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PREFACE

This study is designed to influence positive change in the way managerialism is viewed by the academic community and the manner in which managers exercise those responsibilities. The study was designed by a middle manager in a large college of education in the Deep South. The researcher was deeply drawn the ways in which teaching behavior is modeled and the degree to which it is impacted by managerial decisions. During the study, it became obvious that although this particular manager seemed to have an extremely accepted approach and style participants were reluctant to have comments potentially associated with their teaching beliefs and views of administrators. The study was adapted to assure that no breach of confidentiality could occur. This event forced the researcher to examine the outcomes of managerial decisions when they are not the sole decisive factor. Specifically when such decisions are subject to upper administrative scrutiny or approval and may be changed without consideration of input. It is indeed possible that the career position of the researcher may have caused certain faculty to refuse to participate and could have limited the study.
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ABSTRACT

Determining why and what motivates students to succeed is a prominent question in today’s educational arena. Often accountability measures cycle around the classroom teacher, their preparation, and perceived effectiveness. To assure that teachers have adequate knowledge, minimum grade point averages are required from accredited institutions. Teacher preparation is carefully monitored by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). Each state uses a similar process for awarding initial teaching certificates. Teaching certificates are issued after candidates have completed a rigorous curriculum and proven that they possess the qualities and dispositions of effective teaching. Unfortunately, very few assessments exist to measure teacher effectiveness among tenured faculty. The primary measure used to evaluate teacher performance after initial certification is quantitative data from standardized testing of students. Similarly, the promotion and tenure process dictates the criteria for evaluating teaching and scholarly productivity at the college level. Attributes of scholarly productivity are directly related to the new professor; however, student outcomes and evaluations play a key role in the overall perceived effectiveness of the teacher (instructor), untenured assistant professor.

The purpose of this study is to determine how administrative decisions impact student outcomes and teacher effectiveness. Throughout each step in the methodology, continual synthesis was utilized to determine the connection between, extant data sets such as grade distribution and student progress, and instructor/professor perceptions
about the effects of managerialism. Through this process patterns of decision making can be identified and linked to emerging themes and connections.

The study yielded results to support the theory that administrators and managers in academic settings do impact teaching effectiveness and student outcomes. Due to the fact that administrators rarely have direct instructional contact with students whom they are not the instructor of record, the connection to student outcomes is a direct result of the perception of managerialism. University faculty members who perceived that their input was valued during change were receptive to the changes that occurred. This study could be replicated across any university campus and is not limited to a college of education.
CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

Overview

Determining why and what motivates students to succeed is a prominent question in today’s educational arena. Often accountability measures cycle around classroom teachers, their preparation, and perceived effectiveness. To assure that future teachers have adequate knowledge, minimum grade point averages are required from accredited institutions. Teacher preparation is carefully monitored by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). Each state uses a similar process for awarding initial teaching certificates. Teaching certificates are issued after candidates have completed a rigorous curriculum and proven that they possess the qualities and dispositions of effective teaching. Unfortunately, very few assessments exist to measure teacher effectiveness among tenured faculty. The primary measure used to evaluate teacher performance after initial certification is quantitative test scores from standardized testing of students. Similarly, the promotion and tenure process dictates the criteria for evaluating teaching and scholarly productivity at the college level. Attributes of scholarly productivity are directly related to the new professor; however, student outcomes and evaluations play a key role in the overall perceived effectiveness of the teacher (instructor), untenured assistant professor.

The purpose of this study was to determine how administrative decisions impact student outcomes and university faculty teacher effectiveness. Throughout each step in the methodology continual synthesis was utilized to determine the connection between, extant data sets such as grade distribution and student progress, and instructor/professor
perceptions about the effects of managerialism. Through this process patterns of decision making were identified and linked to the emerging themes and connections.

**Accountability**

Requiring a heightened sense of responsibility toward educational outcomes including student success and teacher effectiveness has been referred to as accountability. The basic rationale for accountability is that when people are held responsible for their performance, their weakness can be identified and eliminated (Marsh & Willis, 2003). Accountability does not work; however, if responsibility cannot be fixed (Caldwell & Spinks, 1998). Accountability is often measured by student performance on standardized tests. School report cards are not only issued by K-12 entities, but have found their way into the post-secondary setting. The number of students passing a given assessment dictates the effectiveness of the institutions of higher education and such data sets are used to measure hierarchies by reporting agencies such as *US NEWS AND WORLD REPORT*. Several researchers have expressed concern over the reliability and validity of such measures. Glasser (1991) encourages society to limit the narrow scope of such assessments. “Assessment of the outcomes of schooling must be designed and employed in ways that take account of modern knowledge of human cognition, and allow us to develop educational environments in which levels of effectively useful knowledge are achieved for all students, and high-levels of competence are attained by many” (p. 22).

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of management on teacher effectiveness in a post-secondary setting. Specifically, this study’s foci are to determine how administrative decisions impact student outcomes and teacher effectiveness. Throughout each step in the methodology continual synthesis was utilized to determine
the connection between extant data sets such as grade distribution and student evaluation and instructor/professor perceptions about the effects of managerialism. Through this process patterns of decision-making were identified and linked to the emerging themes and connections. Primary emphasis was directed to administrative decisions and resistance to change.

Most often teachers and those in academia are resistant to change. Chauvin (1992) found the overarching reason for this resistance to be perceptions of various organizational roles. Concern was given to how change would affect their personal circumstances and the lives of their students. This desire to seek meaningful ownership of change and associate a passionate cause with propositions of those seen as academic figure heads was used as a foundation for the quest to determine if a connection between administrative decisions and teacher effectiveness exists.

**Problem Statement**

The role of the academic administrator is more than pushing paper and being a social liaison between the students and faculty and the constituency of the community. The role of the academic administrator is to positively affect change and improve economic gain by producing highly engaged individuals who think and reflect upon their respective roles in society as a whole. Encountering change can be a problem for most administrators if mishandled.

Pennington (2003) suggests “that proposed changes can be placed along two scales: radical - incremental and core - peripheral. Plotting the character of a proposed change along these scales can provide a sense of how difficult the introduction of any particular initiative might be and how much 'disturbance' to the status quo it might generate.” (See Figure 1).
Figure 1 – Pennington’s Change Model

Pennington also notes that, “as a general rule, professionals and technical staff will tend to resist changes which are perceived to threaten their core values and practices, and which have a negative impact on individuals and which diminish group autonomy.” Establishing the key factors that implicate success of both the teacher and student will facilitate positive change and enhance the ability of administrators to incrementally increase productivity without unproductive disturbance or chaos.

**Research Questions**

1. How are administrative decisions viewed?

2. Which managerial factors significantly impact teacher effectiveness and limit student performance?

3. Is there evidence to support a connection between administrative decisions and accountability/performance?
**Significance of the Study**

Schooling of all people should improve as society enters a new century. Establishing a strong connection between managerialism and teacher effectiveness, will enhance the opportunities to use such as a basis for reform. This reform will allow greater shared governance of university setting and ultimately empower students to attain greater success. Stronger academic preparation inclusive of all members of the university community will strengthen academic societies and propel them into the next generation of scholars.

**Definitions**

To facilitate consistency of terminology, the following definitions will be applied in context.

Accountability - The act of being accountable for outcomes relative to a given situation or circumstance, particularly a heightened sense responsibility toward educational outcomes including student success and teacher effectiveness.

Continual Synthesis – A pattern of reflective practice that allows the researcher to continual gather data and probe in qualitative situations for more precise information that will enhance and direct future study.

Developmental Research Sequence (DRS) – Developed by Spradley to enhance research using a questionnaire, interview, and the development of domains (common threads)

GPA – Grade Point Average

14th Day Count – The day at which the university marks attendance to measure resource and resource allocation.
Manager – Academic Administrator including, but not limited to the chair, dean, assistants, and upper administration.

Managerial Changes – Changes imposed solely at the will of the manager, academic administrator.

Managerialism - A set of management processes and instruments, technically unarguable, and socially and politically neutral.

NCATE - National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Reader Analyst - reader analyst sometimes referred to as a participant observer. This individual is both a researcher and the subject of the study.

Shared Governance – A method for managing instructions of Higher Education that includes all stakeholders in the academic community.

Student – Undergraduate college student, may or may not be a major in the College of Education

Student Performance – The measure of a student’s mastery in a given class, setting, or exam. Typically denoted by the assignment of a letter grade.

Teacher – College Instructor of Record for a given course.

