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CHAPTER I
RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Rationale

Education has come to the forefront of national concern, unfortunately its notoriety has stemmed from negativism originating in the 1980’s. *A Nation at Risk*, the Carnegie Reports on Education, and *A Place Called School*¹ exposed the need for school improvement in American Schools. Critics have continued to report on the inadequacies and ills of the educational system. "Following the issuance of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, State Education Agencies throughout the United States passed legislation intended to reform American Schools."² There is a national call for reform led by former President Bush and the Nation’s Governors in the establishment of America 2000 Goals for Education in the twenty-first century. "Hardly a professional meeting or a monthly journal goes by without some reference to the need for school restructuring. It is a term found in the presidential recommendations for school improvement and in the meeting minutes of interested business leaders throughout the country."³

After the initial call for a serious examination of the nation’s schools, educational reformers viewed the action being taken as rhetorical at best. "Critics of this so-called
'school reform by remote control' initiated a second wave of reform marked by the Carnegie Report in 1986.

At the top of the reform list is the structure and management organization in schools. Bureaucratic, top-down management and decision-making have been credited with the demise of educational quality. "Exclusion from critical choices leads to a pervasive feeling of inefficacy and isolation that erodes the profession." Shared decision-making has been touted as a factor in making major changes in education because "the management of change goes best when it is carried out by a cross role group (say, teachers, department heads, administrators and often students and parents)."

The second wave of reform and lasting school improvement has the basic assumption that "school improvement will occur when teachers become involved in the professional decision-making at the school site."

Kenneth Tye defined school restructuring as programs designed to foster decentralized decision-making and site-based management. School organizations can no longer assume that their organizational system will not be questioned. Changes are necessary for educational quality. "The current restructuring movement is the most significant and serious attempt at school reform of the past quarter century." Barth acknowledged the importance of reform through shared decision-making in his statement "just how ownership for school
decisions is distributed has a large influence on the capacity of a school to improve from within."

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions of the shared decision-making process by team members of a school district that has been restructured to include a shared decision-making team as the decision-making authority in the schools. The focus of the perceptions is on barriers and indicators of encouragement in the process of vision building, curriculum/instruction development, and the development of student/teacher standards.

Statement of the Problem

What are the perceptions of the shared decision-making process team members when addressing span of authority, support, vision building, curriculum/instruction development, establishment of student/teacher standards, and school improvement.

Research Questions

In examining the literature from restructuring and reform these questions are raised regarding shared decision-making teams and their members (principals, teachers and parents):

1) What are team members' perceptions regarding the span of authority to make changes in the school?

2) To what extent do shared decision-making team members believe they are supported by the school board, central
administration, building administration, colleagues, and the leadership academy?

3) How do team members' perceptions differ when evaluating barriers to vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishment of student or teacher standards?

4) What are the differences in team members' perceptions of indicators of encouragement in vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishment of students or teacher standards?

5) How have the team members differed in their perceptions of discouraging factors in vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishing student or teacher standards?

6) How do the team members' perceptions of the shared decision-making process differ when assessing the relationship of the process and school improvement?

In organizing the study, it was suggested by Jane Kendrick, the former Director of the Hammond Leadership Academy, that shared decision-making teams may have different perceptions based on training in the process, position in the school, experience on teams, and grade level configurations in the school.\(^\text{10}\) Investigation of the perceptions of shared decision-making by the team members will be categorized into the following:

1) Organizational grade levels: secondary schools (which
contain any grade above sixth) and elementary schools (which contain no grade above fifth).

2) Positions (principal, teacher, parent and student—if age appropriate).

3) Training in shared decision-making process.

4) Experience with the process: less than one year, one to two years, and three to fours years as a Site Based Restructuring Process team member.

**Definition of Terms**

Terms that will be used in this dissertation are defined for the purpose of this document. These terms which are often generic to the restructuring of schools and specific to the School City of Hammond include:

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT—structural decentralization and devolution of authority with expanded local control and influence with schools being given greater authority and responsibility for their own affairs.¹¹

Restructuring—commonly implies basic changes in ground rules and power relationships, a decentralization of control and decision-making from system-wide central offices to the people involved with the individual schools, a devolution of authority right down to the school building.¹²

ORGANIZATIONAL SCHOOL LEVELS—grade configurations of the schools involved in the study.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN—a the total plan including
restructuring which is developed to reach reform and educational change for the 21st century.

SITE BASED RESTRUCTURING PROCESS-- the name used to replace School Improvement Process as the title for the school reform effort in the School City of Hammond.¹³

SITE BASED RESTRUCTURING PROCESS TEAMS-- groups at each school site consisting of the principal, teachers, parents and students (if age appropriate) who have been charged with the authority and responsibility of developing the school improvement plan.

CORE TEAM-- the principal, teacher, and parent, selected by the Site Based Restructuring Process Team who are expected to plan agendas and guide the focus of the Site Based Restructuring Process Team.

PLAN TEAM-- the Site Based Restructuring Team at each site which has as members, the principal, teachers, parents, non-certified personnel and students (in the high school).

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

The researcher must make several assumptions in this research project, which will enable the study to be conducted in Hammond, Indiana. These assumptions include:

1. The Site Based Restructuring Process Teams are active and functioning in all schools in the district since the district restructuring efforts included a mandate that Site Based Restructuring Process Teams be included in the
building level decision-making procedure.

2. Teachers and parents who serve on the teams have had to consent to being a member of the team. They have either been nominated/selected or have volunteered.  

3. Principals must be members of their team but not necessarily the team leader. The principal must be an active member of the school team according to the Hammond Strategic Planning Manual.  

4. Teams function in similar ways since all teams have at least some members who have had Site Based Restructuring Process training.  

5. All teams have followed some method of developing a vision or mission statement for the school. Vision statement development is a correlate of the state of Indiana's Performance Based Accreditation effort and all schools must have a completed vision statement in place by June, 1993. 

6. All teams have addressed some standard of student behavior in the Site Based Restructuring Process. 

7. All teams have addressed curriculum/instruction development in their school. 

Factors which will influence the summary and conclusions of this study and which must be addressed by the researcher include the following:  

1. The researcher is actively involved in the Site Based Restructuring Process in one of the schools. This
participation has created a bias held and acknowledged by the researcher.

2. This study of shared decision-making is from the School City of Hammond, Indiana. All information applies only to the School City of Hammond Site Based Restructuring Process effort and external validity is limited. Generalizing the results to a wide population is not acceptable. However, it is hoped that school districts which are undertaking a shared decision making process will benefit from the recommendations.

3. The organizational grade levels in the school district limited the choices of schools to be studied.

4. The principals of each of the schools will be instrumental in the success or failure of surveying the team members.

5. Students may not be included in the sample if schools are selected which have no students on their Site Based Restructuring Process Plan Team.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter One has delineated the rationale and purpose of this study. By extensive reading of the related literature, the researcher has developed questions which appear to be relevant to twenty-first century school reform efforts. Chapter One also included the definition of terms used and the
categories of variables which impacted the study. Lastly, Chapter One outlined the assumptions and limitations of the research study.

Chapter Two will review the literature which is the inspiration and foundation for school reform. Related research will be reported as it relates to Site Based Restructuring and the process of shared decision-making in schools. Previous studies conducted in the School City of Hammond, Indiana will be examined and related to this study.

Chapter Three will outline the rationale for selection of the School City of Hammond as the site for this study. It will describe the school district, its history in the shared decision-making process, population, and community. The process used for sample selection, instrument development and field testing will be outlined. Procedures used for categorization and data compilation and analysis will be delineated.

Chapter Four will include the presentation and analysis of data. Chapter Four will begin with a brief summary of the procedures of the study, sample selection and research tool description. Research questions will be presented. Data analysis will be in narrative and graphic forms.

Chapter Five will summarize the process of the study, the selection of the district, the sample, and the survey instrument. Conclusions and recommendations which are a result of this study will be reported in Chapter Five.
Recommendations for further study in school reform as it relates to the implementation of the shared decision making process will conclude Chapter Five.
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CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Call for the Restructuring of Schools

Reports of the need for restructuring American schools have been brought to the attention of the public for the past decade. John Goodlad in *A Place Called School* stated that the "problems of schooling are of such crippling proportions that many schools may not survive."¹ *A Nation at Risk, The Carnegie Reports on Education, and the Governors' Report on Education* and other documents have called for major reforms in school governance which hopefully will lead to improved education in our nations' public schools. Educational reform although deemed necessary is not easily accomplished. "Reforms that aim at restructuring are so multifaceted and complex that solutions for any particular setting can not be known in advance."² In 1985, Lezotte reported that 35 states had adopted major reform efforts. These efforts all had several common elements, one of which was that reform included "a building-based improvement team consisting of teachers and administrators."³

It appears that educational reform has become the cornerstone of political stands. Former President Bush and the Governors of the states have identified the educational
crisis and proposed a solution by establishing the National Education Goals America 2000 at a conference in Charlottesville, Virginia. "It is fashionable for governors to come forth with proposals for school reform in their annual messages to state legislatures." 

Individual states, "with the prime leader being the governor," have begun to establish state education goals for the twenty-first century. "School governance at each level has become busier and more political... policies spill out from districts, states, and the federal government." The mandates are being established by governors and state legislators, yet the call is for decentralization. "Critics of the traditional structure of school administration have launched initiatives to limit the control of school district staffs and grant more autonomy to principals, teachers, and parents."

State legislatures are mandating some sort of restructuring of local school systems. School improvement, and in conjunction with school improvement, new decision-making processes lead the list of reform strategies in American schools. Calls and mandates for reform are not universally embraced by school districts and personnel. Often "because of the emphasis of compliance with regulations, local and regional school districts have responded by becoming more bureaucratic and they actually have used the compliance issue
to strengthen their own positions with regard to decision-making"\(^8\) thus negating mandate effectiveness.

School district bureaucrats who resist change in governance often find themselves at odds with the state legislatures and the state education agencies. State agency employees become the interpreters and find themselves "sitting on the tip of the battering ram of school reform."\(^9\)

**Theoretical Foundations of School Management**

Organizational top-down administration of schools has been the management standard since the 1870's when educational systems began to resemble the factory in the community. With the image of a factory as a foundation, the principal was viewed as a first line supervisor. Teachers were seen as technicians whose products were students. They were to mold those products for use in the commercial American society.\(^10\)

Fayol's five basic functions of management: "planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling\(^11\) comprised the optimum system of school organization. Max Weber's concept and theory of bureaucracy guided managers of schools for many decades. Superintendents handed down decisions to principals, the middle managers, who in turn had the responsibility to supervise the implementation of the superintendent's plan.\(^12\) Teachers were the workers who completed the task of production.

Douglas McGregor's Theory X gave theoretical foundation to the bureaucratic method of top down management. In Theory
X, the manager assumes that the worker "dislikes work and will avoid it if possible; must be coerced, controlled, directed and threatened; and prefers to be directed and controlled by someone in authority." Theory X was consistent with the organizational management in factory schools in the 1870's.

School restructuring and improvement, which has been heavily in demand since the 1980's, calls for a drastic change from Theory X management to management grounded in Theory Y and Theory Z. Employee participation in decision-making has no place in Theory X but is integral in the application of Theory Y and Theory Z.

McGregor's Theory Y assumes that work is as natural as play or rest; commitment to objectives is a function of rewards for achievement; and under proper conditions, people accept and seek responsibility. "Theory Y argues for a general management philosophy that would force reconsideration of structural dimensions." Shared decision-making as a management change would be founded in McGregor's Theory Y. "It consists basically in creating opportunities under suitable conditions for people to influence decisions affecting them."

