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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore whether the decision-making authority of School Improvement Councils (SIC), and/or Parent Advisory Councils (PAC) address and affect personnel, program, and budget-building policy. The basic research question was, “How do shared governance councils operate?”

This study approached the problem through mixed methodology strategies of research, using both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Phase One of the study involved quantitative methods that gathered data from a large sample of teachers and administrators. Phase Two involved qualitative interviews of a teacher, an administrator, and a parent, that helped to confirm the initial findings and provide more in-depth detail.

This study was a replication of a study done by Malen and Ogawa in 1988. They discovered that a pecking order in decision-making influence existed in which principals controlled the decisions of the councils and are often joined by teachers in an attempt to exclude parents.

In comparing this study to Malen and Ogawa’s (1988), two differences were noted. First, administrators are beginning to relinquish some decision-making powers, as indicated by the official enactment of decisions in the
area of programming. Second, parents are beginning to be included, rather than excluded, in the decision-making arenas. Evidence of this lies in the fact that all eight of the sample schools have parents on the SICs and four of the eight schools have implemented Parent Advisory Councils.

Qualitative results indicated that the most significant impact that SICs have in the shared decision making process is in the overall programming area. Budget and personnel were topics of discussion at SIC meetings; however, no official enactments occurred. Thus, the researcher found that as the influence of teachers and parents on building-based councils increased, there was an increase in the success of school policies affected by council decisions in the area of programming.
CHAPTER ONE: NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

This study was designed to explore building-based councils' decision-making authority to address and affect school policy outcomes. This study investigated the relationship between school policy outcomes and the decision-making influence of parents and teachers as members of building-based councils.

Chapter One includes the background and nature of the problem, research questions, an explanation of the problem's importance, and the organization of the study.

Background

Building-based governance promotes decentralization and democratic educational policy-making as a strategy to renew school systems. Although there are different definitions of building-based governance (Marburger, 1988; Mojkowski and Fleming, 1988; and Lindelow, 1981a), the approach involves developing formal structures (committees, councils, etc.) made up of building administrators, teachers, and parents at each school. Often termed school councils, these bodies become the primary place for shared decision making (Berges, 1993; Rogers, 1993; and Stribling, 1993), and are the representative boards for "professional-patron
determination" of school-level policy (Malen and Ogawa, 1985).

Four studies that refer to this research problem include: 1) Malen and Ogawa's (1985) research, which provides a critical test of the ability of site-based governance arrangements to change decision-making relationships; 2) Lucas, Brown, and Markus' (1991) study that addresses the issue of who was in charge as well as principals' perceptions of their own decision-making autonomy; 3) Stribling's (1993) dissertation study that investigates school-based management implementation on school personnel, parents, and students in regard to: budgeting, personnel selection, teacher morale, and campus management; and 4) Rogers' (1993) dissertation study that sought to ascertain the experiences in and enthusiasm for mandated participatory decision making among the teachers serving on elementary school councils in Kentucky. These studies deal with teacher and/or parent decision-making authority to address and affect personnel, program, and budget building-based policy.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore whether the decision-making authority of SICs (School Improvement Councils) and/or PACs (Parent Advisory Councils) address
and affect personnel, program, and budget building policy and to what extent.

Nature of the Problem

Literature revealed inconsistencies of building-based councils' decision-making authority to address and affect school policy outcomes. With this in mind, the research problem was, "How do shared governance councils operate?" The research problem further sought to answer, "Was there a relationship between school policy outcomes and the decision-making influence of parents and teachers on building-based councils?"

Following Malen and Ogawa's (1988) earlier research, which described how shared governance councils operate, this study sought to address several questions using two phases of research. In analyzing the statistics from the School Faculty Survey (Appendix C) in Phase One of this study, the researcher sought to: 1) provide a general profile of the building-based councils studied; 2) gauge their compliance with central office regulations; 3) identify the types of topics addressed by the councils; and, 4) estimate their impact on school policy.

In Phase Two of this study, the researcher captured a detailed description of council dynamics. Therefore, case
studies of select councils were conducted in order to obtain this information.

Phase One: Survey Questions

1. Did schools use shared governance as defined 1) by school board policy, 2) the central office guidelines and 3) each building-based councils' purpose? Were the elementary, intermediate, and secondary schools in compliance?

2. What issues did they address? Were the councils involved in personnel, program, and budget-building policy?

3. What impact did the councils have on building-based decision making? Were the councils able to achieve or progress toward their stated goals?

Phase Two: Interview Questions

1. Who participated on school site councils?

2. What issues were addressed?

3. How were issues processed?

4. What was the perceived impact of the SICs (School Improvement Councils) and PACs (Parent Advisory Councils) on building-based outcome decisions and on educator-parent relationships?

5. What factors were associated with the SICs' (School Improvement Councils) and PACs' (Parent Advisory
Councils' ability to affect school policy outcomes and change relationships between educators and parents?

**Explanation of Problem's Importance**

With change in the world of education, administrators must be willing to depart from the "traditional" paradigm of autocratic leadership and continuously search for ways to improve the educational process through the stated demands of greater involvement (Oswald, 1995; Berge, 1993; Cotton, 1992; Lucas, Brown, and Markus, 1991; and the National Governor's Association, 1991). Through school-based management, both teachers and parents develop ownership in the mission of the school. Parents become partners in the educational process as school-based management provides for increased involvement. Involving school staff in personnel selection, budgeting, and program improvement increases professionalism and allows the campus to meet the needs of students more effectively (Rogers, 1993; Stribling, 1993; Malen and Ogawa, 1985). In a time when money is tight, some Louisiana schools in East Baton Rouge parish responded by using site-based management to improve learning conditions with creative budgeting ("Budgeting Plan Works", 1994).