Teacher Effectiveness – The measure of a teacher’s ability to assist students in the mastery of course content. In Higher Education this also includes scholarly productivity related to the area of expertise and the associated delivery of instruction in a post secondary environment.

Treatments – Managerial Changes made based on previous outcomes in an attempt to enhance effectiveness or resource allocation. For the purpose of this study treatments are based on semester intervals
Withdrawal – Student removal from a class by free choice. A grade of ‘W’ is assigned.
CHAPTER 2:

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Education’s purpose is to replace an empty mind with an open one.
Malcom Forbes (1919-1990)

As far as we can discern, the sole purpose of human existence is to kindle a light of meaning in the darkness of mere being.
Carl Jung (1875-1961)

Defining Cause

Acting with cause is not easily defined; however, it warrants close examination of why and how beings act. Is there a driving force motivating certain actions? Do we spontaneously exist with our purpose? Close examination of behavior and its rationale range the span from moral coconsciousness to involuntary non-purposeful action caused by a given stimulus. For example, a driver putting out his right arm to block a passenger during a sudden stop; what an absurd non-purposeful action if riding alone. As purposefulness has evolved, many new notions have emerged--goals, objectives, motivation, and discipline. Most of these notions are beneficial to pedagogical practice and cognitive development; however, the underlying cause and purpose are rarely examined. This oversight is the root of robotic acts of teaching that does not lend itself to lifelong gain and deconstruction of schooling. Pinar (2004) warns those in charge of educating future generations to limit fragmented practices.

The professional preparation of teachers requires understanding curriculum as interdisciplinary, grounded in self-formation and historical moment. When curriculum is severed…educational experience becomes fragmented. As Linda points out, “this fragmentation … tends to
disembody the curriculum, divorcing it from the cultures and interests and prior knowledge of the students, from the teachers’ knowledge of the subject, and from the epistemologies, the ways of knowing the subject itself. (p. 222)

Consequently, cause and purpose must be embedded in our practices to sustain our humanity and future.

Establishing boundaries for cause may not be an easy process. The dilemma has been at the heart of many debates. Katherine Hayles (1999) endeavored to place the contributors of this debate in a collective work titled *Liberal Subjectivity Imperiled: Norbert Wiener and Cybernetic Anxiety*. Her opening remarks give reason for the acknowledgement of such boundaries:

Of all the implications first-wave cybernetics conveyed, perhaps none was more disturbing and potentially revolutionary than the idea that the boundaries of the human subject are constructed rather than given. Conceptualizing control, communication, and information as an integrated system, cybernetics radically changed how boundaries were conceived. (p. 84)

Although implied, the boundaries may truly lend themselves to purpose. Identifying purpose requires conceptualizing control, communication, and information as an integrated system derivative of the human using the advances in the world today. Purpose cannot be isolated. It must be integrated into all facets of life. This transformation allows for continual growth and examination – an ongoing reflective
metacognitive practice. This integration will also include givens such as culture, gender, and race, but will foster diversity and acceptance.

Simply acknowledging that cause and purpose exist and are beneficial does not create change. Heidegger’s Phenomenology, however, gives a broad base for such decisions and definitions. Heidegger suggests two different ways of thinking. The first is calculative thinking. This is product based and essential thinking. As noted by Kaufmann, Heidegger defines essential thinking as:

The thought of Being seeks no hold in what-is. Essential thinking looks for the slow signs of the incalculable and sees in this the unforeseeable coming of the ineluctable. Such thinking is mindful of the truth of Being and thus helps the Being of truth to make a place for itself in man’s history. This help affects no results because it has no need of effect. Essential thinking helps as the simple inwardness of existence, insofar as this inwardness, although unable to exercise such thinking or only having theoretical knowledge of it, kindles its own kind. (Kaufmann 1975, pp. 263-4)

What exactly does it mean to think this way? Rather than define this from a purely practitioner perspective, I would like to suggest that Haynes’ (1999) reflection of Heidegger’s phenomenology is exquisitely crafted and relative to the question of purpose:

As a preliminary to what I mean by the ideal as real I will prepare the way by saying that once a person begins to think in a phenomenological way
that kind of thinking begins to define their experiences. What does it mean to think phenomenologically? For Heidegger it means that you must always be attempting to realize [sic] your higher purpose and thereby reconcile your higher purpose with your “little spark.”…One way of appreciating a sense of Heidegger’s point is to move to a state of liberating yourself from your being-in-the-world. That is, to do something that does not directly involve yourself or the products of yourself or your thinking about yourself as “the only reality”. If you enjoy visiting another country for the first time or bush-walking or sailing or skin-diving, while doing so, do you not get a sense of liberation precisely because your being-in-the-world is now indirectly (that is, you are not concentrating on your being-in-the-world) participating in something grander? And by being absorbed by that grandness, or in moments when that was the case, (a new culture, the mountains, the wind, the sea, etc) are you not able to see yourself (your being-in-the-world as man or woman) - with a sense of joy – in perspective? These points are all the more reinforced by the fact that Heidegger never mentions the word “man” (or “woman”) in his work, such a state of being is always referred to as Dasein. Why? Because Heidegger is constantly reminding us that we must try to see things from our Being’s point of view, that is, from our higher purposes’ point of view…(or being-in-the-world revealed as Being) is our way of realizing (bringing into being) our Being (the ideal of our higher purpose). I argue that all of Heidegger’s work implicitly attempts this reconciliation between the ideal Being and the real being. In my view this is a
demonstration of a thoroughgoing concern and capacity for aiding
humankind in its material world in providing for what they need to realize
[sic] their destinies. This is the case because it serves to focus
humankind’s capacities on its particular and often unique contribution (or
purpose) in the world. It also neatly serves to distinguish between need
and want: need for their higher purpose or destiny and want (and most
often needless want or excessive want) by their being-in-the-world. (p. 5)
Possibly the greater question of cause and purpose relate to the sense Haynes suggests, a
sense of humanity that places self outside the center limelight in the middle of humanity.
This place can be most useful when we recognize our purpose and define the cause of our
actions and reactions. Students would certainly have a greater appreciation for learning
the simplest task if a cause or purpose were linked to experience. Educators have used a
plethora of descriptors--a setting, a framework, a scaffold--linking past and future
learning, and schema to explain the simplest of notions. The youngest human can
understand the notion of cause, thus it should not be clouded with complicated jargon.
We must clearly define what we do, why we do it, and how it will benefit the world in
which we live. Cause must be individually and globally managed. Those who manage
cause have a responsibility to their own purpose as well as the greater benefit to all
involved. As seen in the next section the management of such directives can be both
positive and negative.

**Managing Cause**

Borrowing inspiration from Shakespeare’s third act in Hamlet, we must ask what
it is to be and how we desire to define our being – “To Manage or To Be Managed: A
Provocative Question”. Shakespeare writes:
To be, or not to be: that is the question:

Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer

The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,

Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,

And by opposing end them? To die: to sleep;

No more; and by a sleep to say we end

The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks

That flesh is heir to, (Edited by Craig, 2000 )

It is possible that Hamlet’s tragedy is synonymous with the travesty occurring in higher education and the managerialism movement. This movement has swept across the United Kingdom, infiltrated Asia’s economy, and countries other than the United States. The bureaucracy of this new system of management threatens academics in higher education who pride themselves with an “identity kit” that is unique and quite different from the corporate sector from which managerialism emerges. Gee (1989) encourages members of these communities to reach full potential within this “social structure which comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize” (p. 7).

Defining management or the act of managing a group has become increasingly more difficult. Initially these terms gave reference to the structure and discipline of a particular community and its way of social interaction was accepted and respected by the members and the leader of the discourse. Today new quests for quality assurance and high standards have created this monstrosity known as managerialism. The development of an accepted definition of managerialism has also been quite controversial. The most inclusive definition was crafted by Santiago and Carcalho
Managerialism is frequently identified as a set of management processes and instruments, technically unarguable, and socially and politically neutral. Its main goals are both achievement of efficiency, and measurement of the performance of the HE (Higher Education) system, its institutions and its professionals. However, its frame of reference is broader in scope and is theoretically and ideologically well established. It combines political, institutional and organizational assumptions with principles of rationality. (p 427-428)

As managerialism continues to develop, many emotions and concerns in favor and opposed to it emerge into what is sometimes a treacherous debate. Those who manage continue to assert that their authoritarian behavior is not oppressive. Those who are managed and believe in a more global academic perspective strive to maintain the integrity their predecessors established. Of course this is no surprise. According to Becher (1989), “tribes of academe…define their own identities and defend their own patches of intellectual ground” (p.24). This is not intended to imply that university scholars are opposed to policies, procedures, and administration; however the members of the professoriate have been placed in a defensive position, which requires them to actually defend their search for knowledge.