Even more to the point of educational management restructuring and decision-making would be the organizational management Theory Z of William Ouchi. The "basis of Theory Z approach to management and decision-making is that involved workers are the key to productivity." O'Hanlon suggested
that collective decision-making would be a major change for schools which could improve the organization by capturing the energy of the teams in problem solving, and decision-making. Implementing Theory Z would be an organizational effort which requires training for all involved top to bottom.18

Theory Z and its subsequent influence on what has become known as Japanese management has had a tremendous impact on the restructuring of schools in America. Japanese management style in schools gives teachers a legitimate and meaningful role in decision-making. Using consensus to carry out decision-making creates an investment and commitment to the decisions. Japanese management helps the manager facilitate change and improvement.19

The "Quality Schools Movement" has been founded in Ouchi’s Theory Z and Japanese management where "workers figure out for themselves what an appropriate objective would be for any situation, no matter how unusual or new."20 Phillips and McColly endorsed Theory Z and Japanese management as a tool for high schools to use to adapt and respond to the demands of the reform movement. They included administration, teachers, parents, students and community leaders in their shared decision-making effort. This team’s task was to build a vision of excellence for the future of the school. The benefits of the shared decision-making process include a shared ownership in the school, a concern for ongoing
improvement and increased community and parent involvement in the school.\textsuperscript{21}

Implications of Theory Z and Japanese management can be interpreted through W. Edwards Deming's 14 Principles of Management. Suggested radical change and school restructuring embrace all of these Deming principles:

1. Create a constancy of purpose for improving the product or service.
2. Adopt a new philosophy.
3. Cease depending on mass inspection.
4. End the practice of awarding business by price tags alone.
5. Constantly improve the system of production and service.
6. Institute training and retraining.
7. Provide leadership.
8. Dispel fear.
9. Breakdown barriers between staff and areas.
10. Eliminate slogans and exhortations.
11. Eliminate numerical quotas.
12. Remove barriers to pride of workmanship.
13. Institute a vigorous in-service training program.
14. Take action to accomplish the transformation.\textsuperscript{22}

Specific to the shared decision-making component of restructuring are the following six principles as cited in
"Management Manifesto", an article by Yvonne Sui-Runyan and Sally Joy Heart in the January, 1992 Executive Educator:

1. Constancy of purpose is demonstrated because "schools function best when workers, mid-level managers and top-level managers, agree on goals and priorities for the future".

2. Adopting a new philosophy occurs when "lead management relies on cooperation between managers and workers".

3. Constant improvement of production in schools is more likely to be the positive result of school managers working collaboratively with staff members who are striving to improve their own performance and contribute to the overall system.

4. Fear is dispelled when school managers provide teachers, students and parents with an environment in which they feel secure enough to challenge the status quo, explore new ways of teaching and learning and use mistakes as feedback rather than punishment.

5. Breaking down barriers between staff areas encourages managers and workers to collaborate as a team with the result being a higher quality product.

6. Taking action to accomplish the transformation requires an all personnel commitment toward the
shared vision with the manager guiding and
serving as a model of the shared decision-making
process facilitator.\textsuperscript{23}

Schools that have embraced Theory Z and Japanese
management have become, if not outwardly at least in theory,
a part of the total quality management network. These schools
recognize that restructuring is based upon building "new
relationships between management and employees, where self
assessment and team evaluation are more frequent, more
meaningful and more precise than ever before."\textsuperscript{24}

**Shared Decision-Making in Restructuring**

Shared decision-making involves the principal of the
building and his/her teachers, parents and students as a team.
The team becomes the decision-making authority in all aspects
of the educational process, school operation and school
change. Theory Z gives "control over the way people respond
to problems and coordination between them so solutions will
mesh with one another."\textsuperscript{25}

In schools, the shared decision-making process
demonstrates Theory Z's postulate of control over problem
solution. "When a faculty participates in operating a school,
the results are also mixed, frequent disagreement, a lot of
careful juggling, considerable effectiveness, a great deal of
independence and interdependence training and not a little
professional invigoration."\textsuperscript{26}
Quality management and shared decision-making relies on team effort. In business and in schools the decision-making teams' key player is the chief executive officer or principal. Robert Loughhead affirms that total quality means "achieving quality in everything the organization does...and this kind of change can only come from the leadership at the top, the CEO." The principal of the school is the CEO with the responsibility to "direct the organizational change to accommodate the employee involvement process."

As the shared decision-making process is established in the school, the principal must "provide the support-time, resources, and encouragement necessary to sustain teachers in collegial interaction." This task of the principal can be a huge barrier to the effective restructuring process. The concept makes shared decision-making a manageable process but effective shared decision-making must involve everyone. Decision making is embedded in a complex of parts that hang together and rely upon trust and subtlety developed through intimacy.

Townsend in *Quality in Action* emphasizes that "participation is involuntary, anything less splits the organization into activists and bystanders." All teachers must participate, not necessarily on a team, but they must participate in the process. "Only through the participation of all professional colleagues in the school can school-site management be truly successful." Participation may mean
that "a mechanism will be in place that allows every individual to take part in the continual improvement of the organization, even if someone does not 'pitch in' until several months after the initial beginning of the process." Involvement avenues can "vary from suggestion systems to self-managing teams. They should match authority to responsibility, creating a high degree of autonomy, and they should capture small and large ideas." When including many avenues of involvement there is understandably a "high risk undertaking for the administrator involved" particularly the traditional autocratic administrator. "Those who wield power do not look kindly on a possible dilution of that power." Teachers in Dade County, Florida felt "substantially more rapport with their principals after three years of shared decision-making under the county's site based management experiment. The principals are considerably less enthusiastic." However, the risk factor can be out-weighed by the benefits of "better decisions, higher employee morale, and prevention of adversarial management-staff relationships." Teachers in Theory Z schools, according to Robert Loughhead are "workers ... given the opportunity to become part of the decision-making process and if they are accorded respect and dignity and given an opportunity to learn the economic side of the business, changes in technology and new approaches to raise productivity and quality levels will meet much less
resistance." Benefits of shared decision-making in dealing with principals and teachers "bonds the decision makers." Principals' and Teachers' Roles in Shared Decision-Making Although restructuring a school is an "organizational and cultural process of breaking from the past" the administration must cautiously approach the change process. District administration which believes that "flexible, decentralized management requires authority to be pushed downward as far as possible so that those closest to the environmental change can observe, analyze and react to the change" must provide education and training in the process. "All shareholders (i.e. shared decision-making participants, school and district staff and the community at large) need to be given a clear rationale for implementation of shared decision-making. Those making decisions at the school site need a clear charge and operational ground rules, and they need to be provided with information relevant to specific site decision-making tasks." Prior to the call for reform, teachers and parents were seldom involved in the decision-making process. With the restructuring of schools, teams need training in the process which will be implemented. Training will provide team members with the understanding that they have been "assembled to share leadership responsibility with the principal." Hall and Williams' research revealed that trained groups consistently
performed more effectively than untrained groups on measures of decision quality.\textsuperscript{45}

The principal, although not required to lead a shared decision-making team, has the responsibility of "insuring consistency between teacher determined goals and targets and the school district's overarching goals."\textsuperscript{46} Shared decision-making at a school site must work within the parameters of the district. Principals guide their teams toward restructuring and improvement by effecting change which the district can support.

Principals in shared decision-making schools must "establish the structures and send the signals that enable teachers to undertake such leadership."\textsuperscript{47} Teachers, burdened with isolation in the classrooms and little time to share, are not sure "whether they could trust the principal."\textsuperscript{48} Building that trust between teachers and the principal can be a huge task. "Each member of the system must recognize as legitimate the decision-making powers of the other members."\textsuperscript{49}

The success of the process of shared decision-making is predicated on the team's belief that it is a viable procedure in the school. "Constructive participation and involvement cannot occur unless system members believe their participation will lead to action and are able to perform tasks in the planning process."\textsuperscript{50}
Trust in the principal is a prerequisite for success of the shared decision-making integration into school management. Afsahi reported that lack of trust in the principal was a major barrier to the success of shared decision-making meetings in her study of Los Angeles High Schools. Principals, too, have the responsibility to break the longstanding paradigms of teacher's roles. "The success of school site-management programs will depend first and foremost on how administrators view teachers." Administrator's paradigms of teachers as subordinates must be replaced with the belief that teachers are part of a "collegial and collective management system at the school level." Bergman proposed this metaphor of the principal's and teachers' control in shared decision-making: "it was as a tightly wound watch spring. As we moved toward site based management, I had to let it unwind incrementally with each new release of the spring, new potential and energy was realized." 

Teachers' Responsibilities and Benefits

Teachers who participate in shared decision-making "must become responsible professionals, willing to devote the time and energy that leadership requires, have a willingness to be held accountable for the decisions they make and be willing to listen to one another and to accept leadership from within their own ranks." These tasks are additional to the daily task of teaching children. The process requires "time and
effort to make it work" but if the time and effort are expended the "potential benefits for the school organization can result in:

1. Teachers will be less likely to perceive a strong authority structure and thus may be more apt to identify with goals and objectives of the school.
2. Teachers will benefit from a greater sense of job satisfaction which tends to improve attitudes.
3. Teachers will be more inclined to exhibit loyalty to their principal."

The school organization benefits from the shared decision-making process through an improvement in teacher willingness to participate in the school. Zaltman suggested that the "degree of acceptance, satisfaction, commitment and follow up action with regard to planning decisions is positively related to the degree of involvement that members of the system feel they have in the decision-making process." Muchler stated "teachers presence on planning teams may informally provide them with more information thus increasing their influence (on authority) through opportunity." Teachers who have been in the isolation of classrooms have a feeling of being omitted from decisions. They often complain of decisions being issued from the central office or the principal. Their complaints are indications of their dissatisfaction with bureaucratic authority and their jobs. Shared decision-making can influence teachers attitudes toward authority and teacher tasks. "If teachers are granted authority to make important decisions, then they should feel
a greater sense of self-attainment and influence, thereby increasing their satisfaction with their jobs."\textsuperscript{60}

Teachers who participate in the process become more involved in the management of the school. This participation does not come without fear or trepidation. The majority of teachers are conservative and somewhat resistant to change. Zaltman stated that the "degree to which individuals believe the consequences of the innovation or change will be attributed to them alone is inversely related to their willingness to take risks."\textsuperscript{61} The shared decision-making process provides a collegial group where a "willingness to make decisions and to take responsibility for implementing them"\textsuperscript{62} becomes the standard operating procedure for school improvement. Bergman reported that where "members of our council sensed a growing control, their commitment and enthusiasm for their work together grew."\textsuperscript{63} Teachers' participation and satisfaction will increase when "policy makers and administrators provide the structures and resources to enable teacher leadership to grow."\textsuperscript{64} Teachers must avail themselves of the opportunity provided in the shared decision-making process.

**Barriers in Shared Decision-Making**

Barriers to the successful inclusion of the decision-making process can be varied according to the site and personnel involved in the process. Harrison, Killion and Mitchell identified four errors that their district made when
implementing shared decision-making: 1) a lack of clearly defined goals and vision; 2) clearly defined roles of those involved; 3) sustained training of team members; and 4) staff adaptation to change. 65

An American Association of School Administrators survey reported that administrators (62%) favored decentralizing decisions to the school site but only 42% of those administrators advocated giving greater authority to teachers. Of the teachers surveyed, 76% favored greater school authority and again only 42% favored giving greater authority to the teacher. Lewis reported that the AASA survey results indicated that there was still doubt about the success of the process by many teachers and administrators. 66

Malen, Ogawa and Krantz in the article "Site Based Management: Unfulfilled Promises," reported that the process failed in several ways. Included in the failures were:

1. Shared decision-making teams often address insignificant or managerial issues rather than educational change and school policy.
2. Shared decision-making is time consuming and frustrating for team members.
3. Change is slow and evidence of improvement is often hidden.
4. There is little observable data to support the idea that the shared decision-making process has led to higher achievement for students. 67

A study of site based management in Salt Lake City by Malen and Ogawa resulted in the conclusion that the process was viewed with approval. The teachers felt however that most decisions were still made by principals and the central
office. Malen and Ogawa suggested that ongoing training for group members be focused on groups dynamics.⁶⁸

Renzie's research led to the conclusions that these barriers inhibit the development of the shared decision-making process:

1. Shared decision-making roles and processes are unclear to staff. Communications and a still emerging process may contribute to this barrier.
2. Many staff believe they have not been truly empowered to make decisions which effect their jobs.
3. Staff involvement is crucial to the success of the shared decision-making process. Those who have not been involved are less enthusiastic and informed about the process.
4. Shared decision-making in practice has not matched shared decision-making in theory and belief.⁶⁹

Factors which contributed negatively to a shared decision-making process team meeting were reported by Afsahi. Findings of lack of trust and time expenditure were significant barriers to the success of the process. Administrative dominance of meeting agenda contributed to problems associated with shared decision-making. The single most deterring factor was poor attendance (and involvement) in the meetings and committees.⁷⁰

**Indicators of Encouragement for the Process**

Locke and Schweiger concluded that there is support for the thesis that participatory decision-making leads to increased satisfaction and productivity, with satisfaction
increasing more than productivity.\textsuperscript{71} Site based management, according to Malen, Ogawa and Krantz, should provide team members with greater influence on policy decisions, a stronger school-wide planning process, instructional improvement and higher academic achievement.\textsuperscript{72}

Collegiality is perceived as providing an atmosphere of support for shared decision-making. The process is often a factor in building collegiality. Through collegiality teachers are willing to work together to make decisions.\textsuperscript{73} Principals, in their support of the shared decision-making process, can effect the institutionalization of support and collegiality in the school.\textsuperscript{74}

Asfahi found four factors which contributed to the success of the shared decision-making process at meetings which were held by process teams. These indicators of success were:

1. Most members believed the process benefitted the school and the students.
2. The team leaders were organized.
3. An agenda was set and followed with a facilitator, recorder and observer performing specific group tasks.
4. Committee membership selection was critical in continuing the work of the team.

