATISFACTORY (23 *5 %)	•*NO RESPONSE (45 *9 %)
							RUCTURING TEAM PLAN	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCHOOL REST
ŝ	n						●=EXELLENT (25 =5 %)	¤≠ABOVE AVERAGE (85 ±17 %)
Ļ	+ • •		··· ··· ···	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•••••		:=AVERAGE (198 =39 %)	•=NOT ADEQUATE (111 =22 %)
							*=HIGHLY INADEQUATE (41 =8 %)	•=NO RESPONSE (#5 =9 %)
								SUPPORT FROM THE LOCAL COMMUNITY
ő	ח						•=EXELLENT (49 ×10 %)	#=ABOVE AVERAGE (134 =27 %)
	0 3 0 9 77	10000000000000		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	•	:=AVERAGE (195 =39 %)	•=NOT ADEQUATE (68 =13 %)
							*=HIGHLY INADEQUATE (17 =3 %)	•=NO RESPONSE (42 =8 %)
							BERS	SUPPORT FROM THE SCHOOL STAFF MEME
202	ណ៍						■*EXELLENT (34 =7 %)	H#ABOVE AVERAGE (90 =18 %)
	•		··· •• •• •• •• •• ••	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • • • • • • •	0 0 0 0	:=AVERAGE (233 =46 %)	•=NOT ADEQUATE (63 =12 %)
							★=HIGHLY INADEQUATE (27 =5 %)	• #NO RESPONSE (58 =11 %)
								SUPPORT FROM THE CENTRAL OFFICE
22	ũ						<pre>■=EXELLENT (31 =6 %)</pre>	н ≢ аво ve average (105 ≈21 %)
	+		··· ··· ··· ···	··· ··· ··· ···	••••••	0 0 0 0	: = average (232 =46 %)	•=NOT ADEQUATE (64 =13 %)
							◆*HIGHLY INADEQUATE (25 *5 %)	•=NO RESPONSE (48 =10 %)
							RESTRUCTURING TEAM	THE REQUIRED TRAINING FOR THE SCH.

NOTES: + = LESS THAN 2 PERCENT

5

	6	TAL			1	202				505						
	PAGE	TO RESPO							+=====		100					
									нн::::::		80%					
	2				. : :				··· ··· ··· ···		++ 60%					Ŭ.
	199 199				··· ··· ···				 		40%					
	I A T T ON				•				•••							
	CT FVAL				•				* * * * *		20%					
	T 000.15	-			* * • • • •				0000		%0					
	FIGURE 1	CATEGORY		;e =5 %)				35 = 17 %)								
		CHUUL K OR EACH		JUATE (2	- 33 %)	= 17 %)	rru	QUATE (8	(% 60=	=5 %)						
		NS UF S		' INADEC	ìE (167	:NT (88	OR REST	INADE	3E (195	ENT (23						
		RIBUTIO OF RESP		*HI GHLY	-AVERAG	=XELLE	PPORT F	YH9 IH≃	≠AVERA 0	י=באבררנ						
		CY DIST	RSHIP	•		•	AND SU	•		•		F				
		REQUENC	A LEADEI	_	×)	(% 63	USIASM,	(%	(%	(% 0		PERCEN				
		I TEM F NUMBER	NG TEAN	15 =9 %)	62 = 12	(117 =)	S. ENTHI	55 = 13	(89 = 18	(48 = 1		THAN 2				
			RUCTURI	DNSE (4	QUATE (VERAGE	ARENESS	ONSE (6	QUATE (VERAGE		= LESS				
•••		STATEMENT	SCHOOL REST	••NO RESP(• NOT ADE	H=ABOVE A	STUDENTS AW	• NO RESP	•=NOT ADE	¤=ABOVE A		NOTES: +				
		v	107				<i>.</i> .									

STRONGLY DISAGREE, # = SOMEWHAT DISAGREE NOTES: MISSING AND NEUTRAL RESPONSES ARE NOT ACCOUNTED IN THESE DATA.

	VUMBER	PERCENT > DISAGREE <	PERCENT	NUMBER
SRT NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF STAFF				
NON-SRT MEMBERS	100	46.3% ••••••	нанининининееееееееееееееееееееееееееее	116
SRT MEMBERS Community-apathy insurmountable	70 64.2	ннынициеееееееееееееееееееееееееееееееее	инининина	3 6
NON-SRT MEMBERS	1C2	38.3%	пининининиевееееееееееееееееееееееееееее	164
SRT MEMBERS A CERTAIN GROUP DOMINATES SRT	54	50.5% •••••••	аапилилаааааа∎өөөөөө 49.5%	53
NON-SRT MEMBERS	83	43.5% •••••••••	ининининиевоесосовое 56.5%	108
SRT MEMBERS Unhappy with the Srt Direction	67 5E	. 8% ••••••••••••••••	ипинанана	47
NON-SRT MEMBERS	98	50.8% •••••	ананинанина	95
SRT MEMBERS We understand our longterm goal	82 71.9%		ананини	32
NON-SRT MEMBERS	66	48.5% •••••••	анананананана	105
SRT MEMBERS Lack of feedback, a big concern	32	30.2% •••••ннини	анинининининин 69.8%	74
NON-SRT MEMBERS	79	29.9% •••••ининин	пипипипипи	185
SRT MEMBERS LOCAL COMMUNITY SUPPORT, EXCEL.	53	45.7%	ананананананаазаза 54.3%	63
NON-SRT MEMBERS	112 64.	7% •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	ининининее 35.3%	61
SRT MEMBERS STUDENTS-ENTHUSIASM, EXCELLENT	39	44.3% •••••нинининини	ананананананана	49
NON-SRT MEMBERS	130 80.2% ••		инииниее 19.8%	32
SRT MEMBERS	44	53.7%	ининининии • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	8C +-
	100% 80%	60% 40% 20% 0%	0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 10	%00
	STRONGLY	DISAGREE, ¤ = SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	H = SOMEWHAT AGREE, • = STRONGLY AGRE	EE