The continued push to become economically driven by producing mass numbers of candidates who can pass the quality assurance controls has widened the gap between those who manage and those who are to be managed. After two decades of debate, Patrick Fitzsimons, a New Zealand scholar, took the strong position that he and his academic peers were to blame for the less than productive “academic model” and
essentially had fallen prey to the demise of the profession as was predicted by the
managerialists. In a challenging rebuttal, he called all academic scholars to action rather
than resistance. Fitzsimons (1999) asserted:

Resistance to managerialism as a form of domination is sometimes recommended
as something that will enhance autonomy. But because managerialism sees itself
as the antidote to chaos, irrationality, disorder, and incompleteness, there are no
spaces within such a social order in which autonomy can be contested
legitimately. Managerial definitions of quality, efficiency, improved
productivity or self-management, construct a particular version of autonomy.
Those who do not desire these managerial constructs of autonomy are simply
defined as absurd, as under managerialism, these notions appear as self-evidently
‘good’. **Even the presentation of resistance itself indicates an engagement
already within the definitions provided by managerialism** [emphasis in
original]. (p.4)

Managers participate in every facet of education as chairs, directors, and deans.
What specifically determines if a person will be managed or will be the manager? Most
of society believes that position and rank in some hierarchy determines the number of
those who are under your jurisdiction. Fortunately, this bears little truth and is often over
rated and abused. When did it ever become acceptable to place aside core principles to
impose external structures without purpose for financial and economic gain? Our
academic identity and spirit will continue to dissipate if collaborative effort is not
purposefully executed. Foucault’s "strategic reversibility of power relations" (1982, p
221) is needed to bring an end to the notion of discipline and punishment that make us
prisoners of managerialism, our own creation. Granted, there is a need for some strategic planning and political insight; however, the governance of education is transforming the humanistic cognitive process of knowledge acquisition to a machine-like process of acquiring and assessing knowledge. Although Fitzsimons (1999) does not identify the “they” in his summation of managerialism, “In the interests of 'better' education they (albeit grudgingly) write mission statements, implement strategic plans, design appraisal forms, and measure efficiencies. The result is that the governance of education is transformed under the new managerialism…” (p. 4) In my opinion, it is clear that ‘they’ represents members of the academic discourse who have become managerialists.

I now return to the provocative question. Should I aspire to be a manager who has earned rank and position based on tenacity of successful performance or should I assume the role of the managed? As a manager, can I be effective? As the managed, is my creativity stifled and suppressed? Possibly the best critical analysis of this dilemma is to apply Nietzsche’s (1989) manner of evaluation which is based on the contribution to survival and health (as metaphors for life). I must determine my position within a discourse and then actively participate and conduct myself in a manner that fits within the given framework, but allows the development of the individual. I am suggesting a conscience. Managerialism will always surround the higher education arena, but within the conscience, we can act and react as managers and successfully be part of discourses, the academic and the managerial. Now to the answer to the question of being, within the realm of humanity and the discourses we engage. We must act in a mindset that allows academic freedom to fluidly ‘be’ and move within set boundaries. The borders should be managed in a manner that diminishes the managerialist stereotype and facilitates growth and development of all entities.
Administering Cause

One major factor that affects student performance is the allocation of resources. Districts, states, and even the federal government have instituted measures to assure that students with the greatest needs are adequately served and that all resources are fairly allocated. In order to fully understand this process, I examined the resources that are controlled via site-based management. Initially one would think that these resources manifest themselves in tangible objects including, but not limited to, materials of instruction and technological advancements. Surprisingly, staff allocations, the actual number of professionals assigned to a given plant, fit into this category. Using the minimum foundation calculation formula, a given number of certified personnel may be hired. The formula utilizes the total number of students registered at a given school to determine staff allocations. Unlike higher education units, a set dollar amount is not assigned. There is no provision for salary savings to purchase additional resources unless they are provided by external funding sources. This practice creates the emergence of several questions related to personnel equity and teacher quality. Will the teachers with the greatest expertise/advanced degrees be equally distributed among the various academic sites? How will the universities with lower staff retention rates improve? How can academic quality be measured where all students are provided premium-learning opportunities when professional staffs differ within a locality or state?

John Rockoff (2003), Columbia University School of Business, concluded:

Raising teacher quality may be a key instrument in improving student outcomes. However, in an environment where many observable teacher characteristics are not related to teacher quality, policies that focus on
recruiting and retaining teachers with particular credentials may be less effective than policies that reward teachers based on performance. As measures of effective teaching, test scores are widely available, objective, and (though they may not capture all facets of what students learn in school) they are widely recognized as important indicators of achievement by educators, policymakers, and the public. (p. 22)

The teacher retention movement could actually overshadow the need for quality. Inevitably, teachers will migrate and teach where they want based on personal and emotional factors. Energy and dollars spent on teacher retention will not assure that low performing schools will meet the minimum standards. The challenge then becomes facilitating the process of creating quality teachers. Accomplishing this mission given the numerical staff allotment requires savvy managerialism.

The term creative staffing emerged in educational settings as programs were eliminated and principals wanted to find ways to assure continuance. A common practice would be sharing line position between two departments. Most recently, creative staffing has been used to establish a mechanism to improve teacher quality and provide support. After close examination of highly functioning K-12 schools, Miles and Darling-Hammond (1997) assert that “the process of rethinking staffing is sometimes easier when a particular staffing model is identified at the start…. for example, teachers were asked to commit to implementing the Success for All model, and the district provided an opportunity for teachers who did not choose the model to transfer to a new school. Teachers were given another opportunity to transfer after six months of implementing the new model” (p. 41). This allowed teachers to choose which of the new models they would prefer to participate in. Instructional programs and models receive
special staffing considerations. Some of these areas receive federal support in addition to
the normal staffing allowance, particularly in Louisiana. Title I funding provides
instructional specialists to implement specific models. Teachers who succumb under the
weight of instructional models chosen by the administration often feel abused.

A newly defined position has emerged in many creatively staffed schools – the
teacher coach. The teacher coach provides content and managerial support to teachers.
Logistically, the number of classrooms is reduced by one, each class increases in size
minimally, and a peer leader role is staffed. An increase in student performance is often
directly attributed to these teacher coach positions. According to J.A. Ross (1992),
“Student achievement was higher in classrooms of teachers who had more contact with
their coaches and in classrooms of teachers with greater confidence in the effectiveness
of education. Teachers who relied on school administrators reported less involvement
with their coaches and these teachers obtained lower student achievement” (p. 51). The
management of school sites is typically viewed as a “top down” model. Establishing a
layer of peer management provides an academic liaison that has a social investment
motivated by best practice.

Teachers helping teachers is a simple notion; however, barriers do exist. One
teacher interviewed in Miles and Darling-Hammond’s (1997) study commented as
follows: “It takes at least a year just to understand what we are trying to do, and we have
built up such working relationships by then, when we lose someone due to budget cuts, it
really sets us back” (p. 41-42). This reluctance to put faith in the program and teacher
concern over effectiveness of the program is valid. Unfortunately, district officials have
too often provided support for a short period of time and then cancelled the program.
Often, the decisions to start and stop such programs are politically motivated and teacher
concern rarely reaches to the level of the decision makers and is usually ignored. The success of implementing teacher coach programs is a key factor in improving student achievement and teacher quality. It is important that school administrators manage in a fashion that will allow for such support continuously. The age-old administrative ploy of dangling the proverbial carrots at teachers will not transform teaching and learning.