These four factors enhanced the development of the team as it functioned in the process of shared decision-making and school improvement.\textsuperscript{75}
Research in the Selected Study Site

In a study of the school improvement process in the School City of Hammond in 1986, Witherspoon made the following conclusions regarding the initial Hammond Process.

1. Principals and teachers had positive attitudes and perceptions of the process.
2. Principals and teachers agreed on the general areas of authority for the school improvement process.
3. Principals had positive attitudes regarding the actual functioning of the process. Teachers felt significantly different than the principals. They had less positive attitudes about whether they had: input in decisions affecting their school; principal support of the process; meaningful roles in the process; and whether the process itself was meaningful. 76

Smiley and Tuermer conducted a study of the School Improvement Process and the Site Based Restructuring Process in the School City of Hammond. Teachers and administrators were surveyed as to their perceptions of the progress made in shared vision, participatory leadership, results oriented management and culture for innovation. The perceptions were based on progress or differences in the four areas comparing the school improvement process and the site based restructuring process. Overwhelming majorities of the teachers, 58 to 76% felt that there had been no change in the development of these areas. Smiley found that teachers who had been active in the first School Improvement Process initiative related more positive attitudes toward the process in the four areas. Similarly, Site Based Restructuring
Process trained teachers displayed more positive attitudes than non-trained teachers.  

In an early case study of the School Improvement Process in Hammond, Casner-Lotto suggested that teachers with tremendous support of the union leadership were participating in a "gradual yet fundamental shift in the decision-making authority." Principals felt that their rules, roles and relationships were changed. The union president and the superintendent of schools believed that the district was moving away from an 'us vs. them' attitude to one of cooperation.

Each of the three previous studies suggested that although there were greater perceptions of the sharing of decision-making authority, not all members of the constituency were in full agreement that the process was truly in effect. Early studies concluded that team members and non-team members in the faculty held diverse perceptions of the importance of the shared decision-making process in the School City of Hammond. Witherspoon determined that the teachers were less enthusiastic about the actual sharing of authority. Smiley met with teachers views that were "to paraphrase the popular aphorism 'SIP happens'. In the early case study, Casner-Lotto found many cynical attitudes toward the School Improvement Process held by teachers.
Summary of the Literature

School reform is a major focus in the American public. There is concern that the schools, because of their structure and management, are not meeting the educational needs of the students. Schools are failing to provide an educational experience which will prepare students to be productive workers in the 21st century.

The call for reform has been heard from politicians, education authorities, local community members, and from school administrators. At the top of the reform agenda is the organizational management and leadership in schools. The mandate is to implement a school improvement plan which more often than not includes a shared decision-making process. School sites are gaining more autonomy from districts with the stipulation that parents, teachers, administrators, business leaders, and sometimes students, are actively involved in the decision-making process.

Research and the literature provide a wide base of knowledge about the barriers to the shared decision-making process. Attitudes of people not involved in the process often inhibit the development and implementation of school improvement plans. A lack of training and support of team members were deterrents to the success of school improvement projects.

Benefits from the process are derived from satisfaction and enthusiasm for teaching. Ownership in programs and in
change endeavors is enhanced through the shared decision-making process. Principals expressed satisfaction in sharing the responsibility of school governance.

Shared decision-making has had an impact on the restructuring and reform of educational systems. Definitions of school reform and restructuring may be diverse but a shared decision-making process is a necessary element. Tye defines restructuring as "programs designed to foster decentralized decision-making and site based management." Anne C. Lewis states "restructuring may mean different things to different people but reformers agree that it has already changed the definition of educational leadership."

Summary of Chapter Two

Chapter Two reviewed the literature which is related to the shared decision-making process and school governance. This chapter reviewed the theoretical basis which school administrators use to implement the process as the decision-making authority in the school. The chapter included an overview of role changes, benefits, barriers and encouraging factors which are associated with the shared decision-making process.

Chapter Two contained a review of the research studies which have occurred in the School City of Hammond. The studies completed by Witherspoon, Smiley, and Casner-Lotto were reported. This reporting should provide a knowledge base for data analysis as reported in Chapter Four.
Chapter Three will provide a demographic background of the city of Hammond and the School City of Hammond. A historical background of the shared decision-making process in Hammond is outlined. Chapter Three will include a description of the methodology and procedures of the study.

Chapter Four will include data presentation and data analysis. The research questions will be related to the data. The two Likert and ten open-ended survey questions will be presented graphically as well as in narrative form.

Chapter Five will contain a summary of the study, and conclusions and recommendations which are derived from this research. Recommendations for future study will conclude Chapter Five.
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CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

Chapter Three outlines the demographics of the School City of Hammond which is the district selected for this study. A historical background of the district’s shared decision-making processes will provide a knowledge basis for examination of the data. Chapter Three will present the procedures followed in the selection of the district and the selection of the sample. The method used for construction of the survey tool and procedures used for data analysis will conclude Chapter Three.

Demographics of the District

The School City of Hammond is located in an urban city at the north western corner of Indiana. Hammond’s population in 1990 was just over eighty thousand ethnically diverse people. The white population is 78%, blacks and hispanics comprise 9% and 12% respectively.¹

The city is mostly residential, with light steel-related industry and service industries providing the tax base. Historically, Hammond’s residents were employed in the steel industries in East Chicago and Gary, Indiana. Since 1970, the
steel industry has ceased to be the mainstay as an employer. The percent of people employed by steel has decreased to 30% (down from a high of 55% prior to 1970). Retail and service employment has increased to 23 and 27 percent.²

The School City of Hammond has 24 instructional sites: 16 elementary schools; 2 elementary/middle schools; 1 middle school; 2 middle/high schools; 2 high schools; and 1 career center which services student from all of Hammond’s secondary schools as well as students from surrounding districts.³

The School City employs over 800 teachers and 70 district and building level administrators. A support staff of over 700 employees is comprised of custodians, secretaries, teacher aides, kitchen workers, tradesmen and laborers.⁴ The staff services a student population in excess of 13,830 in grades kindergarten through twelve.⁵

Central office administration is led by Superintendent David O. Dickson, who has been in the position since 1984. Dr. Dickson is accountable to five elected Board of School Trustees. He is assisted by four assistant superintendents (curriculum, personnel, finance, and pupil personnel). There are many directors, supervisors and coordinators who provide added support for the school sites.⁶

Elementary schools, which have enrollments ranging from 125 to 600 students, have a principal as sole administrator. Secondary schools have a principal and one or two assistant
principals administering to student and staff needs. No site is without a full time principal.

The family income level in the school city is primarily middle and low level earners. Over thirty percent of the student population is eligible for the federal free lunch program. Most student achievement scores indicate that Hammond's student population is scoring at or slightly below the national and state norms.

Although Hammond has a central district administration for the overseeing of the twenty-four school sites, the recent focus of management is the devolution of control and authority to the local school site. Each school is mandated to have a Site Based Restructuring Plan Team roster listed as part of the building management organization.

Background of Shared Decision-Making in Selected District

The prototype of the current shared decision-making process was developed in the early 1980's. This prototype was titled the School Improvement Process and was modeled after processes and programs developed by the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities (I/D/E/A) school initiative. The district School Improvement Process gained momentum when one of the Assistant Principals, Elizabeth Ennis, at Hammond High School, attended an I/D/E/A conference. Miss Ennis wanted to build a team which would join together to solve the increasing gang and discipline problems at the
school. She along with a selected group of teachers, parents, students, district administrators and school board members sought a financial grant from the Kettering Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, and the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute.  

This selected group, called the School Improvement Process team, sought to bring about school reform and change through the shared decision-making process. Gary Phillips, formerly of the Kettering Foundation, became the advisor to the high school team and later was the consultant for the district initiative.  

The high school School Improvement Process team began to address some of the perceived problems at the school through shared leadership and problem solving. Word of the actions of the School Improvement Process team at Hammond High School spread to the two elementary/middle feeder schools to Hammond High. These two schools' administrations, faculty, and parents voluntarily adopted the School Improvement Process of shared governance for their schools.  

In 1984, the district offered a School Improvement Project Awareness workshop for a team from each of the other twenty-one schools in the district. The team members from each school included the principal, a teacher, and a parent. Since 66 of the 67 team members attending the workshop endorsed the idea of the School Improvement Process teams and shared decision-making, the Board of School
Trustees sanctioned the School Improvement Process as a district endeavor in the summer of 1984.\textsuperscript{16} During the school year 1984-1985, the School Improvement model was developed for implementation at any of the school sites.\textsuperscript{17} The model closely matched that of the I/D/E/A School Improvement Program.\textsuperscript{18} Under the direction of the Superintendent of Schools, David O. Dickson, an implementation team of teachers, principals and district administrators developed what they perceived to be a viable model for shared decision-making. The School Improvement Process team at each site would include teachers, parents and a school administrator (the principal did not have to serve on the team if he/she chose not to do so). The administrator was not able to be the chair of the team if he/she wanted to be included on the School Improvement Process team.\textsuperscript{19} All decisions made by the teams at the building levels had to be reviewed and approved by a program review committee and the Board of School Trustees.

Teams could address problems which were inherent to their school site.\textsuperscript{20} Through shared decision-making and problem solving school teams believed they could make changes without restrictions. This belief, conceived in error and misunderstanding, was a contributing factor in the demise of the School Improvement Process initiative.

Structure and organization of School Improvement Process teams was very loosely outlined. The process did not
delineate team membership, selection, meeting frequency or span of authority. The principal's authority and scope of involvement was defined according to the discretion of the principal. Some building leaders were reluctant to share authority, some were actively involved in the process and the remaining principals exercised denial of the process' existence. The unstructured direction for the principal was also a contributing factor to the School Improvement Process' downfall.

Prior to the enactment of School Improvement Process teams at the buildings, the district provided a "pre-implementation workshop" in the spring of 1985. The workshop participants included the CORE teams members (administrator, teacher and parent) but no training was provided for the entire School Improvement Process team. This training was to provide a greater understanding of the process and its place in the administration of decision-making in the school.

Implementation of the School Improvement Process was begun as a district initiative during the school year 1985-1986. Team functions and activities were not uniformly operating in all schools. The district allowed each school to become as involved in the process as the school team seemed interested. Team involvement had a direct relationship to the willingness of the principal to support and share the expansion of the decision-making authority in the school.
All schools in the district had School Improvement teams which were examining some form of organizational management. Teams which became actively involved in the process were creating vision statements. Curricular change or instructional issues seemed to be moot points for most teams.

Team members were often pressed for time. Most School Improvement Process meetings and activities took place after the regular school day. Teachers and administrators became frustrated when the time to be creative was at the end of a busy school day. Teams were lacking time, training and financial resources required for effective shared decision-making and school reform.

During the 1986-1987 school year, the district was able to provide a nominal sum for each school to implement School Improvement Process initiatives. This money came from a grant from the Indiana Department of Education. Most teams used the grant money to develop goals, strategies and vision statements, and to alter the school cosmetically. Few schools, as before, addressed curricular needs and changes.

Also in 1987, teachers were able to plan staff development activities through a $66,000 grant from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. These stipends to schools provided substitute pay so that teams could meet during the school day to address reform. The grant also funded a Labor/Management Conference for administrators and School Improvement chairs.
Gary Phillips left Hammond as a consultant at the end of the contract period in 1987, leaving the School Improvement Process without an out of district perspective. Training of teams came less often. CORE teams had been trained in the process but there was no provision for continued training or initial training of an entire team. The lack of training for the entire team influenced the successful operation for the School Improvement Process teams.

Hammond district administration observed the lack of change efforts at the schools and engaged the service of Philip Schlechty of the Center for Leadership in School Reform in Louisville, Kentucky. Schlechty began work with the Hammond School Improvement Process in 1987.