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES ON SELECTED ITEMS BY SRT MEMBER STATUS

FIGURE 2

.

· • • · • • • •

PAGE 41

٠

.

6

Table 1

Results of Logistic Regression analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Logistic Regression	Parametter	Parameter Estimate	Odds Ratio Estimate	Chi Square Value	Probability Estimate	Null Hypothesis
1	Intercept Membership	0.1484 -0.7334	1.2 0.5	1.1 8 9.19	0.2767 0.0024	Rejected
2	Intercept Membership	0.4749 -0.4936	1.6 0.6	14.18 4.57	0.0002 0.0325	Rejected
3	Intercept Membership	0.2633 -0.6178	1.3 0.5	3.25 6.64	0.0713 0.0100	Rejected
4	Intercept Membership	-0.0311 -0.9099	1.0 0.4	0.05 12.90	0.8290 0.0003	Rejected
5	Intercept Membership	0.0588 0.7795	1.1 2.2	0.18 9.44	0.6745 0.0021	Rejected
6	Intercept Membership	0.8509 -0.6781	2.3 0.5	40.08 8.71	0.0000 0.0032	Rejected
7	Intercept Membership	-0.6076 0.8359	0.5 2.3	14.58 9.79	0.0001 0.0018	Rejected
8	Intercept Membership	-1.4018 1.2552	0.2 3.5	50.46 17.91	0.0000 0.0000	Rejected

	Statement	Agreed	Disagreed	SRT member	non-SRT member
Logistic regression	1: SRT is not representative of staff	155	170	109	216
	2: Community-apathy is insurmountable	217	156	107	266
	3: A certain group dominates SRT	155	150	114	191
	4: Unhappy with the SRT direction	127	180	114	193
	5: We understand our long-term goal	179	131	106	204
	6: Lack of feedback is a big concern	248	133	116	264
	7: Local community support is excellent	110	151	88	173
	8: Student enthusiasm is excellent	70	174	82	162

NOTES:

1. Null Hypothesis to ...ed in each of these regression analysis is that,

There was no difference of opinion between the SRT members and the non-SRT members on a given statement. (statements applicable to each regression analysis are stated above.)

2. Details on agreed and disagreed responses by membership category is given in Figure 2 on page 41.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baltimore City Public Schools, (1990), "Plan for Improving Student Achievement Through Restructuring," (mimeograph), Baltimore, Maryland.
- Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, Brief to Policy Makers, (1992), Brief No. 4, Fall 1992, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Collins, Robert A. and Hanson, Marjorie K., (1991), "Summative Evaluation Report: School-Based Management/Shared-Decision Making Project 1987-88 Through 1989-80," (mimeograph), Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida.
- David, Jane L., (1989), Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management, in *Educational Leadership*, May 1989, pp. 45-53.
- Maraschiello, Richard F., (1992), "Documenting the Implementation of School Based Management/Shared Decision-Making (SBM/SDM) in an Inner City Chapter 1 Elementary School," Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meetings, San Francisco.
- NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals), (1990), "Developing Leaders for Restructuring Schools: New Habits of Mind and Heart," (prepared by Charles Majkowiski), Reston, Virginia.
- Newmann, Fred M., (1993), Beyond Common Sense in Educational Restructuring: The Issues of Content and Linkage, in *Educational Researcher*, vol. 22, no. 2, March 1993, pp.1-13 and 22.
- Newmann, Fred M., (1992), Director's Introduction, in Brief to Policy Makers, Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Brief No. 3, Fall 1992,



43

- Rossman, Grethen B., and Anthony, Patricia G., (1992); "Restructuring From Within: The Massachusetts Experiment with Integrating All Students in the Classroom," Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meetings, San Francisco.
- Sashkin, Marshall and Egermeier, John, (1991) "School Change Models and Processes: A Review of Research and Practice," (monograph) Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, Washington, D. C.,
- Taylor, Dianne L. and Teddlie, Charles, (1992), "Restructuring and the Classroom: A View from a Reform District," Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meetings, San Francisco.
- Tye, Kenneth A., (1992), "Restructuring Our Schools: Beyond the Rhetoric," in <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, September 1992, pp. 9-14.