Eventually the continuous cycle of giving and removing support to teachers will result in the demise of public schooling. Most recently the Progressive Policy Institute Report written by Andrew Leigh and Sara Mead (2005) and distributed less than six months ago finds:

The quality of America's public school teaching force is neither as good as it could be nor as good as it must be to prepare our children for a global economy. Certainly, the nation has thousands of highly skilled, dedicated teachers. But, since the 1960s, the quality of the teaching profession has declined. Even more troubling, there are huge teacher quality disparities between poor and affluent schools. Disadvantaged children -- those who most need excellent teachers -- are the least likely to have them. It is time for policymakers to realize that the status quo methods of improving teacher quality simply do not work. Many of the old solutions favored by education groups to improve teacher quality -- such as raising teacher salaries across the board, improving training, and requiring certification -- have not fixed the problem. Indeed, one of the most popular education policy proposals of recent years, cutting class sizes, risks unintentionally lowering teacher quality even further, as affluent districts make up their numbers by poaching the most capable teachers from poorer areas. (p. 1)
The expertise of teacher coaches and their ability to model effective teaching methods will improve teacher quality individually. The individual result must be celebrated with confidence knowing that a strong team will emerge. That team will eventually form a new cycle where quality teachers become coaches. Knowing that coaches possess a successful desire and motivation, it is my strong belief that these reformed teachers will create classroom teams. The prize of this successful process will be the trophy of achievement and a well-prepared future generation.
CHAPTER 3:  
METHOD  

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine how administrative decisions impact student outcomes and teacher effectiveness. Throughout each step in the methodology continual synthesis was utilized to determine the connection between, extant data sets such as grade distribution and student progress, and instructor/professor perceptions about the effects of managerialism. Through this process patterns of decision making can be identified and linked to the emerging theme and connections.

Overview

Data sets from courses at each level of college preparation were collected for future use. These data sets were grade distribution, enrollment count including attrition, and student retention. Next data were analyzed and placed into charts and table to facilitate evaluation. A phenomenological research model using communication as a basis was employed to gather information from the teachers of record to determine their perspectives about the class outcomes and any factors which may have impacted student performance of their teaching success. Using Spradley’s (1979) Developmental Research Sequence (D.R.S.) as a basis for the research design, a written questionnaire with personal interview follow-up clarification was conducted. Finally, domains were created and common themes evolved that expressed the link between the decision maker and the academic stake holders. These themes were a direct result of the comparison of the phenomenological communication patterns. This type of qualitative data collection “assumes that both verbal and nonverbal communication is culturally patterned” and
“culture is central to understanding human behavior” (Jacobs, 1988, p.18). In this study the behaviors of world of academia and its managerialism will be investigated.

**Research Design**

Based on Spradley’s design an ethnographic analysis including extant data and naturalistic inquiry was crafted. Spradley (1979) describes a valid process of ethnography as gathering notes “1) from what people say, 2) from the way people act, 3) from the artifacts people use the ethnographer can make cultural inferences which can lead to hypothesis testing (p.8).” This method of inquiry allowed for an ongoing analysis thorough out the data collection period and provided the freedom to continue to focus the study while gathering data and led to greater depth in understanding the problem (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The D.R.S model provided a progression that built on a distinct taxonomy of questions, data analysis from interviews, and synthesis of information to discover relationships and themes. Figure 2 gives a clear visual sequence of the full process utilized.

Giving full consideration to the posed research questions and to the vulnerability of the participants, it was determined that an analysis of each course in a case study manner would yield information that could be gathered without jeopardizing the issue of confidentiality. Robert Yin’s case study analysis was determined to be a useful research method that would connect the manager and the student without subjecting the faculty to a potentially explosive situation. Yin defines the case study research method as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, (Yin, 1984, p. 23). Consequently, each course was treated as a separate case and comparative analysis was utilized to determine causal relationships. A local school
Figure 2 – Research Design
principal with an Educational Specialist degree served as the informant. All data sets and domains were checked for accuracy by the outside professional. Common threads emerging from the communicative data were compared to assure that all recurring responses were accounted for and recorded in an ethical manner that would clearly depict the magnitude of recurring responses.

**Population and Sample Design**

For the purpose of this study critical case sampling was utilized. Patton (1987) explained the importance of critical case sampling as a means of focusing or highlighting an aspect or a particular point in a program. These points were identified as each level of the college span beginning with freshman and extending to senior. As constructed this sampling and investigation was granted an exemption from the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects. (See Appendix C) All ethnic populations and genders represented on the campus were included. This sample also represented underrepresented groups and non majors.

This study was conducted at a large research intensive university in the Deep South. The institution has a total enrollment of 25,709 undergraduate students. Students are divided reasonably equally across academic levels and with regard to gender. Racially the campus is skewed with 80.41% of the students being Caucasian, 9.04% being African American, and 10.55% stating other as their ethnicity. Surprisingly, of the 1,308 full-time faculty 66.28% are male and 82.72 % are white. Of the 41 black faculty members, three reside in the department being studied. This is unique to the university as a whole.

The department studied is the largest of the three departments residing in the College of Education. This department is responsible for teacher education at the
undergraduate level and also supports all levels of graduate studies. Courses in the
department range in level beginning with the initial freshman experience. Currently 34
full-time faculty members actively teach EDCI courses. Some full-time faculty members
were assigned to supervision of student teachers. For the purpose of this study those
members were not included.

**Instrumentation**

The designed interview included a combination of open ended questions and
general descriptive information. An example of general information was, “What are the
prerequisites and background of the given class?” Instructors of record were provided
extant data upon request. Initial responses were desired to eliminate bias and gather
perceptions. The combination of both types of questions is noted by Patton (1987) as an
opportunity for researcher to probe and expand information gained from interviews. This
allows for greater depth and minimizes the overuse of predetermined responses

**Validity and Reliability (Analysis of Domain)**

Spradley (1979) crafted seven semantic relationships. These relationships will be
used to enhance analysis. Using his method for developing domains, common thread
was synthesized from the summative interview data to measure the connection between
the qualitative and quantitative data. Spradley’s relationships were identified to the
degree possible during the summative findings and analysis.

These relationships are:

- Strict Inclusion (X is a kind of Y)
- Cause and Effect (X is a result of Y)
- Rationale (X is a reason for doing Y)
- Function (X is used for Y)
• Means-End (X a way of doing Y)
• Sequence (X is a step (stage) in Y)
• Attribution (X is an attribute (characteristic) of Y)

To increase consistency internal coding systems of common themes were cross checked for accuracy. A qualified informant served in the role of auditor to assure that all themes were clearly represented.

**Case Studies Representative of Extant Data**

Extant data sets were presented using Yin and Heald’s (1975) case study/survey design related to policy analysis. Each course and the respective data sets were treated as one individual case. This strategy proved to be especially effective as confidentiality was a major concern.

The case survey method is mainly concerned with the analysis of qualitative evidence in a reliable manner. The method enables the reviewer to note various experiences found in each policy study and then aggregate the frequency of occurrence of these expectations. The frequencies form a basis for simple statements of association and nonassociation of different types of experiences…The case survey method thus carries the classic case study method one major step forward; it enables aggregate reviews of individual case studies to be undertake with scientific rigor. (p. 372)

This method utilizes a reader analyst sometimes referred to as a participant observer. This individual is both a researcher and the subject of the study. Faculty members in colleges of education prove to be the ideal reader analysts as they thrive on reflective practice.
CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS

Introduction

Extant data were collected and organized in a manner suitable for presentation and to assure anonymity. For instance, course numbers were given alphanumeric identifiers known only by the researcher. However serious concerns arose with the interview piece of the data collection. Faculty members were extremely reluctant to participate. Many reasons were cited with the overarching concern being that someone could possibly pair the extant data sets with the faculty interview narratives. All participants were willing to answer and found merit in the query; however, many were concerned that punitive consequences from upper administration might be imposed. Initially, this was not thought have a serious impact on this study, but after the concern was echoed repeatedly and in consultation with members of the committee, it was deemed that a potential breach of confidentiality did exist. Knowing that the connection was critical to substantiate the hypothesis of the researcher the following changes were made to the initial questionnaire (See Appendix B). Questionnaire Question 1 was not reported or included in this to eliminate potential confidentiality threats. This question asks the following: general descriptive information, size, level… General comments to Question 2 were collected. References to specific course numbers and acronyms were omitted. All responses were reported in one summative narrative rather than individualized transcripts. Responses were analyzed and tallied to determine the recurring themes.
Giving full consideration to the posed research questions and to the vulnerability of the participants, it was determined that an analysis of each course in a case study manner would yield information that could be gathered without jeopardizing the issue of confidentiality. Robert Yin’s case study analysis was determined to be a useful research method that would connect the manager and the student without subjecting the faculty to a potentially explosive situation. Yin defines the case study research method as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, (Yin, 1984, p. 23). Consequently, each course was treated as a separate case and comparative analysis was utilized to determine causal relationships. A local school principal with an Educational Specialist degree served as the informant. All data sets and domains were checked for accuracy by the outside professional. Common threads emerging from the communicative data were compared to assure that all recurring responses were accounted for and recorded in an ethical manner that would clearly depict the magnitude of recurring responses.