In the 1987-1988 school year, School Improvement Process teams were progressing at various rates. Some teams had ceased to function, some were still in the perfunctory management stage, and other were engaged in professionally addressing school reform. Teachers in cross sections of the district were frustrated yet encouraged, overburdened and apathetic of the process. This lack of district continuity led to confusion, distrust, and often jealousy among the entire professional staff.

School Improvement Process teams began to address issues which resulted in change in curriculum, grade reporting, and student attendance policy. Many teams, in their enthusiasm to address these issues through shared decision-making, did
not follow the board procedures for policy change. In the spring of 1988, the board denied the proposals of two School Improvement Process teams, despite faculty development and support of the proposals.

This rejection of the proposal played into the hands of the teachers and principals who were skeptical and antagonistic towards the process. Those who did not buy into the shared decision-making process at the school site were able to utter the "I told you so's" that are so prevalent in the education profession. The idea of shared decision-making and site based management as an educational reform in Hammond, Indiana was struck a fatal blow by the lack of the Board of School Trustee's endorsement.

The fall of 1988-1989 brought continued distrust and havoc in the School Improvement Process program. Rather than try to revive a severely disabled program, the school district suspended the School Improvement Process project in all the schools. The superintendent and the board formed a committee to develop a strategic plan to correct previous flaws in the shared decision-making design.34

The strategic planning committee met on a regularly scheduled basis during the 1988-1989 school year. Using the weakness of the School Improvement Process structure, the committee proposed that the current Site Based Restructuring Process replace the old School Improvement Process as the
model for shared decision-making in the School City of Hammond.

The recommendations of the strategic planning committee incorporated the following changes in the shared decision-making process:

1. The principal must be a member of the CORE and Site Based Restructuring Process team.
2. Team selection processes were defined with teachers being selected by nomination and vote from their peers, parents being selected from the parent groups, and student (if appropriate) being selected by the members of the student government.
3. Concepts of restructuring replaced concepts of improvement.
4. Roles, responsibilities, authority and accountability were remanded to the CORE team, plan team and design teams. Each group had defined roles in the Site Based Restructuring Process.
5. Steps for implementation of new policy which might be counter to board policy were spelled out to eliminate plans being rejected by central office or the board.
6. Formal assessment training and full plan team training was included in the development of the Site Based Restructuring Process.
7. Principals had veto power over any plan team decision. Principals could send proposals back to the plan team until the proposals met with the Principal's approval.

8. Team membership and composition was specified by school enrollment. Teachers had to have a majority of one when compared to the combination of all other groups.

9. If the plan team followed all steps involved in altering board policy, the Board of School Trustees could not overturn a plan team proposal.\(^{35}\)

The Site Based Restructuring Process at each of the school sites is supported by a central office position which is titled the Director of the Hammond Leadership Academy. The director supervises a high school, middle school, and elementary school coordinator. The coordinators act as liaisons for research projects, staff development activities, and change initiatives which are in process at the buildings. The director, Miss Ruth Mueller, and coordinators work closely with the principals and plan teams to ascertain that they follow the steps outlined in the process.

The Center for Leadership in School Reform in Louisville, Kentucky supports the reform initiative by offering consultant services on a regular basis. Mrs. Marty Vowels is the current consultant to Hammond.
The Hammond schools' Site Based Restructuring Process initiative was phased into the district in four segments. In the fall of 1989-1990, principals were informed of the replacement of the School Improvement Process with the Site Based Restructuring Process which was a result of the strategic planning committee recommendation. Schools were invited to choose when they would receive training in the process, with the expectation that all schools would participate in training and the Site Based Restructuring Process by January of 1992. The first group of four schools was trained in January of 1991, the second in June of 1991, the third in October of 1991, and the last in January of 1992.

Financial support for Site Based Restructuring Process teams was $1,500 of discretionary money for each school. Advanced curriculum programs could be supported by applying to the Education Bank established by the academy for supplemental funds. This financial support was an indication of the good faith made by the board for the process and the strategic planning committee.

Site Based Restructuring plan teams are currently in operation in all of the schools in the School City of Hammond. The 1992-1993 school year was designated as the criteria year for the state of Indiana Performance Based Accreditation for the district. It was the task of the Site Based Restructuring Process teams at each of the schools to ascertain that each
school had a report of the strengths and weaknesses of the school as well as goals, strategies, and action plans for school improvement.\textsuperscript{38}

With the completion of the Performance Based Accreditation report, many teams are in the state of change. Some teams are replacing personnel, some teams disbanding, and some teams addressing new issues. It remains to be seen whether the shared decision-making model has been institutionalized in the district.

Selection of the District

Unlike most districts where "teacher participation was not a consequence of a system-wide policy proclaimed by the superintendent or the school board,"\textsuperscript{39} Hammond was selected because the restructuring process was developed through the collaboration of the School Board, Teachers' Union, parents and students.\textsuperscript{40} The current shared decision-making process has been in place since the late 1980's. The district had experienced failure in the initial School Improvement Process, reconstructed the concept as the Site Based Restructuring Process and reinstituted the program. The district also has developed a training program for team members which should have an influence on the perceived success of the programs.

For the researcher, there were the pragmatic reasons of availability and cooperation of respondents in the study. From superintendent to parents, the willingness to participate in the study has eased the difficulty in data collection.
Permission to conduct this study was obtained from Dr. Thomas Knarr, Assistant Superintendent for Pupil Personnel Services and School Improvement Projects. (Appendix A) Personal encouragement for this research project has also been received from the Superintendent of Schools, the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, and the Director of Secondary Education.

Research Questions

Hammond's previous experience with the shared decision-making process and the current shared decision-making initiative provided the researcher with a site for surveying team members on the research questions. Principals, teachers, and parents were asked to respond to open-ended questions which focused on these research questions:

1) What are team members' perceptions regarding the span of authority to make changes in the school?
2) To what extent do shared decision-making team members believe they are supported by the school board, central administration, building administration, colleagues, and the leadership academy?
3) How do team members' perceptions differ when evaluating barriers to vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishment of student or teacher standards.
4) What are the differences in team members' perceptions of indicators of encouragement in vision
building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishment of student and teacher standards?

5) How have the team members differed in their perceptions of discouraging factors in vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishing student and teacher standards?

6) How do the team members' perceptions of the shared decision-making process differ when assessing the relationship of the process and school improvement?

Selection of the Sample

The sample for the research study was a purposefully selected random sample taken from the twenty-four school sites in the district. One of the descriptive variables in the study was grade level organization of the building. Prior to the random selection of schools, the schools were separated into elementary (grades kindergarten through five) and secondary (grades six through twelve). The two schools which are kindergarten through eight were classified as secondary schools. The purpose of separating the grade levels was to insure that both elementary and secondary shared decision-making teams were included in the research.

Once separated into two grade level categories, three schools were randomly selected from the eight secondary schools and six schools were selected from the sixteen elementary schools. These nine schools were proportionately representative of the total district.
Principals from each of the selected schools were personally asked if their Site Based Restructuring Process teams would agree to take part in the survey. All principals were given the option of having the researcher come to a team meeting to explain and answer questions about the study. One of the nine principals expressed an interest in having the researcher attend a meeting and personally distribute the surveys. All other principals indicated that they would place the survey distribution on the team meeting agenda but did not want to allocate team time to survey explanation and discussion with the researcher.

Each principal was asked how many people served on the Site Based Restructuring Process team to determine the total number of surveys that would be placed in circulation. Surveys were sent to the principals for distribution to the teams. A cover letter and a self addressed envelope was attached to the survey. Respondents were requested to return the completed survey through the district mail system. Principals distributed a total of seventy-five surveys to the Site Based Restructuring Process team members in early May.

Thirty-three surveys were returned to the researcher by June 10 (the last day of school for teachers). Eight of the nine principals returned surveys, twenty-one were returned from teachers and four parents returned surveys. There were no student surveys returned, possibly because only one team selected has students as members.
The Survey Instrument

The research on the perceptions of team members toward shared decision-making ranged from team meeting processes\textsuperscript{41} to the attitudes of teachers and principals toward the process.\textsuperscript{42} No previous instrument was found which would measure the barriers and indicators of encouragement involved in the shared decision-making process as perceived by the members of these teams. The researcher, with the advice and consultation of Dr. Jane Kendrick, the former director of the Hammond Leadership Academy, determined that perceptions of team members would be collected in the areas of vision building, curriculum and instruction development and the establishment of student/teacher standard, since the majority of Hammond teams had addressed these issues in some manner.

The original survey tool (Appendix B) was field tested on the researcher's own school shared decision-making team. Questions were eliminated or modified according to the responses obtained from the field study to the open ended questions. Questions were not judged for the content of the response, instead questions were used which would create a "mountain of data"\textsuperscript{43} for the researcher's study.

After the original field study was evaluated, the researcher solicited the collaboration of the current Leadership Academy director, Miss Ruth Mueller. Additional refinement of the open-ended questions and the two Likert
scale questions was the result of this collaboration. (Appendix C)

The research tool was developed for the study of the shared decision-making process in Hammond, Indiana. Analysis, conclusions and recommendations gleaned from this tool are specific to the Hammond shared decision-making initiative and should not be generalized to all shared decision-making processes. It is hoped that conclusions and recommendations could be utilized by administrators interested in the development of site-based shared decision-making processes in other school districts.

**Procedures of Data Analysis**

The two Likert style questions were reported as responses solicited from the different descriptive groups being surveyed, elementary or secondary; principal; teacher or parent; Site Based Restructuring Process trained or untrained; and number of years experienced in the process. These two questions were used as a cross reference when responses were obtained from the open-ended questions.

The survey was constructed to provide built-in broad categories for classification. Perceptions were grouped under the concepts of vision building, development of curriculum and instruction, establishment of student/teacher standards, and the shared decision-making process as it relates to school improvement. The concepts of vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and student/teacher standards
establishment were defined into additional categories of barriers, indicators of encouragement, and factors which led to discouragement for team members.

The coding of the data were initiated by listing all the responses for each concept according to the category. No value (positive or negative) was placed on any response. No property for a category was predetermined. Properties were labeled after all the responses were listed, examined, and compared. Those responses describing barriers, encouraging factors and discouraging factors were examined and coded for each concept.

The categories for responses regarding the barriers were coded into these properties: attitudes/behaviors, time, communications, finance, directed decisions, and no barriers. The categories for responses regarding indicators of encouragement were coded into these properties: involvement/support, physical evidence, communication, attitudes, training, consensus of need for change, and no indicators of encouragement. Properties of factors of discouragement were coded into: outside of building support, understanding of the process, understanding of the concept, time, consensus of need for change, attitudes, and teacher inadequacies.

Responses which had a crossover of properties were examined until it was possible to place them in one particular category. All responses were labeled with a property. Once
the properties of the categories were established, they were placed on a continuum according to the frequency of citation in the responses of those in the survey.\textsuperscript{45}

Frequency was also attributed to the members of the descriptive variable groups according to position, grade level, training, and years of experience. Thus the "who" as well as the "how often" was examined by property coding of categories.

Summary of Chapter Three

Chapter Three presented the methodology and procedures used in this research study. It began with a demographic and historic description of the city and school district of Hammond, Indiana. Reasons for selection of the district for the study as well as the research questions and sample selection were delineated.

The development and field testing of the research tool, was described for the reader. Procedures used to analyze the two Likert style questions and the ten open-ended survey questions were explained.

Chapter Four will include the presentation and analysis of the data collected from the team members of the shared decision-making teams in the School City of Hammond.

A summary of the research, conclusions reached from the analysis of the data, and recommendations stemming from the conclusions will be contained in Chapter Five.
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CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This research was conducted in the School City of Hammond, Indiana on nine purposefully selected random sampled shared decision-making teams. The teams were comprised of principals, teachers, and parents in elementary and secondary schools. Team members were, by a large majority, trained in the shared decision-making process. More than eighty percent of the team members had more than one year of experience in the process.

The research tool was a survey which contained two Likert style questions and ten open-ended questions which allowed ample space for team members to record their perceptions of the shared decision making process in their school. The tool was developed with the consultation of the former director of the Hammond Leadership Academy. The original tool was field tested by the researcher's shared decision-making team. Modifications were made following the field testing.

Thirty-three of the seventy-five surveys distributed were returned with some portion of the survey completed. Data were coded into areas of the study which included span of
authority, support, vision building, curriculum and instruction development, student and teacher standards establishment, and school improvement. Data were reported in narrative and graphic forms.

Data were used to arrive at conclusions from the study. Recommendations, from the conclusions and for future research, stemmed from the data analysis.

**RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER ONE**

**What are team members' perceptions regarding the span of authority to make changes in the school?**

**Perceptions on Span of Authority**

All groups, which were defined by position, trained, experienced, and grade levels, agreed that they had complete or at least limited authority over building a school vision. Three to one respondents claimed that there was complete authority as opposed to limited authority.

The majority of the respondents indicated that they had limited authority over building procedures, although principals said the team had complete authority to change building procedures. Only two respondents (both parents) claimed there was no authority to manage procedural changes.

All but three respondents claimed that there was limited or complete control over the development of new curriculum and instructional methods. Twenty respondents claimed that there was at least limited control. Seven elementary respondents
and one secondary respondent said that teams had complete control of curriculum and instruction.

A total of twenty teachers, principals and parents indicated that team had no control over staffing in their school. Eleven claimed limited authority in staffing issues, while only one person stated there was complete control over staffing. The single indicator of complete control was an elementary teacher with training and 1-2 years of experience on the shared decision-making teams.

Staff development, on the other hand, did not have any respondent who believed they had no authority in this area. The majority of the respondents stated that they had limited authority, eight stated there was complete authority in implementing staff development in their school.

Eleven people claimed that the teams had no authority over the operations in the building. Twenty respondents indicated that they believed that they had limited control over operation. Principals, who are accountable to the Central Administration for the operation of their buildings, claimed that they had little (6) or no (2) authority for the operations of their schools.

Twenty-six respondents indicated that they had limited and/or complete control of the development of student and teacher standards. Only three respondents stated that standards were beyond their span of authority. Principals were divided with four claiming limited authority and two each
claiming complete or no authority. The majority of teachers (13) indicated limited authority in modifying student or teacher standards. Parents agreed three to one that the authority to change student/teacher standards was limited.

Figure 1 illustrates team members perceptions on their span of authority to implement change in the school.

**FIGURE 1: PERCEIVED AUTHORITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>COMPLETE</th>
<th>LIMITED</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision Model</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Standards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Site Based Restructuring Process teams in this study claimed the greatest amount of authority to be in the process of building the vision for the school. Staff development was the next area in which teams exerted authority. The area of curriculum and instruction development was the third in rank.
for the span of authority. Building procedures and student/teacher standards were viewed as having at most limited authority. Operations was the next to last area which teams believed that they could impact. Staffing was listed as the least likely area for which teams had authority to make changes or decisions.

According to the research completed by Conley and Bacharach most shared decision-making teams find that their decisions are made in the areas of: Vision Building, Building Procedures, Curriculum and Instruction, Staffing, Staff Development, Operations, and Student/Teacher Standards.¹ This study would narrow the areas of span of authority to: Vision Building, Staff Development, and Curriculum and Instruction.

**RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER TWO**

To what extent do shared decision-making team members believe they are supported by the school board, central administration, building administration, colleagues, and the leadership academy?

**Perceptions of Support**

Respondents in the research study were asked to determine the amount of support that they received from the School Board, Central Administration, Building Administration, Colleagues and the Leadership Academy. Respondents were asked to indicate, whether each of these groups gave the shared decision-making process much, some, little or no support.
The School Board was considered to give some support by four principals, five teachers, and three parents. One secondary teacher claimed the Board lent little support as did seven teachers. A parent and a secondary teacher thought the Board gave much support. No support was evidenced by two principals, four teachers and a parent.

The Central Administration was given credit for much support by two parents and one teacher. Six principals and six teachers stated some support was apparent from the Central Administration as did two parents. Two elementary principals and one parent claimed no support was in evidence by the Central Administration.

No respondent claimed little or no support from the building administrators. Eleven teachers said building administrators gave them much support. This was also agreed to by four principals and two parents. Some building administrator support was witnessed by seven teachers and three parents.

Five respondents experienced little or no support by colleagues. Three principals, eight teachers and three parents indicated that colleagues provided some support. Three principals, eight teachers and two parents stated that colleagues could be credited with much support.

The Hammond Leadership Academy was given little credit for support by four teachers. Two teachers and three parents claimed that they did not see evidence of any support by the
academy. Principals were split, three and three, on whether the academy provided some or much support. Five teachers claimed much support while seven teachers stated there was some support. Two parents experienced much support from the Academy.

In the Site Based Restructuring Process trained groups there was not a great difference in the perception of support. Most of the respondents had received training. Those who hadn't, indicated similar perceptions regarding support.

Figure 2 depicts the team members' perceptions of support from the five groups.

FIGURE 2: PERCEPTIONS OF SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF SUPPORT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF CITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN ADM</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLD ADM</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEAGUE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDSP ACA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- MUCH
- SOME
- LITTLE
- NONE
In terms of years of experience, the respondents with the least number of years tended to respond negatively (little or no support) when surveyed about Board, Central Administration, and Leadership Academy support. All experience levels tended to respond positively (much or some support) when questioned about Building level and collegial support.

Site Based Restructuring Process teams in this study indicated that the greatest amount of support was evident in the building level administration. Colleagues provided the next degree of support for the teams. The Leadership Academy and the Central Administration were perceived to provide about the same amount of support when examining much, some and little support as positive indicators. The School Board was perceived to provide the least support of all five groups.

According to Heart and Sui-Runyan "dispelling fear (the eighth of Deming's fourteen points) can be accomplished when school managers provide teachers, students, and parents with an environment in which they feel secure enough to challenge the status quo, explore new ways of teaching and learning and use mistakes as feedback rather than punishment." Providing this environment is created by supporting the process of shared decision-making in the schools.

Building administrators work in cooperation with the school shared decision-making teams, they meet together, discuss and solve problems, and determine goals for the school. Team members work with colleagues on a daily basis
developing a support system which is readily accessible. Team members seldom have interaction with central administration, the leadership academy and the school board. The interaction between team members, building administrators, and colleagues fosters the secure environment which provides support for the team members.

RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER THREE

How do team members' perceptions differ when evaluating barriers to vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishment of student and teacher standards?

Barriers of Vision Building

Figure 3 represents the team members' perceptions of barriers encountered in building vision in the school.

FIGURE 3: BARRIERS OF VISION BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY OF CITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMCATN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMCATN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principals perceive the barriers to building vision as: time, financial support, lack of central administration communications, and the traditional attitudes of the staff. Two of the elementary principals and one of the secondary principals believed that no barriers were encountered in vision building. One of the secondary principals reported that the major barrier to building vision for the school related to the "difficulty of getting teachers to get involved in and buying into the process... as a result teachers give lip service to the vision of the school but do little to institutionalize its attainment."

Both secondary and elementary teachers claimed that time was the primary barrier to vision building. As one elementary teacher stated "We've been 'meetinged' out." A high school teacher stated that not being compensated for the time expended was a barrier. This financial recompense for time was the only financial support aspect mentioned by teachers.

Also as a barrier to vision building was the problem of communication which was perceived by teachers to be a grave deterrent. In survey responses the communication category included a lack of understanding of the process; actual one on one communication; writing the actual statement on paper; people being caught up in semantics; and opposition to the actual wording of the vision statement.

Less often cited but nevertheless a part of teachers' perceptions of barriers were relationship issues. One teacher
had a concern that the process was being metamorphosed into the "team going along with the most assertive person" rather than sharing the making of decisions. Teachers reported that there was additional stress in the building because some of the "teachers lack the ability to work together." Gaining the approval from the faculty by the consensus method proved to be a barrier for teachers.

Five of the seventeen teachers reported that there were no barriers in building the school vision. One reported that vision building was "relatively easy. All teachers share the basic wants for their students as well as parents. It was just a matter of writing it down and executing it."

Parents included financial support and time expenditure as perceived barriers. Communication too was a problem for parents. One parent stated: "It was difficult to list all our wants into a short, to the point statement."

Affirming Renzie's research which concluded that "staff involvement is crucial to the success of the shared decision-making process and communications contribute to this barrier," team members in Hammond Schools indicated communications and attitudes were barriers to vision building.

Time was identified as a major barrier in this research. The time barrier was also identified in research by Malen, Ogawa and Krantz in 1990. Afsahi concluded that "time expenditure was significant" as a barrier.
Barriers of Curriculum/Instruction Development

Principals perceived that staff apathy was a barrier to improving curriculum and instructions. One elementary principal stated apathy was apparent by: "The slowness in which the staff buys into the change, it slows the whole process of improvement." Another principal mentioned that some of the teachers see no need for improving the curriculum. Teachers perceived apathy in a variety of ways. One stated "no one wants to do the work." Others expressed the thoughts that teachers see no need for change. Parents, too, expressed the perceived lack of need for change as a barrier. One parent determined that a "lack of imagination in curriculum development caused a lack of action in the implementation of change.

The second-most mentioned barrier to curriculum and instruction improvement was central administration's lack of guidelines. Principals and teachers listed this a major concern. The scope of the lack of guidelines ranged from not having curriculum guides at all to not receiving directions from the central office personnel. Five principals and teachers specifically mentioned the lack of central office guides as a barrier to the improvement of curriculum and instruction.

Conversely, both principals and teachers cited that the state, central office and School Board policies placed restraints on the team's actions in curriculum and instruction
improvement. Central office has control of staffing of special area teachers and often makes "city wide decisions which teams have no control over." Teams are often limited in varying curriculum because of what is "approved city-wide."

Principals cited a lack of time for research, development and implementation as a contributing barrier in curriculum and instruction improvement. Only one teacher mentioned time as a factor. Although time was mentioned by principals, the frequency of the reference to time was not sufficient to label time as a major barrier.

Personalities and staff attitudes were often cited as barriers by teachers. One teacher stated that "teacher differences in opinion and philosophy has created anger and factions never before experienced here."

Funding was mentioned by all three groups. Although, funding was mentioned by only one respondent from each of the principal and parent groups. Five teachers cited financial barriers to be great.

Unusual, although cited by both an elementary principal and an elementary teacher, was the barrier of "doing something different." The principal related this barrier as: "it is difficult to set the new trends in curriculum, to break the mold." The teacher expressed a "feeling of frustration in creating acceptance and the desire to implement the curriculum and instruction changes."
Team members in Hammond reported that a major barrier in developing curriculum and instruction was the restraint established by state and local administrations. This supported research conducted by Malen and Ogawa which concluded that teachers believed that "most decisions were still made by principals and the central office."\(^6\)

Shared decision-making teams in Hammond indicated that staff attitudes were the major barrier in effecting curriculum changes. Traditional line and staff organization makes it hard for teachers to "break the mold" in the concept of empowerment, according to a secondary principal. An elementary teacher reported that teachers "pay lip service" to proposed changes due to the belief that the shared decision-making process will not be institutionalized. Another secondary teacher cited the general staff attitude was "this is just another fad, endure it and it will go away. Nobody really listens to teachers anyway."

Thomas Renzie's study included an item which addressed the teachers' belief regarding the future of the shared decision-making process. Although only half of the teachers surveyed believed that the process will be more effective in the future, less than half of the teachers (47\%) thought that the process was institutionalized. Renzie concluded that "many staff believe that they have not been empowered to make decisions which effect their jobs."\(^7\) This conclusion is
consistent with the beliefs of the teachers and perhaps some of the team members in this study.

Figure 4 illustrates the perceptions of team members regarding barriers experienced in curriculum and instruction development.

**FIGURE 4: BARRIERS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

**Barriers of Student/Teacher Standards Establishment**

Although the majority of the respondents to the survey had identified that they served on the Site Based Restructuring Process plan teams for three to four years, eight respondents indicated that their team had not yet addressed the issue. Seven respondents indicated that no barriers had been encountered in establishing student or
teacher standards. Yet in the question based on span of authority for teams, 27 respondents indicated that their teams had some or complete authority to establish building level student and teacher standards. Only three believed that the team had no authority to change standards at the individual school.

Attitudes and behavioral barriers were identified as the major element in the hindrance of establishing student or teacher standards. One principal stated that "we all seem to agree upon certain standards, the difficulty comes in reaching consensus on specifics." Another principal stated that an attitude barrier could be explained as: "the process needs more involvement by teachers."

Staff members have identified their lack of wanting to do the work as a barrier. An elementary teacher claimed that "different ideas and requirements of various staff members in establishing these standards" hindered the process.

Directed decisions, or the lack there of, were barriers to the process. Principals were split on whether they had too much board policy restraint or whether they were given no district direction. One teacher claimed that "too much is still decided by the principal and the Union. Teachers get chastised if we judge our peers."