**Questionnaire Administration**

The questionnaire was administered orally in an informal manner to ease the concerns previously addressed. There were a total of 15 respondents. Three initially refused to participate, thus an additional three were selected. The group consisted of the instructors of the targeted cases being studied and an equal number of unaffiliated instructors who teach classes of the similar constructs. This design was utilized to assure that the opinions reflected were representative of the faculty and not biased. Considering 15 of the 32 total full-time faculty exclusive of those assigned administrative duties, the population sample was representative of 46.8% of the whole.
**Questionnaire Responses**

Questionnaire responses are presented in a narrative. The parenthesis denotes the number of times that a particular response was given. The notation (5) would imply that five respondents gave similar comments to a particular question.

Responses to Question 2:

What skill sets or background should students have prior to taking this course?

(Prerequisites)

- Students should be education majors (5)
- Appropriate for general education
- Completion of lower level education courses, must be major with GPA (4)
- Praxis I (6)
- Need to understand that this is a course for teacher certification (8)
- None

Responses to Question 3:

What significant changes if any have occurred in your course over the past 24 months?

- New Program, Size fluctuates
- Size (7)
- Course Requirements/Structure
- Nothing
- Teaching Majors in other colleges (4)
- New Number, students take class earlier
- Having an assistant after begging for help (3)
- Having part of class in real world setting (4)
Responses to Question 4:

Who/what caused these changes?

Board of Regents/State/Redesign (2)

Chair (7)

Need to save money/ Previous Dean’s requirement for lower level classes to be bigger even though they are taught by instructors who have bigger loads anyway. (5)

New Chair/Office Staff (5)

Hurricane Katrina

Responses to Question 5:

Were the changes viewed as positive or negative? Explain.

Finally positive, after making class so big someone finally realized that it needs to get to a manageable size

Positive, I can now teach all the content – Glad they listened to me

Negative, Non majors are not sure they really want to teach

I think positive, students get core principles earlier in program before other pedagogy classes (3)

Negative, then positive, but it made me change the whole way of teaching when my class was so large

Positive, interim chair offered assistance rather than condemnation

Responses to Question 6:

Did the changes impact student performance? If so, explain

Yes, students are happier by my observation and they can reflect. (2)

No, not initially, but once they embraced the need for more contact hours they realized that it made them better prepared for the real world

Yes, before students had difficulty even getting an appointment and I certainly could not keep up with emails; there were just too many.
No with the super sized class, yes with the small class. (3)

Yes because they had two professionals plus their mentor to ask for help

Responses to Question 7:

Did the changes impact your teaching style? If so, explain

Yes, when I felt abused, I actually began to count down the days to final exam week.

Yes, you can not use some seminar type reflective processes with 70+

Yes, I felt like a game show host trying to beg the students to stay in the class

Yes, I finally do not feel rushed.

Yes, I now see positive evaluations and I was trying all types of methods to keep my teaching evaluations up.

Yes, It made me sad and I felt unappreciated

Yes, for the first time in my entire career, I felt like a failure.

Responses to Question 8:

Were there any implications personally, i.e., health related issues etc.

Yes, I was extremely tired

Yes, I actually think I fell asleep on my way home

Yes, Now that we have proven this massive class size is not good for some advanced classes, I feel like a huge burden has been lifted from me.

I know I am nicer to my family. I think I had become harsh because of work related problems.

Yes, I really believe I had some medical complications because of the stress.

Yes, it was a financial burden teaching so many.

No, I have just learned to accept that this is how it goes in higher ed.
Questionnaire Data Set Analysis

Questionnaire data analysis was presented in the same manner as questionnaire responses. The common threads were noted by examining the totality of responses and the emerging themes.

Analysis of Question 2:

What skill sets or background should students have prior to taking this course?

(Prerequisites)

Common Thread – Courses were for primarily education majors or those seeking teacher certification. It was perceived that students would do better if they had some previous education coursework. Respondents stressed need for grade point average and passage of national exams. Course were not seen as general education and open to all students.

Analysis of Question 3:

What significant changes if any have occurred in your course over the past 24 months?

Common Threads – Class Size, Utilization of Teaching Assistants, Program Structures including the redesign and recatogorizing of some course numbers. The order in which students take classes was also included in the structural thread. Concern was given to the need for prerequisites and a sequence to successfully comply with state certification and redesign mandates.

Analysis of Question 4:

Who/what caused these changes?

Common Thread – Changes were made at levels higher than the instructor. Some decisions were perceived to be financially motivated rather than in the
best interest of the student and faculty assigned. Many changes were seen as
top down and reflected decision making based on factors other than best
practices.

Analysis of Question 5:

Were the changes viewed as positive or negative? Explain.

Common Thread – Changes were eventually viewed as positive, after a
negative experience was identified. There was an undertone of relief that
issues related to individual situations were identified and solutions were
offered by administrators. Some respondents asserted that too long of a
period lapsed before their concerns and suggestions were addressed. It was
unclear as to the validity of the suggestion as individual personal scenarios
and suggested academic problem solving were not part of the interview.

Analysis of Question 6:

Did the changes impact student performance? If so, explain

Common Thread – Unanimous impact was identified both positively and
negatively depending on the circumstance. Given N=15, a total of 80%
responded with the opinion that a connection between student performance
and administrative changes did exist.

Analysis of Question 7:

Did the changes impact your teaching style? If so, explain

Common Thread – 100% of the respondents identified some type of impact on
their teaching performance and their ability to control the
demands/requirements of the teaching environment.
Analysis of Question 8:

Were there any implications personally i.e. health related issues etc.?

Common Thread – Majority of the respondents felt as though their personal lives were impacted by the situations both real and perceived related to the teaching environment. The outlier has an attitude of acceptance as a condition of higher education. This in a sense could also be seen as an affirmative response as the individual’s view has been skewed by situational ethics.

Confidentiality and Fidelity of Questionnaire Responses

Due to the concern of respondents addressed earlier in this chapter, questionnaire responses taken via dictation are in the custodial care of the informant. These holographic documents will be disposed of upon the completion and acceptance of this study. The informant holds advanced degrees in the field of education and has no ties to the university population being studied. This process should further alleviate all potential threats to the integrity of the study and its participants. The presence of such concern for self protection also suggests that the existence of managerialism is a real factor in the examined academic society. The misuse of managerial power has lasting results on all stake-holders and often propels change in a radical disruptive model (See Figure 1 p. 4). As previously noted, Pennington cautioned against the risk of radical change that could potential create chaos.

It should also be noted that the administrative position of the current researcher may have facilitated the unwillingness to participate and the cause of concern related matters of confidentiality. The confidential custodial care arrangement was secured to reassure participants of the commitment to them as academic partners that copies would only be viewed by the informant and the researcher.
Case Study Data Sets: Case 1 – EDCI 4xxx

Overview: EDCI 4xxx is a class taken by all elementary majors spanning certification for grades PK through 8.

Managerial Change: Due to the level of this class size was more than tripled.

Treatment A: Class Size Reduction

Treatment B: Class Size Reduction

Enrollment Retention

Table 1: EDCI 4xxx - Enrollment Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 4xxx</th>
<th>Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>14th Day Class Count</th>
<th>Final Enrollment</th>
<th>Graded Completers</th>
<th>Completers with ‘C’ or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Change</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.03%</td>
<td>75.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.12%</td>
<td>92.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.66%</td>
<td>96.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grade Distribution

### Table 2: EDCI 4xxx – Grade Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 4xxx</th>
<th>Grade of ‘A’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘B’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘C’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘D’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘F’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘W’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Case 1 Data

The analyses of both the enrollment retention and grade distribution for EDCI 4xxx show a negative impact of student completion and performance during the managerial change. This class was increased by more than 300%. The effects were detrimental to students’ ability to complete the course with the required grade of ‘C’ or higher. Only 66.66% of the 102 students completed the course with an acceptable grade. This reflected a 26.4% decline in student grade attainment at the state requirement.

Another area greatly affected by the increase in class size was the retention rate. Twenty-four of the one hundred students who remained in the class withdrew. This magnitude of withdrawal is highly unusual. High withdrawal rates can potentially impact a student’s ability to complete the college program in the prescribed time period. This is also seen as an unacceptable practice by higher university administration as it increases the average length of time it takes for students to graduate. Such averages are used as a calculator to determine an institution of higher learning’s ranking in national reporting polls. Such a delay also places a financial strain on the student and limits the resources that are available for financial support. For example students who repeatedly encounter this type of situation may exhaust their financial resources and find themselves unable to complete programs of study.

Treatments A and B were similar as each reduced the class size. Treatment B actually returned the class size back to the original level prior to the managerial change. These more manageable class sizes reduced the withdrawal rate significantly to a level between 2.56 and 3.44%. The only negative impact of Treatment B was the number of students completing the course with the grade of ‘C’ or better declined approximately 3.5%. Upon further investigation, an external factor was noted. Some of the students
were not majors and were enrolled as a result of the natural disasters that impacted the Gulf South. It should be noted that such students were at a disadvantage due to late admission and the tragedy each experienced. The emotional trauma and stress sis not enhance the learning environment. As many students were allowed to return home, withdrawal rates also increased.

Overall, the negative impact of the managerial change was remediated by the treatments which reduced class size. Data tables suggest that this type of action to minimize financial strain is not effective in this setting. Allocating resources in an alternative manner would benefit the instructor and the learner. An exact quote from the instructor for this case expressing concern for future outcomes should the initial treatment be repeated supports the quantitative data findings.

I was concerned that the Fall sections of 4xxx are very large. We experimented with the larger sections of 4xxx in the past and it was an unmitigated disaster… unlike math or biology class students in 4xxx need to be able to talk and respond and be able to publicly articulate their privately held untested ideas and prejudices about pedagogy. A larger class intimidates and prevents this from happening.

This level of concern for both the student’s growth and ability to develop professional dispositions and the ability to teach effectively is a prime example of the managerial impact on university faculty teaching performance when decisions are absent of their input. A positive use of authority would enhance the opportunity for faculty to view managerialism as a necessary tool in the operation of an academic unit.
Case 2 – EDCI 4yyy

Overview: EDCI 4yyy is a class taken by all elementary majors spanning certification for grades PK through 8.

Managerial Change: The sequencing of this class and size were expanded to allow students greater flexibility in program design.

Treatment A: Use of Teaching Assistant as Co-Teacher and grader at midterm.

Treatment B: Reduction of Size

Enrollment Retention

Table 3: EDCI 4yyy - Enrollment Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 4yyy</th>
<th>Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>14th Day Class Count</th>
<th>Final Enrollment</th>
<th>Graded Completers</th>
<th>Completers with ‘C’ or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.42%</td>
<td>94.28%</td>
<td>91.42%</td>
<td>91.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Faculty B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.14%</td>
<td>94.28%</td>
<td>91.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22**</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22**</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23**</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Faculty B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23**</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>95.83%</td>
<td>95.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Faculty was a graduate student
**Withdrawals represent non-majors
## Grade Distribution

### Table 4: EDCI 4yyy – Grade Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 4yyy</th>
<th>Grade of ‘A’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘B’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘C’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘D’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘F’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘W’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change Faculty A (Midterm)</td>
<td>63.63%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment A Faculty A</td>
<td>63.63%</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B Faculty A</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change Faculty B (Midterm)</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>17.64%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment A Faculty B</td>
<td>85.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B Faculty B</td>
<td>91.66%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Case 2 Data

The data sets in the case are presented for two instructors, one tenured faculty member and a graduate student nearing completion of a terminal program of study. The sets are presented in a parallel manner and include data from concurrent semesters. The use of data from parallel sections with the same treatment proved to be insightful. The unique opportunity allows the researcher to identify the potential impact of faculty perception and reaction to change. The primary managerial change was resource allocation by increasing the number of seats in each section by 10 a total of 40% respectively.

The impact was noted immediately and the first treatment was utilized at midterm by the request of the faculty member. The results were very different. The faculty member who felt the class size was an injustice and demanded Treatment A saw little change in grade distribution or retention. A teaching assistant/grader was assigned to each section of the course. The extant data evidence supported the notion that this treatment produced little to no impact on the class taught by the faculty member. Essentially one student who had a grade of ‘B’ at midterm earned a ‘C’ as the final grade.

The result in the section taught by the graduate student saw extremely positive results. Students failing the class reduced from 8.82% to 2.94%. Students with the grade of ‘C’ at midterm were reduced from 17.64% to 5.88%. There were no significant outliers or performance indicators that show the treatments for the multiple sections were applied differently. The same teaching assistant was used for both classes.

Treatment B returned the classes to the original size and resulted in class sizes of approximately 25. Treatment B had little impact in both sections. It should be noted that
the connection between the outcomes related to student performance this treatment are almost nonexistent. It appears as though the increase and subsequent decrease in class size had a greater impact on the given faculty. The faculty perceived that they were doing a better job when the additional resources were allocated and their concerns were seen as valid. The peer interaction of the graduate students formed a cohesive strength in the ability to deliver material in an effective manner.

Overall, the treatments for this class did not impact the data sets consistently. It is difficult to conclude that the treatment directly impacted the students. It should be noted that via the questionnaire that the faculty of this course did feel as though the manager’s decision to assist in the concerns made them more effective as noted in responses to questions three and five.

**Case 3 – EDCI 1xxx**

Overview: EDCI 1xxx is a class taken by all elementary majors spanning certification for grades 1 through 8.

Managerial Change: Class restructured and extended to include additional credit hours. Original class referred to as initial. Restructured class refers to the new class with greater credit hours.

**Enrollment Retention**

**Table 5: EDCI 1xxx Enrollment Retention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 1xxx</th>
<th>Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>14th Day Class Count</th>
<th>Final Enrollment</th>
<th>Graded Completers</th>
<th>Completers with ‘C’ or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Change</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
Table 5 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>During Managerial Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Class</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructured Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Change</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grade Distribution

### Table 6: EDCI 1xxx – Grade Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 1xxx</th>
<th>Grade of ‘A’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘B’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘C’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘D’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘F’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘W’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior to Change</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=20</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During Managerial Change Initial</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>65.21%</td>
<td>26.08%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During Change Restructured</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Change</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td>61.53%</td>
<td>34.61%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Case 3 Data

Upon initial inspection of the data sets it appears that all data reported in this case study are synonymous and there appears to be little reason for examination of the sets. Table 5 shows 100% of students enrolled completed the course. All students attained the state required grade of ‘C’ or better. The question to be answered was why evoke any managerial change or treatment. In comparison with the interview my answer would be that of depth and mastery. These two factors are clearly seen in Table 6, but could be clearly overlooked as all students appear to be on track to meet or exceed the performance target.

The grade distribution of the course again appears aligned with best practices in the field of education. When comparing the two initial classes, the top two data sets, with the restructured classes, it can be noted that the grade distribution has been consistently impacted. Prior to the change in class structure, approximately 70% of the students earned a grade of ‘A’. According to this university’s grading policy, a grade of ‘A’ indicates distinguished mastery of material and a grade of ‘B’ indicates good mastery of material. After the class increased the number of contact hours, 60.17% of students earned a grade of ‘A’. The number of students earning an “average” grade of ‘C’ was also greatly reduced. Colleges of education do not survive turning out average teachers. The data suggest that the increases of contact and focus on the course objectives allowed greater time to master objectives, minimizing the average performance. A significantly clearer picture of those who are distinguished and those who are good also emerges.

Overall, students and faculty in this case view the change positively. The faculty in this course is delighted as noted in the questionnaire to have more contact time to greater prepare teacher candidates prior to the internship experience. Student evaluations
for this course are extremely positive and reflect the connection of the significant impact of taking additional credit hours, the managerial change, and their performance pre and post completion of undergraduate study.

**Case 4 – EDCI 1yyy**

Overview: EDCI 1yyy is a class taken by all secondary education students seeking certification. These students are non-majors spanning multiple colleges across the campus.

Managerial Change: Creation of a New Class

Treatment A: Assignment of two academic personnel to teach the class.

Treatment B: Assignment of one academic person to teach the class.

**Enrollment Retention**

**Table 7: EDCI 1yyy - Enrollment Retention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 1yyy</th>
<th>Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>14th Day Class Count</th>
<th>Final Enrollment</th>
<th>Graded Completers</th>
<th>Completers with ‘C’ or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Change</td>
<td>New Class Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.11%</td>
<td>98.11%</td>
<td>96.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment A</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>97.18%</td>
<td>94.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B (Midterm)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.42%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>67.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Grade Distribution

**Table 8: EDCI 1yyy – Grade Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 1yyy</th>
<th>Grade of ‘A’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘B’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘C’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘D’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘F’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘W’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Change</td>
<td>New Class</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=52</td>
<td>48.07%</td>
<td>42.30%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment A</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=71</td>
<td>71.83%</td>
<td>22.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B (Midterm)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>46.42%</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Case 4 Data

This case is the first case studied representative of students who are not education majors. This class does require that students who enroll have determined that they want to add teacher certification as a minor to their undergraduate programs of study. The class has a limited data set due to the fact that it is a new program and this class has been offered only two years. One section of this class is offered and the enrollment tends to reflect very large classes in the fall and smaller classes in the spring. The primary reason for Treatment A was the dissatisfaction of faculty and students. This also was based on reflective practice as a new program was implemented. Student concerns were that of feedback and actually being able to have the attention of the professor. Faculty too had exactly the same concern, i.e., giving direct feedback to this large class.