Time allocation for standards development was designated as a barrier by both principals and teachers. A teacher claimed that "having only one or two department chair meetings
a year" created a barrier in developing standards for students and teachers.

Financial support, if coupled with training, was mentioned in three different survey responses. A teacher claimed that "we need more funding for teacher development and education" when addressing teacher standards.

Figure 5 depicts perceptions of team members of barriers faced in the establishment of student and teacher standards.

**FIGURE 5: BARRIERS OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT**

Team members indicated that student or teacher standards had not been addressed by most teams. This would be in agreement with the question on span of authority which teams
indicated that they had little or no authority to make changes in the standards. Changes that were made were in the student standard areas. Teams related little involvement in addressing teacher standards. Renzie concluded that "shared decision making roles and processes are unclear to staff." 

RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER FOUR

What are the differences in team members' perceptions of indicators of encouragement in vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishment of student and teacher standards?

Indicators of Encouragement in Vision Building

The primary indicator of success and encouragement in vision building was in involvement and support. Twelve of the statements included some indication that support, collegiality, cooperation, and working together were in evidence during the vision building process. Statements were as brief as "it brought people together" and "we had a go for it attitude" to as lengthy as "Building administrators were always there if any problems arose. Colleagues were talking and lending support." One elementary principal said that "the attitudes of the staff working together for common goals became positive," Parent involvement was in evidence in the statements of two principals and two teachers.

Another indicator of encouragement was the willingness of staff, parents and principals to share ideas. A principal believed that through the "tenacity of the team" staff members
had "great input of ideas." Team members solicited teachers ideas by "coming to discuss what needed to be done." Parents were provided an avenue for feedback through "team member discussions and a parent survey."

Physical indicators of encouragement included a "finished PBA report" according to one principal. One teacher reported that the element of stipends for teacher's time indicated encouragement for vision building. This same teacher identified the fact that having "treats provided" at their meetings was encouragement. A secondary teacher said that a physical indicator was that "our vision statement is hanging throughout the building and is placed in our Gov-o-Gram." An elementary parent identified that "having our new building and it's technology" was a physical indicator of success.

Positive statements were the norm for this survey item. As one principal phrased it: "most felt this was very necessary and was the first challenge. Things went very smoothly." A secondary teacher summed up the indicators of encouragement as "verbal encouragement, participation, and ownership of results." An elementary teacher stated that this process "brought people together to discuss vision building and coming to a common statement."

Vision building, according to the respondents, was influenced by the Hammond Leadership Academy through verbal support, training of teams and guidance in developing the vision. A secondary teacher indicated "we were given
training in how to write a vision statement." An elementary teacher said that training enabled the team to "plan for meeting student, teacher, parent and building needs."

The teaming process was in evidence for the entire staff. Both teachers and principals reflected on the staff consensus which developed in building the vision. One elementary teacher stated that "staff consensus was reached quickly-internalization, although there, is not so easy to detect."

Only two people replied that there were no indicators of encouragement in vision building. One teacher elaborated that "a few staff members are not open to change causing dissension among staff." No principal or parent indicated that there were no indicators of encouragement to be identified in building the vision.

Figure 6 represents the perceptions of the team members regarding encouraging factors in vision building.

FIGURE 6: ENCOURAGING FACTORS OF VISION BUILDING
The data on the indicators of encouragement in vision building include the terms: communication, involvement, participation, cooperation, and positive attitudes. This inclusion would indicate an affirmation of the research conducted by Locke and Schweiger which concluded that "participative decision-making leads to increased satisfaction and productivity."9

Indicators of Encouragement in Curriculum and Instruction Development

Attitudes towards the process of curriculum and instruction improvement were cited as the greatest indicators of encouragement. All three groups mentioned that attitudes encouraged their shared decision-making teams in addressing this issue.

Principals' had a greater number of qualified encouraging statements. They included: "Most felt change was necessary. The process was difficult and some felt they lost if their opinions were not accepted." Another principal reserved judgement when referring to curriculum change. That principal stated "I'm still waiting to see if my teachers are serious about ideas written in the PBA report." A third principal endorsed the "tenacious attitude of the Site Based Restructuring Process team" and a development of a "collegial relationship" with peers.

Teachers were more willing to cite positive attitudes toward change as encouragers in changing curriculum. An
elementary teacher stated "we had a willingness of teachers to work together and accept new ideas and change." Another reported that "People were willing to change to make improvements for teachers and students." Two secondary teachers said administrative attitudes and support was critical in encouragement. One stated "the building principal was behind us," the other claimed "actually we did get encouragement from downtown when we were allowed to add new courses not on the school's course master."

A parent noticed a "willingness to change methodology" in the teaching staff. Another parent claimed there was a "fast realization that things do need to be updated."

Closely related to attitudes was the teams' realization that consensus on the need for change existed during the process of curriculum and instruction improvement. A principal reported that "consensus was reached on the part of the plan team, parents, and the foreign language teachers." An elementary teacher reported that the "staff reached consensus after only two or three meetings." Another elementary teacher stated that the "group worked as a whole towards a goal in our action plan which involved instruction." A secondary teacher claimed that the design team was able to "develop guidelines that most teachers felt comfortable following."

Physical evidence of encouragement was cited as: "a finished PBA report; a change in the math curriculum; the
freedom of teachers to allow gifted students to attend upper level classes; and teachers' methodology changed to address different learning styles." Teachers more readily cited physical evidence than did principals or parents.

Figure 7 illustrates encouraging factors reported by team members in the development of curriculum and instruction.

**FIGURE 7: ENCOURAGING FACTORS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

Two principals actually cited support by name, however several of the responses categorized into the properties of attitudes and consensus had references of support. Grouping the three properties together would create a group which had a tremendous number of encouragement indicators for addressing
curriculum and instruction improvement by a shared decision-making team.

Six respondents, five teachers and one parent, did not answer this question on the survey. There was no indication of whether they could not identify encouragers for this item or whether they believed that it had not been addressed.

Collegial attitudes and a realization that there was a consensus on the need for change comprised the majority of indicators of success in curriculum and instruction. Shared decision-making team members related that the support and willingness to implement change provided the collegial atmosphere needed for team success. Casner-Lotto concluded that the shared decision-making process was moving teachers and administration away from an "us vs. them" attitude.  

**Indicators of Encouragement in Establishing Student/Teacher Standards**

Eleven respondents claimed there were no indicators of encouragement for establishing student and teacher standards. This was inferred by either not answering the item or by writing none. All of these were from teachers. Each parent or principal had a specific response to this item. Two teachers added additional comments to the response of "none." These comments were: "We are chastised for expressing our thoughts on teacher standards or incompetency." and "We haven't done it yet." The former comment did not delineate who chastised teachers---peers or administrators but in the
item concerning barriers to developing standards this same teacher cited that peers were the ones offering the criticism.

Physical evidence was cited by both principals and teachers as indicators of encouragement in developing student and teacher standards. Principals mentioned the finished PBA report; a standard grading program; and celebrating success. Two principals made mention of new programs for students as physical evidence. One claimed the Site Based Restructuring Process team developed "a stars program which recognizes good behavior and has specific standards for good behavior." The other principal reported that he noticed that teachers "when grouping classes for next year, had a greater concern for individual students and their placement."

Teachers cited the development of the PBA action plans, a strong discipline and attendance policy, and an awards assembly which recognizes student achievement as indicators of encouragement. Incentives were mentioned by an elementary parent.

Positive attitudes were claimed to be indicators of encouragement by all three groups. Principals responded that "all were involved" and that there was an "openness to change as well as a desire." Another principal said that "when teachers/students became involved they took ownership and positive programs and ideas have evolved." Teachers reported that they "recognized a need for developing standards for students and teachers" and that "they wanted input in their
working lives and relationships." A parent said that "students wanted greater communication between themselves and their teachers." Another parent claimed that an indicator of encouragement was the "insight to the fact that our own standards are not up to par and some drastic measures must be taken."

Both teachers and principals claimed that some measure of staff support was noticed. However, support and involvement was only mentioned four times in this item.

No group indicated that teacher standards had been addressed by the Site Based Restructuring Process team. Contrary to that was the teacher's statement about being chastised for discussing teacher standards.

Figure 8 illustrates the perceptions of the encouraging factors in establishing student and teachers standards.

**FIGURE 8: ENCOURAGING FACTORS OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT**
Time nor funding was not mentioned in any response on indicators of encouragement in development of student or teacher standards.

Teams did not address the development of students or teacher standards according to 11 respondents, those teams which did address this area indicated that attitudes and physical evidence were the primary encouragers. The positive attitudes focused on recognition and awards programs for students.

RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER FIVE

How have the team members differed in their perceptions of discouraging factors in vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and establishing student and teacher standards?

Discouraging Factors in Vision Building

Nine respondents indicated that there was nothing really discouraging in building the school vision. Four of the seven principals said that nothing was discouraging and two added that "it was a good experience" and the "process was not discouraging." One teacher claimed that "there hadn't been anything discouraging about vision building."

Understanding of both the process and the vision itself claimed the greatest comments on discouraging factors. Six respondents claimed the process was discouraging to them. Teachers said that it was "hard to explain to peers what is meant by vision," and that "teachers lack understanding of the
process." A parent claimed a lack of interest in the process discouraged her. Two teachers said the process was difficult because "the work load seems to fall on the same people" and "not 100% of the community was involved in vision building."

Gaining the understanding and support of the vision statement was discouraging to ten respondents. A principal reported discouragement by the inability to get "follow-through and full commitment for some members of the staff." A teacher said that "after the vision was developed and voted on by parents and teachers, many teachers indicated dissatisfaction with it." A secondary teacher claimed that "staff members can say in public that they give support but if they don't buy into the process nothing will change." Two secondary teachers claimed "apathy on the part of teachers in wanting to understand and agree with the vision" was discouraging to the members of the Site Based Restructuring Process plan team. A parent reported being "very discouraged to see that a lot of people did not look to the future."

Influences outside the control of the individual schools had a discouraging affect on the team members. The district administration, state agency, school board and teachers union were mentioned by all three groups. Teachers were the most specific in their citations in this sub-category. These teacher statements indicated some of their concerns and discouragement about vision building. "Inconsistencies about the correct procedures that came from the top. First we did
it right then on the next visit it was wrong." "Some reluctance of School Board and Central Administration to know who actually has the final say (Power)." "The State as well as Central Administration has changed formats a number of times (e.g. School Improvement Program to Site Based Restructuring Process) that many staff members are feeling that if time and energy are spent on Site Based Restructuring Process it will eventually be thrown out and something else will take its place (what's the use)." Another secondary teacher was discouraged by "knowing that we cannot do what we want for our students because of Board, Union, and monetary restraints."

Figure 9 illustrates the discouraging factors in vision building that were reported by team members.

**FIGURE 9: DISCOURAGING FACTORS OF VISION BUILDING**

![Bar Chart](attachment:image.png)
Three teachers mentioned that the time spent in building the vision was discouraging. No principal or parent reported that time was a discouraging factor.

Factors of discouragement in the process of building a school vision were related to understanding both the actual vision and the process used for decision-making. Teachers related that it was difficult to get teachers to see a need for a vision statement and to understand the development of consensus of all constituents. Witherspoon concluded that teachers in Hammond had less positive attitudes (than principals) about whether the shared decision-making process itself was meaningful.\textsuperscript{11}

**Discouraging Factors in Curriculum/Instruction Development**

References to the perceived need for change were made by all three groups as factors contributing to the discouragement for teams involved in curriculum and instruction development. This lack of perceived need for change was distributed evenly across all groups.

Principals cited a lack of vision and no interest in curriculum shifts. They also indicated that "not all staff members attended workshops so what was known by those who did attend (such as a need for change, superintendent's push, involvement of the leadership academy) was not known by those who did not attend." A secondary principal stated "changing the paradigms and viewpoints of parents was difficult. They
wouldn't understand our mission and goals and then (they
would) call downtown or a board member with complaints."

Elementary teachers viewed the lack of the perceived need
to change as discouraging in many facets. An elementary
teacher reported that "not all staff are willing to try new
ideas. The success factor must be guaranteed (to them) --
nothing is for sure." Other elementary teachers claimed that:
"teachers are not readers therefore unaware of current trends
or opportunities;" "teachers have a lack of desire to work at
this;" and "variances of opinions are as far as what should be
included in various subject areas," created an atmosphere
where "many of our teachers don't see a need for this." A
Site Based Restructuring Process team member stated the "we
had an excellent school already" leaving the researcher with
the impression that no change was perceived as necessary.