Treatment A was determined to be the best course of action when the enrollment count increased by one-third. Two full-time faculty members were assigned to the class. Splitting the class was not an option as that is done during a lab conducted by the content area. Adding an additional faculty member had little impact on retention. The initial retention rate was 96.22% and the rate after Treatment A was 94.36%. Grade distribution showed a greater impact. Greater numbers of students were able to attain grades that reflected mastery of the course content.

The most significant finding related to Case 4 was the impact of Treatment B. Treatment B reflected the reduction of teaching staff to one as the class size did not warrant two faculty members. A sharp decrease in the number of completers and an increase of almost 30% in the number of withdrawals was alarming. Grade distribution also reflected a decline in performance. Nearly 68% of the enrolled students were able to achieve the state standard of attaining a grade of ‘C’ or higher.
This case raises great concern as to the impact of managerial decisions. The
decision and class size were aligned with all of the desires of the stakeholders. A small
student teacher ratio and content objectives that related to teaching area labs were the two
primary concerns of those involved in the reflection of the initial class. Although
Treatment B was certainly justified, it produced an extreme level of impact.

**Case 5 – EDCI 4zzz**

Overview: EDCI 4zzz - Newly created general class for all majors. Course is highly
sought after to meet requirements to enter senior colleges.

Managerial Change: Creation of new general education class

Treatment A: Class Size enlarged by 100% (Double from the original)

Treatment B: Class size enlarged by 200% (Triple from the original)

Treatment C: Assignment of teaching assistants to assist with class management

Treatment D: Splitting of class into two sections. Data represented is a summation of
both sections.

**Enrollment Retention**

**Table 9: EDCI 4zzz - Enrollment Retention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 4zzz</th>
<th>Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>14th Day Class Count</th>
<th>Final Enrollment</th>
<th>Graded Completers</th>
<th>Completers with ‘C’ or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
Table 9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After Treatment B</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>138</th>
<th>135</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>56.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment C</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>60.66%</td>
<td>46.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment D (Midterm)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.66%</td>
<td>96.66%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Data not available as it represents midterm of the current session
# Grade Distribution

Table 10: EDCI 4zzz – Grade Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 4zzz</th>
<th>Grade of ‘A’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘B’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘C’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘D’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘F’</th>
<th>Grade of ‘W’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Managerial Change</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=42</td>
<td>30.95%</td>
<td>23.80%</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>23.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=84</td>
<td>20.23%</td>
<td>26.19%</td>
<td>21.42%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>22.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=135</td>
<td>11.85%</td>
<td>31.11%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>5.18%</td>
<td>25.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=140</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>16.42%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=145</td>
<td>12.41%</td>
<td>29.65%</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
<td>11.03%</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Case 5 Data

Case Study 5 represents a course taken by majors and non-majors to fulfill general university requirements. The data presented reflects the entire course history since initial implementation. This type of class is designed to serve many students and support the mission of the university related to undergraduate study. The managerial change data relates to the initial establishment of the course. Consecutively, including Treatments A and B the course enrollment was increased to assure that a greater population could be served. Treatment C was utilized to alleviate the concerns of upper university administrators related to retention and performance.

Data sets for the first semesters reflect minimal changes in outcomes considering that the class size increased 50 seats each semester. Grade distribution remained consistent and the number of completers remained in the 60 – 65% range. Treatment C was utilized to address concerns related to the extremely high percentage of students withdrawing or failing the class. The class was not serving the constituents of the university in a manner that appealed to the need to retain students in classes and actually have them complete the course. Although Treatment C was thought to be a step in the right direction, it too produced little change. Only 46.66% of students completed the class with a grade of ‘C’ or better. The withdrawal rate reached 49% with an additional 7.85% of the class failing.

Treatment D reduced the class size by 50%. Each of the two sections would have seventy-five seats. The sections were taught similarly with a full professor providing guidance for the additional section. A midterm check reflected a positive result. Data were presented in a summative manner to allow for comparison of all students in the course. To date only 13.10% of the students have withdrawn. This represents a greater
than 20% improvement. Additionally, the grade distribution reflects a positive connection to the treatment.

Overall, providing a low pupil teacher ratio for each section rather than in one section seems to be effective. Students at the course level are more responsive to having a single faculty member and have embraced Treatment D. A strong connection between the manager and this data set exists. This is inclusive of managers at varied levels in university governance.
CHAPTER 5:  
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

**Introduction**

This study was designed to examine the impact of management on teacher effectiveness in post secondary settings. Specifically, this study’s foci was to determine how university administrative decisions impacted student outcomes and teacher effectiveness. Three research questions were posed.

1. How are administrative decisions viewed?
2. Which managerial factors significantly impact teacher effectiveness and limit student performance?
3. Is there evidence to support a connection between administrative decisions and accountability/performance?

In brief, Research Question One was viewed as an administrative task motivated by external facts rather than best interest. It appeared to be seen as a exercise of fiscal survival. Question two, allowed for the clear examination of the link between the qualitative responses and the quantitative data. Examining student performance with an enhanced focus of teacher responses clearly aligned the treatment (managerial decision) to the student based outcomes. Finally, question three, allowed the research to drawn connections between the perceived strengths and weaknesses of managerialism. The attitude of the university faculty toward decisions is often compounded by multiple acts of managerialism. The combined with individual responses related to student performance were used to develop plans for future research.
Summary

The completion of the research design allowed all three questions to be studied. Answers and conclusions were developed based on the responses of questionnaire participants and the extant data sets. Results yielded conclusions that can be applied to many academic situations to inform best practices. Yin (1994) asserted that generalization of results, from either single or multiple designs, is made to theory and not to populations. Multiple cases strengthened the results by replicating the pattern-matching, thus increasing confidence in the robustness of the theory. If modified slightly, the results could be applicable to other managerial settings outside the realm of education.

Research Question One, how are administrative decisions viewed, was primarily answered using the questionnaire responses. Respondents felt as though many administrative decisions were financially motivated. Some suggested that individual concerns were not addressed with a sense of urgency and longer than necessary periods of time lapsed before administrative decisions were made and assistance was offered. Concern was given for student performance in general, but the primary undertone was related specifically to the sacrifice of faculty. The teaching environment created by such managerial decisions was directly cited as a factor with cause to them personally. Each respondent exhibited some personal concerns. Health, family, and financial strain were each noted as byproducts of academic administrator’s decisions. Essentially this related to Pennington’s model of change with the disturbance factor impacting the professional.

The difficulty conducting the questionnaire is also a reflection of the view of administrative decisions. Respondents who were passionate about the validity of this
area of research were reluctant to respond without a guarantee of confidentiality. Concern generating fear was indicated by one-third of the respondents. Concern was attributed to the thought that upper administration would identify their responses as a personal attack and retaliate in some manner. This observed behavior suggested a possible misuse of authority and power.

Research Question Two, which managerial factors significantly impact teacher effectiveness and limit student performance, was explored by comparing the faculty responses and the case study data sets. Strong connections existed between decisions related to courses and curriculum administration and the performance of students. The analysis of each data set linked the “treatments” and impact on student performance. Achievement and mastery of course content reflected the level of change and the participants, both teachers and students, to embrace that change. Often subsequent “treatments” were attempts to correct previous decisions that yielded adverse outcomes.

Overall, the data provided by both types of investigation is rich and strongly supports the purpose of the study’s quest to link the manager and the student. Complete data and reflective related analyses are documented in Chapter 4. The primary factors that emerged were accessibility of faculty in large classes, class size, and class organization including assignment of faculty resources.

Research Question Three, is there evidence to support a connection between administrative decisions and accountability/performance, absolutely, the initial review of questionnaire could be viewed a simple opinions. Combined with the data sets, validity to the responses and a connection becomes apparent. The connection to the specific cases and the managerialism of each setting linked the performance of students and the accountability of the assigned instructor. Students evaluate the teachers, not
administrators. In cases viewed as limited in the area of teacher effectiveness, students often withdrew in large percentage. These rates ultimately linked back to the decisions made by the manager.

**Limitations of the Study**

The substantial limit to this study was concern to maintain confidentiality. Due to unexpected changes within the unit, faculty members were uncertain about participation and the implications of their individual responses. Ideally individual responses would have been linked to each case. The large summative response report generated enough data to determine if connections exist, but a more in depth study linking various levels of study and specific circumstances as viewed by the teacher would be insightful. This too impacted the narrative of the researcher, as comments made by specific faculty could not be linked in narrative form to protect identities and assure no retaliatory reaction from administration. Another area that would be enhanced is the development of domains linked to specific cases. Common threads were used due to the given situation; however specific domains would have provided additional information.

**Implications for Further Study**

This study could be replicated in many various settings. Using one level of college study across many units would be intriguing. This would allow for comparison of grading expectations and class size. Such a study could also be completed demographically, by comparing schools in the Southeast to comparably sized schools in the other geographic regions. Finally the study could be conducted in a longitudinal fashion to compare the styles of various administrators. A suggested area to explore would be the standard deviations and mean GPA of students. This would add to the quantitative depth. To assure that comparable data sets were used courses would need to
be limited to a specific level in colleges that require a given grade in each course. For example, some education courses at higher levels dictate no grade lower than ‘C’. It would be difficult to compare this with a general education course in the same unit.

**Conclusions**

Several conclusions emerged at the end of the study, the most significant being the existence a strong connection between the manager and the student. The teacher’s effectiveness, which is an end result of managerial decisions, affects student performance, thus the link between the manager and student evolves. The utilization of shared governance could possibly remedy some of the negative outcomes in the cases studies. The questionnaire respondents implied a concern to be included in the decision making process. Allowing faculty to have input about resources and structures may facilitate positive outcomes, however managers should not fall prey to the notion that inclusion abdicates them of responsibility. Finally, all stakeholders in the academic environment are human. Essentially all parties need the same attention and care; they just present themselves at different levels of development and engagement. Managers who exhibit an awareness of the needs of respective parties are perceived as being more effective.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO FACULTY

Dear Faculty Member,

As shared governance spreads across university campuses, research in the development of a model(s) of processes that higher education administrators and faculty follow in the adoption and integration of academic changes into teaching and learning is currently being conducted. As an administrator, I am interested in contributing to the theoretical knowledge in the field and am hoping to identify ways to positively impact student performance and teacher effectiveness.

The course you teach has been randomly selected as part of this research. Your participation and insight as the instructor of record who serves as a critical contributor to the educational development of university students, a broad array of research areas, ongoing scholarship, and service is invaluable.

Please complete the attached questionnaire. It should take approximately 25 minutes. Your responses will be handled in a confidential manner and released only as summaries with no personal or organizational identifiers.

Sincerely,

Kelly McFatter
APPENDIX B:
INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. General Descriptive Information Number, Level, Size, ….

2. What skill sets or background should students have prior to taking this course?
   (prerequisites)

3. What significant changes if any have occurred in your course over the past 24 months?

4. Who/what caused these changes?

5. Were the changes viewed as positive or negative? Explain.

6. Did the changes impact student performance? If so, explain

7. Did the changes impact your teaching style? If so, explain

8. Were there any implications personally i.e. health related issues etc.
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☐ a) the participants cannot be identified, directly or statistically;

or that
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or that
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Implications of Managerial Decisions on Teacher Effectiveness and Student Performance

Kelly McFatter

April 28, 2006
Purpose
- The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of management on teacher effectiveness in post secondary settings.
- Specifically, this study’s foci are to determine how administrative decisions impact student outcomes and teacher effectiveness.

Problem Statement
The role of the academic administrator is more than pushing paper and being a social liaison between the students and faculty and the constituency of the community. The new role of the academic administrator is to positively affect change and improve economic gain by producing highly engaged individuals who think and reflect upon their respective roles in society as a whole. Encountering change can be a problem for most administrators if mishandled.
Research Questions

1. How are administrative decisions viewed?

2. Which managerial factors significantly impact teacher effectiveness and limit student performance?

3. Is there evidence to support a correlation between administrative decisions and accountability/performance?
Population Overview

• Students 25,709
  Male 47.92%  Female 52.08%
  White 80.41%, Black 9.04%, Other 10.55%
  Freshman 27%, Sophomore 23%
  Junior 22.2%, Senior 27.8

• Faculty 1,308
  Male 66.28%  Female 33.72%
  White 82.72%, Black 3.13%, Other 14.15%
Critical Case Sampling (Patton)

- A variant of expert sampling sometimes referred to as judgment sampling.
- Sample represent various points or stages.
- Allows for a guided focus and highlights points.
- Focal Points for this study will be each level of coursework.
  
  For Example 1xxx, 2xxx, 3xxx, 4xxx

- Two sets of extant data will be related to each point. One that represents prior operative procedure and one that is representative of the administrative decision
- Used three to five sets of data in each case. Each representative of a treatment or managerial change during a given semester
Population Sample

- Faculty Respondents
  N=15 (3 refused to respond)
  46.8% of department teaching faculty represented, N= 32
- Five Cases
  6 faculty members
  Multiple semesters
Case Size
(Case Size will varied with class level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25 students</td>
<td>50-100 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple sections</td>
<td>Single section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Only</td>
<td>Instructor + TA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Design

- Gather Extant Data
- Distribute Questionnaire, addressed reluctance to participate, completed clarification as needed
- Analyzed Questionnaire by developing common themes using Spradley’s model. Utilized informant.
- Implemented Yin and Heald’s case study/case survey design related to policy analysis.
- Draw Conclusions
Development and Analysis of Domains ‘Common Threads’

- Domains occur from recurring themes
- Domains can be “Core” or “Peripheral” (Pennington)
- Domains are a means to organize relationships
- Identified Domains can be used to facilitate change.
Spradley’s Relationships

- Strict Inclusion (X is a kind of Y)
- Cause and Effect (X is a result of Y)
- Rationale (X is a reason for doing Y)
- Function (X is used for Y)
- Means-End (X a way of doing Y)
- Sequence (X is a step (stage) in Y)
- Attribution (X is an attribute (characteristic) of Y)

Referred to as common themes due to the need to report questionnaire data as one set. Could be linked to individual responses and cases if confidentiality were not an issue.
Questionnaire

1. General Descriptive Information Number, Level, Size, ..... (Question was not reported due to confidentiality)
2. What skill sets or background should students have prior to taking this course? (prerequisites)
3. What significant changes if any have occurred in your course over the past 24 months?
4. Who/what caused these changes?
5. Were the changes viewed as positive or negative? Explain.
6. Did the changes impact student performance? If so, explain.
7. Did the changes impact your teaching style? If so, explain.
8. Were there any implications personally i.e. health related issues etc.
Examples of Questionnaire Responses

- (4) Need to save money
- (5) Offering Assistance rather than condemnation
- (6) ‘Super sized classes.
- (7) Abused
- (7) Game show host, beggar
- (7) Failure
- (8) Medical Complications
- (8) Financial Burden
- (8) Acceptance

() denotes question number
Cases – Overview of Managerial Change

- Case 1 – Increase and Decrease of Class Size
- Case 2 – Increase of Size and utilization of Additional Assistance
- Case 3 – Increase in Contact Hours
- Case 4 – Assignment of Multiple Faculty
- Case 5 – Continuous Growth to support Administrative Agenda
Case Findings

• Case 1 – Mass withdrawals, email, grade appeals
• Case 2 – Power of Perception
• Case 3 – Mastery of content and fair reporting
• Case 4 – Mass exit, specific units. Power struggle
• Case 5 – Flagship vs. Performance
How are administrative decisions viewed?  
(Answered using questionnaire responses)

The majority of respondents felt as though the chair of some higher authority was responsible for the changes they encountered. Often it was felt that these changes were financially motivated. (4)

Some also felt like it was difficult to get the administrator to listen or that too much time lapsed before a decision was made. This idea was threaded through more than one question similar to reference to fiscal matters (5)

All faculty agreed that the decisions made by the impacted their teaching (professional) and personal lives. (7,8)
Which managerial factors significantly impact teacher effectiveness and limit student performance?

(Answered Using Case Data Sets and participant responses)

- Allocation of resources
- Student Teacher Ratio
- Willingness to Academic Problem Solve
- Perception
Is there evidence to support a correlation between administrative decisions and accountability/performance?

Yes

Individual Case References
Professional Gain from Completion of Study

- Initial Endeavor
- Each Stage
- Limitations
- Replication
- Publishing
- Application
VITA
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