A parent reported being discouraged when he/she "found
out about just how much needs to be worked on." Another
parent reported that it was "sad to see that many could not
understand that the system is very outdated. The curriculum
does not peak the interest of the students."

Principals, teachers, and parents were discouraged about
not having continuity in curriculum from level to level and in
a lack of district-wide curriculum guides. An elementary
principal stated "If we had current district level curriculum
it would be easier. We could modify it to our needs."
Financial support from the district office impacted the curriculum and instruction improvement process. Both principals and teachers cited funding. A teacher expressed it in this manner, "often times to build a curriculum for a variety of students, flexibility in scheduling requires more staffing which central administration is opposed to because of monetary constraints." Another teacher stated "I do not believe that central administration was behind us."

The lack of time was mentioned as contributing to frustration in curriculum change. The inference was for the implementation not the innovation of the curriculum change. Teachers stated that "there is never enough time to do all that must be done" and there is "not enough time to implement new programs or ideas."

Four respondents did not answer this item on the instrument. There were no comments on whether or not the team had addressed the issue.

A principal stated that "dealing with different personalities as it affects expertise" impacted curriculum and instruction development. A teacher reported that the "stress level in teachers was not worth a curriculum and instruction change."

The perceived need for change was at both ends of the continuum of development of curriculum and instruction. The need for change was cited as an encouraging factor by eight respondents. The belief that no change was needed was cited
by thirteen respondents as a discouraging factor in curriculum and instruction development. Townsend stated that "only through the participation of all professional colleagues"\textsuperscript{12} will the success of the shared-decision making process be in evidence. Team members need to create a consensus on the need for curriculum change prior to successful implementation.

Figure 10 depicts graphically the discouraging factors related to curriculum and instruction development.

**FIGURE 10: DISCOURAGING FACTORS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOURAGING FACTORS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF CITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ND/CHNGE ADM SUPPRT</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discouraging Factors in Establishing Student/Teacher Standards**

As with the barriers and encouragement indicators in student/teacher standard development, the greatest response category was none or no answer. Teachers and parents
indicated that the team had not really addressed this issue in some schools.

Of the completed responses, most team members were discouraged by the inability of the school community to reach consensus on establishing standards. There was perceived a need for standards but the difficulty appeared to be in the development of the actual standards. An elementary principal reported that discouragement came from "not the reluctance to change but on the disagreement in actual policy formation." Teachers stated that it was "hard to get consensus on minimum and/or maximum standards." Another indicated that "people (staff/parents/principal) have many different opinions regarding pupil discipline. We can not agree on the approach or method of an all school discipline program."

Attitudes of staff apathy impacted development of standards. A principal related that "they did not catch on to the spirit of change and were not motivated. Hence they slowed the process by questions and the lack of desire." A secondary principal in referring to teacher standards claimed that "staff members (some) on the fear of the unknown or the distrust of what the goal actually is" were reluctant to address the issue. A parent was discouraged "to see that many did not care or thought everything was adequate."

Both a teacher and a principal reported being discouraged by teachers' inabilitys to monitor student behavior. The principal cited "poor or irrelevant teaching strategies." The
teacher said that "incompetent teachers remain on staff" which causes a gap in the student standards development process.

Time and the willingness of teachers and parents to become involved and "share the workload" was cited by four respondents. An elementary parent was discouraged because "parents don't seem willing to lend a hand."

Figure 11 illustrates discouraging factors in establishing student and teacher standards as perceived by team members.

**FIGURE 11: DISCOURAGING FACTORS OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOURAGING FACTORS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF CITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCENSUS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDES</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER SIX**

How do the team members' perceptions of the shared decision-making process differ when assessing the relationship of the process and school improvement?
Perceptions of Shared Decision Making and School Improvement

Only six respondents claimed that the shared decision-making process did not have a positive influence on the school improvement process. Two teachers observed limited influence or reserved judgement on the process. One elementary teacher claimed "limited improvement," the secondary teacher claimed that "it is really too early to see significant indicators of change in education-- it still takes a long period of time because of the structural arrangement within the organizational framework to promote change. Examples of those structural arrangements are poor external reward system, closed classroom doors, etc." A parent believed that "we should see this improvement next semester."

Three elementary teachers had no kind words when asked if the process had aided in school improvement endeavors. One simply stated "so far it hasn't." Another claimed "no, school improvement is very stagnant. There are those that refuse to participate." The third elementary teacher was most negative in expressing his/her opinions as "A few do the work for all. Consensus is fine if we can do something about the things we research and want to change-- things needed to change were ignored because others were easier to go about changing. Time out of classroom was bad - after school would be worse. Administrators should have done research and presented to faculty. The decision-making process would be
great if that is all we had to do-- add teaching duties etc. and it's too much."

There were four citations of physical evidence of school improvement which came about due to the shared decision-making process. Physical evidence included: an adjusted day schedule for staff development activities, the addition of an academic awards assembly, student of the month recognition, and the fact that "various grants have been received which always improves the school. All efforts in this area have been well received and implemented." These references were made by three teachers (one elementary and two secondary) and one elementary parent.

Seven references were made to the issues of empowerment and ownership. Principals made three specific statements to these issues. These included: "Our identified goals (due to staff ownership) will bring us even closed as we work toward attainment;" "Everyone is responsible for change and therefore responsible for the building as a whole;" and "People took ownership and are willing to spend time in developing their 'special areas and proposals'."

Two elementary teachers claimed that the shared decision-making process "helps in that there is ownership in the outcomes," and that it "makes us stakeholder so we believe in the process and the change." Two secondary teachers opined that "this process helped bring a feeling of ownership to the
school" and that the process created "more empowerment to teachers/more ownership to teachers."

The most significant contribution to school improvement that the shared decision-making process made was in the building of collegial relationships. All three groups made a total of fourteen references to a collegial atmosphere existing in the school after the shared decision-making process had been used to create a school vision or produce the Performance Based Accreditation report.

Principals reported that "after the initial evaluation process, the staff pulled together as they worked on different correlates of the PBA report." They also claimed that a "dialogue has begun," and that "leadership was shared and many times more effective." An elementary principal shared that "most teachers are seeking answers to concerns from colleagues and curriculum discussions are active and more frequent." Two secondary principals claimed "it has given the school community a better insight to what needs we must pursue for the well being of all involved," and the "process formally involved parents in the school improvement efforts. The shared decision-making process provided the framework and structure that has enhanced school improvement initiatives."

Elementary teachers determined that the shared decision-making process "helped in communication" thus "creating a certain cohesiveness among teachers from working together in the process on committees." One elementary teacher stated
"I'll have to admit, teachers who were really apathetic finally came around and joined in on the decision-making—that was nice to see." Another said that "staff members feel that their opinions and ideas are important. The administrator is listening to and acting upon new fresh ideas. The attitude is becoming positive and friendly among all staff members."

A lone secondary teacher stated "it has brought faculty members together- helped lessen the 'we/they' way of thinking by teachers."

Three elementary parents cited a collegial atmosphere to be the result of the shared decision-making process. One stated "It was nice to see people who have been working together for so many years finally realizing that their problems are not unique. The idea that things maybe can change brought a light of encouragement to some who are very set in their ways. Another said that "it has helped to bring parents and teachers closer and to have a better understanding of each other." The third claimed "We are now able to focus on problems and face them or try to solve them instead of putting them on a shelf for later. As a parent, I feel the school as a whole has become a closer community that works together."

Consistent with the research studies conducted in the perceptions of shared decision-making in education and in the Hammond Public Schools, teams identified collegial atmosphere
as the primary indicator of school improvement. Improved relations with administration/faculty, faculty/faculty, and school/parent was cited as a contribution to school improvement made by the shared decision making process.

Figure 12 represents the perceived school improvement factors which are related to the implementation of the shared decision-making process. The graph shows that the development of a collegial atmosphere in a school that implements the shared decision-making process will be the greatest benefit derived from the process.

**FIGURE 12: SHARED DECISION-MAKING AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF CITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS EVDN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLL ATMOSP</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Chapter Four

Chapter Four presented the data. Analysis of the ten open-ended and two Likert survey questions was depicted. The data analysis consisted of the statement of the research question and the coding of the responses into categories which relate to the proposed question. Analysis was depicted graphically as well as in a narrative. Chapter Four summarized the data collected from the perceptions of the shared decision-making team members in areas of vision building, curriculum and instruction development, student and teacher standards establishment, and the shared decision-making process as it relates to school improvement.

Chapter Five will include conclusions and recommendations which were gleaned from the study. Recommendations for future research study will conclude Chapter Five.
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CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research study was to examine the differences in perceptions of the shared decision-making process that were held by team members of shared decision-making teams in a school district.

Team members were identified by position (principal, teacher, or parent), grade level (secondary or elementary), trained or untrained in the shared decision-making process, and by the number of years they had served on a shared decision-making team. Areas of perceptions of the shared decision-making process included vision building, development of curriculum and instruction, establishment of student or teacher standards, and shared decision-making as it related to school improvement. Research was also conducted on the team members perceptions of their span of authority for change and support from the school board, central administration, building administration, colleagues and the Hammond Leadership Academy.

A survey was constructed to solicit the perceptions of shared decision-making team members in the School City of Hammond, Indiana. Combining the collaboration of the director
of the Hammond Leadership Academy and the field testing of the initial instrument by the researcher's shared decision-making team, an instrument was constructed which contained two Likert style questions and ten open ended questions which addressed the perceptions of shared decision making. Demographic questions addressed the descriptive variables of position, training, grade level, and experience.

Seventy-five surveys were distributed to nine purposefully selected random sampled shared decision teams. Thirty-three surveys were returned to the researcher. There were no student surveys returned, possibly because only one team selected had students as members. Data were coded into properties for barriers, encouraging factors, discouraging factors and relation to school improvement. The properties were placed on a continuum for each area.

Conclusions were reached following a critical analysis and examination of the dimensions of each of the properties. Conclusions are specific to the School City of Hammond and should not to be generalized to all shared decision-making processes. It is hoped, however, that school system administrators who are planning on implementing a shared decision-making process will be able to utilize the researcher's recommendations in their implementation of this management tool.
Conclusions

Conclusions were derived from an analysis of the data that was solicited from the shared decision-making teams in Hammond, Indiana. Conclusions were based on responses from team members who were principals, teachers, and parents in either secondary or elementary schools. The majority of the team members were trained in the shared decision making process, and have had three to four years experience in the process.

The following conclusions have been made from this research study:

1. Team members' perceptions were there is a limited span of authority for change in procedures, curriculum/instruction, staff development, operations, and student/teacher standards. Exceptions to these perceptions were in the areas of vision building where a majority of respondents reported complete or limited authority and staffing where a majority of respondents reported limited or no perceived authority for change.

Thirty-three respondents in this question indicated that there was complete or limited authority in building a school vision. Thirty two respondents indicated they had limited or no authority in the area of staffing. The remaining areas had limited authority as the primary response category.

2. Team members derived the greatest amount of support from the constituent group which had the most interaction with them.
Teachers identified the building administrator and colleagues as providing them with the greatest support. Parents identified the building administrator as the provider of support. Principals indicated that colleagues and the central office provided their support base. In all responses, support was not identified as coming from a group which the person little interaction with. The school board was identified as providing the least support for members of the shared decision-making team members.

3. Team members were encouraged by the active involvement of the staff in building vision statements. They were discouraged by the lack of understanding for the need for a vision and viewed communications and time as major barriers to the building of a vision. Perceptions of vision building were similar for principals, teachers, and parents.

The vision building process had positive statements regarding shared decision-making and building the vision. Principals were credited with statements such as: "it was a good experience, the process was not discouraging, most felt this was necessary, and it brought us together." Principals also stated that time needed to develop a vision was not adequate to provide understanding of the need for a vision.

Teachers on teams experienced an "apathy toward the process which led many teachers to indicate dissatisfaction with the process." Yet teachers claimed that staff involvement in the process was satisfactory.
Parents identified the involvement of all concerned to be an encouraging factor in vision building. Parents were concerned that "many parents still do not know our vision." 4. When staff believed there was a need for change in curriculum and instruction development, their attitudes enhanced the implementation of curriculum development. Teachers who believed that reform in curriculum was not needed inhibited the shared-decision making team's capacity to affect curriculum development.

Parents and teachers cited the attitudes of teachers and the need for curriculum change as factors which encouraged the team to pursue curriculum development. Teachers believed that they were "able to meet student needs and learning styles" because the team could develop guidelines that teachers "are comfortable with." Others cited that "teachers see no need for change" and not "everyone sees a need for change." Principals related that "differences of opinions created anger and factions in the staff" and "staff sees no need for improvement in the curriculum." One principal affirmed that attitude has an impact on curriculum because "most felt the change was necessary although the process was difficult and some felt they lost if their opinions were not accepted." A parent related that curriculum change was accelerated when there was a "fast realization that things do need to be updated."
5. Student standards which support acceptable behavior were addressed by shared decision-making teams. Teacher standards were difficult to establish through the shared decision-making process.

Teachers and principals identified physical evidence of changing student standards as: recognition programs, honor assemblies, and the development of "specific standards for good behavior." Teachers"recognized a need for developing standards." Parents claimed that there was "insight to the fact that our own standards are not up to par."

In addressing teacher standards, a teacher claimed that "we get chastised for expressing our thoughts on teacher standards or incompetency." A principal said that the failure to address teacher standards was because "staff members on the fear of the unknown or the distrust of what the goal really is" won't take the risk in addressing teacher standards. A teacher claimed that staff apathy was the cause of failure to address this area.

6. A collegial atmosphere, where teachers feel empowered to influence the policies of the school, was identified as the greatest contributor to school improvement as a result of the shared decision making process.

Principals, teachers and parents stated that the ownership developed through the empowerment of teachers and the collegial atmosphere established in the school contributed to school improvement. Principals stated that: "dialogues had
begun, the staff pulled together as they worked, leadership is shared and many times more effective, and it (shared decision-making) has involved parents in the school improvement efforts." Teachers readily admitted that: "it helped in communication, there is a certain cohesiveness among teachers, staff members feel that their opinions and ideas are important, the administrator is listening to and acting upon new fresh ideas, and the attitude is becoming positive and friendly among all staff members." Parents, too, attributed the shared decision-making process as being responsible for: "people who have been working together for so many years finally realizing that their problems are not unique and helping to bring parents and teachers closer and to have a better understanding for each other."

**Recommendations**

When a school administrator contemplates initiating a shared decision-making process as the governing standard for his/her school, the researcher offers the following recommendations:

1. The shared decision-making team should be made knowledgeable on the which areas they shall have the authority to make changes for school improvement.
2. Training in the change process as it relates to all areas which changes can be made is crucial in knowledge development for teams. Training should be an introductory and ongoing activity in the shared decision-making process.
3. Support from the "top" --school board, central administration and building administration-- will be needed to develop a viable shared decision-making process which can be successful when initiating a school improvement program. Support is evidenced by regular interaction with the shared decision-making teams.

4. When beginning the shared decision-making process, administrators should find ways to alleviate the barriers of time expenditure for team members and staff, and to provide financial support for the process.

5. Communicating the procedures for shared decision-making to the non-team staff members is important. Communications should include both written and verbal methods in orienting staff and parents in the process and need for the process.

6. Principals need to involve the entire staff in the shared decision-making process. Apathy and the failure to participate will cause the process to deteriorate into only team members being responsible for school improvement.

7. Develop an atmosphere which encourages the attitude that school improvement begins with collegiality and continues through an attitude that change is necessary.

8. Define the policies, both local and state, which will restrict the span of authority for change. Teams should know these restrictions prior to addressing the school improvement initiatives.
9. Administrators should be prepared to address the different personalities of the staff and know how the staff interacts with each other and members of the shared decision-making team.

10. If school improvement is the designated outcome for the school, the administrator should be prepared to share his/her authority through the shared decision-making process.

Recommendation for Future Research

In the analysis of the data from this study, these recommendations for future research studies emerge:

1. This study focused on the perceptions of shared decision-making team members on the process of shared decision-making. Further research is recommended on the perceptions of teachers and parents who are not members of the team towards the process.

2. This study focused on the barriers, encouraging factors and discouraging factors in vision building, curriculum and instruction development, and student and teacher standards establishment. Further research is recommended in the perceptions of those factors in staff development, procedures, operations, staffing, and budgeting.

3. The data from this study indicated that the team members believed they had no authority in staffing. Future studies are recommended in discovering what factors influence team members in deciding what they have authority to change.
4. Future study is suggested in determining what additional factors can influence the collegial atmosphere in a school improvement program.

5. Further research is suggested in determining which factors contribute to the successful attitudes evidenced in the vision building process.

6. Future study is recommended in determining which factors inhibit teams from addressing issues relating to teacher standards development.

7. Future study is recommended in determining how the shared decision-making process is contributing to school improvement in other school districts.

8. Further research is suggested regarding the perceptions of team members in regard to the factors which lead to their satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the shared decision-making process.
APPENDIX A

LETTER OF REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY
April 4, 1993

Aletta M. Hicks
8311 Lake Shore Dr.
Gary, Indiana 45403

Dr. Thomas Knarr
Assistant Superintendent
School City of Hammond
41 Williams
Hammond, Indiana 46320

Dear Dr. Knarr:

This letter is to request confirmation regarding the research study that I spoke to you about recently.

I would like to survey nine shared decision-making teams in the Hammond Public Schools to determine the perceptions of the impact that shared decision-making has on change in education.

I am proposing to randomly select three secondary school and six elementary school teams to be in this study. Surveying would take place in May and June of 1993.

Thank you for taking time out of the day to speak with me on my research. I hope to hear from you soon concerning this study.

Sincerely,

Aletta M. Hicks
Doctoral Student
Loyola University of Chicago
APPENDIX B

FIELD TESTED SURVEY
Dear SBRP Plan Team Member,

I am completing my doctoral degree at Loyola University of Chicago and I have chosen to study the perceptions of the shared-decision making process. The sample for my study will be plan team members from selected school in the School City of Hammond. I would appreciate your time in completing this survey. Your cooperation will serve as a field test for my survey instrument. Please be candid in your responses. All surveys will be confidential.

PLEASE CHECK DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS:

1. Building Organization: ___ Elementary ___ Elementary/Middle ___ Middle ___Middle/High ___ High School.

2. Position: ___ Student ___ Parent ___ Teacher ___ Principal.

3. ___ SBRP Trained ___ NOT SBRP trained.

4. SBRP Team Experience ___ 0-2 years, 3-4 years.

IN THE SPACE PROVIDED, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS TO THE EXTENT OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE SHARED-DECISION MAKING PROCESS ALLOWS.

1. WHAT ISSUES DO YOU PERCEIVE SBRP TEAMS TO HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO CHANGE?

2. WHAT BARRIERS HAVE YOUR SBRP TEAM ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTING CHANGE THROUGH THE SHARED-DECISION MAKING PROCESS?

3. IF YOU HAVE (OR HAVE NOT) FELT ENCOURAGED BY ANY OF THE FOLLOWING: A) CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL B) BUILDING LEVEL ADMINISTRATION C) COLLEAGUES OR D) LEADERSHIP ACADEMY PERSONNEL-- HOW HAVE THEY ENCOURAGED OR DISCOURAGED YOU?
4. WHAT FACTORS HAVE HELPED YOUR SBRP TEAM MAKE CHANGES IN QUALITY EDUCATION?

5. DESCRIBE THE PERSON WHO ASSUMES AUTHORITY AND LEADERSHIP ON YOUR TEAM.

6. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED BY YOUR TEAM? VISION BUILDING; FACILITATING PROCEDURES AND STRUCTURES; CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; STAFFING; BUDGETING; STAFF DEVELOPMENT; OPERATIONS; OR STUDENT/TEACHER STANDARDS.

7. WHAT ACTIVITIES HAVE YOUR TEAM CONDUCTED TO IMPLEMENT CHANGE THROUGH THE SHARED DECISION-MAKING PROCESS?

8. WHAT IS YOUR PERCEPTION OF THE SUCCESS OF THE SHARED DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN YOUR SCHOOL?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY. THANKS AGAIN!
May 2, 1993

Dear SBRP Plan Team Member:

I am in the research stage of my doctoral studies at Loyola University of Chicago and am asking for your assistance in completing this degree.

I have chosen to study the perceptions of the shared decision-making process that plan team members have after being involved in the process. Since we all have varied experience with shared decision-making, it will be interesting to compare our perceptions of the process.

The surveys are numbered for my own record keeping but please be assured that your confidentiality will be maintained by this researcher.

After you have completed your survey, return to me through the school mail in the provided envelope.

I appreciate your time and cooperation in this study.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

Sincerely,

Aletta M. Hicks
Doctoral Student
Loyola University of Chicago
Survey Number ______

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS.

1. Building Organization: ______ Elementary
________ Elementary/Middle ______ Middle
________ Middle/High ______ High School

2. Position: ______ Principal ______ Teacher ______ Parent
________ Student

3. Have you had School City of Hammond SBRP Training?
______ yes ______ no

4. Years of SBRP Team Participation Experience:
______ less than 1 year
______ 1 - 2 years
______ 3 - 4 years

IN THE SPACE PROVIDED, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS TO THE EXTENT OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE SHARED DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

1. Of the following areas please indicate whether you perceive the SBRP plan teams to have complete, limited or no authority to change conditions which relate to the areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>COMPLETE</th>
<th>LIMITED</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VISION BUILDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING PROCEDURES/STRUCTURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFFING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT/TEACHER STANDARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What barriers have your SBRP team encountered building the SCHOOL VISION?

3. What barriers have your SBRP team encountered in improving CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION?
4. What barriers have your SBRE team encountered in developing STUDENT OR TEACHER STANDARDS?

5. Please indicate the degree of encouragement that you have received from each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF ENCOURAGEMENT</th>
<th>MUCH</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL BOARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEAGUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP ACADEMY PERSONNEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What were the indicators of encouragement in VISION BUILDING?

7. What were the indicators of encouragement in developing CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION?

8. What were the indicators of encouragement in establishing STUDENT OR TEACHER STANDARDS?

9. What has been discouraging about the VISION BUILDING process?

10. What has been discouraging about the development of CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION?

11. What has been discouraging about the establishment to STUDENT OR TEACHER STANDARDS?

12. What indicators have you observed regarding school improvement which can be attributed to the shared decision-making process?


Bell, Terrel H. "Reflections One Decade After A Nation at Risk." Phi Delta Kappan. April, 1993, 595.


Copy on file in Pupil Personnel Office, School City of Hammond, IN.


Golarz, Ray J. to Dr. Frank Sanders, Superintendent, 10 February 1982. Copy in the file of the Pupil Personnel Office, School City of Hammond, IN.

Golarz, Ray J. to Gil Johnson, 23 June 1983. Copy in the file of the Pupil Personnel Office, School City of Hammond, IN.

Golarz, Ray J. to Dr. Frank Sanders, Superintendent, 21 March 1984. Copy in the file of the Pupil Personnel Office, School City of Hammond:IN.

Golarz, Ray J. to Dr. David O. Dickson, Superintendent, 31 June 1984. Copy in the file of the Pupil Personnel Office, School City of Hammond:IN.

Golarz, Ray J. to Dr. David O. Dickson, Superintendent, 23 August 1985. Copy in the file of the Pupil Personnel Office, School City of Hammond: IN.


"I/D/E/A School Improvement Program Sip." Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc: Dayton, Ohio.


Knarr, Dr. Thomas, to all Principals, 6 January 1988. Copy in the file of the Pupil Personnel Office, School City of Hammond, IN, photocopied.


Spitzer, Gerald, to Dr. Thomas Knarr, 20 February 1987. Copy in the file of the Pupil Personnel Office, School City of Hammond, IN, photocopied.


VITA

The writer, Aletta M. Hicks, was born October 8, 1946 in Hammond, Indiana.

In September, 1964, Miss Hicks entered Indiana University, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Science in physical education in 1968. She was conferred the degree of Masters of Science in physical education in 1972. Her teaching experience began at Morton High School in Hammond, Indiana in 1968 and continued there until 1987. During those years, Miss Hicks served as teacher, coach and athletic director. In 1987, she was appointed Assistant Principal at Clark Middle/High School in Hammond. She currently is serving as the Principal of Clark School.

Miss Hicks resides in Gary, Indiana.
The dissertation submitted by Aletta M. Hicks has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max Bailey, Director
Associate Professor, ELPS
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. L. Arthur Safer
Associate Professor, ELPS
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Janis Fine
Visiting Professor, ELPS
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

November 30, 1993
Date

MAC Bailey
Director's Signature