Further research significantly contributed knowledge related to the study of site-based governance by...
incorporating data obtained from more recent case studies. Additional research helped to determine the extent to which building-based councils composed of teachers or parents employed their decision-making influence to address and affect personnel, program, and budget policy outcomes.

Limitations of the Study

This research study was limited by the following aspects in its design, which could threaten its validity:

1. The results of the study were contingent on the most feasible population statistics available during the 1997-1998 school year.

2. The results of the study were restricted to one school district, and some findings were particular to it.

Organization of the Study

In Chapter One the nature of the problem under investigation is presented along with the purpose of the study, the research questions, explanation of the problem's importance, and the organization of the study. The independent variables were: 1) format of participatory decision-making arrangements: SICs (School Improvement Councils) composed of teachers and an administrator, and PACs (Parent Advisory Councils) composed of parents and an administrator and, 2) process
qualities of teachers, administrators and parents on these councils as they interact (actor interactions). The dependent variables were the outcome effects of school policy regarding personnel, program, and budget.

Chapter Two contains a representative review of the literature dealing with participatory decision making with regard to teachers and community involvement/parents and building-based decision making/management including council membership and authority. Chapter Two gives various models and research findings.

In Chapter Three, the methodology of the research includes a description of the sample, data collection, design of the instrument, validity and reliability studies and data analysis/treatment.

In Chapter Four, the quantitative statistics from the School Faculty Survey are reported, graphed, and discussed. Chapter Five states the results from the teacher, administrator, and parent in-depth interviews. These results are also graphed and discussed.

Chapter Six summarizes the findings of the quantitative and qualitative data, makes conclusions, provides rationale, and suggests recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Does the decision-making authority of SICs (School Improvement Councils)-teacher dominant, and/or PACs (Parent Advisory Councils) address and affect personnel, program, and budget-building policy? Within this section, participatory decision making, school-level decision making, and management are reviewed as elements of various change strategies that have emerged in education over the last 30 years. Computer searches were conducted to identify sources of information from the Educational Research Information Clearinghouse and Internet. Also consulted were bibliographies and literature reviews, and Dissertation Abstracts International. These searches centered on participatory decision making and building-level decision making and the related areas of decentralization, community participation, and school councils.

Related literature of primary and secondary research, reports, and data about educational statistics and testing are available. Primary research on record utilizes a conceptual frame for gauging influence on decision making, which combines political (dynamic process inputs converted into outputs) and organizational perspectives (interplay
of influence during situational change among interdependent actors who hold divergent preferences and priorities and command different power sources in site-based councils). Further investigation revealed that there was also a vast amount of secondary research regarding empowerment of teachers and/or community/parents in schools with building-based management. The review also produced eleven reports that examined school site management. Data pertaining to educational statistics and testing incorporate the methods of Murphy, 1991; Borg and Gall, 1989; Yin, 1984; and Patton, 1980.

This chapter discusses the general literature on participatory decision making, with regard to teacher and community involvement/parents. Then, it focuses on decision-making involvement through building-based councils' decision-making/management attributes of membership and authority in terms of definition, rationale, and outcomes.

**Participatory Decision Making**

**Teachers**

Conley and Bacharach (1990) found that the key issue in school site management is the participation of the school's professional staff in management rather than site-based decisions about resources.
According to the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching (1988), teachers working together must be free to exercise their professional judgment. This exercise of power gives the teachers the ability to influence decisions concerning such things as: the materials and instructional methods to be used; the staffing structure to be employed; the organization of the school day; the assignment of students; the consultants to be used; and the allocation of resources available to the school.

In recent decades, both the public and private sectors have been challenged to increase the participation of their employees in the decision-making process. Marburger (1988) contends that all parties affected by a decision are to be involved in participatory decision making. Viewed from the teacher perspective, Duke, Showers, and Imber (1980) define participatory decision making as "teacher involvement in the process by which school decisions are made" (p. 93).

Speaking specifically to participatory decision making in educational settings, Hoy and Miskel (1982) summarize research in the following way. Teacher participation in decision making is an important factor in the morale and enthusiasm of teachers; is positively
related to the individual teacher's satisfaction with the profession of teaching; is preferred by teachers when principals provide them the option to be involved; has consequences that vary from situation to situation; involves the need for roles and functions to be varied according to the nature of the problem; is affected by both internal and external factors; and, proves to be more effective than the limited quality of the typical administrator decision. In order to maximize the positive contributions of shared decision making and to minimize the negative consequences, the administrator needs to answer the following questions: a) Under what conditions should teachers be involved? b) To what extent and how should teachers be involved? c) How should the decision-making group be constituted? d) What role is most effective for the principal?

From the viewpoint of school administration, Lindelow, Coursen, and Mazzarella (1981) suggest four advantages of Participatory Decision Making: 1) It is the method of governance most consistent with democratic principles; 2) it promotes better decisions and more effective implementation of those decisions; 3) it improves communication within a school by providing formal channels; and 4) it improves employee satisfaction and
school climate. Similarly, Maxcy (1995) states, "For
democratic institutions such as schools to prosper, they
must represent the larger democratic form of living within
the social space of the schools" (p. 98).

Although the literature speaks to many positive
effects of Participatory Decision Making, there are
disadvantages reported as well. Yukl (1981) suggests six
possible limitations. Extreme use of participative
procedures: usually requires more time than autocratic
decisions; raises subordinate expectations about
influencing other decisions; may cause a manager to be
perceived as lacking in expertise, initiative, and self-
confidence; may result in lower quality decisions if
subordinates lack relevant expertise, are apathetic about
participating, or have goals and values incompatible with
those of the leader; diffuses responsibility and makes it
difficult to assign responsibility for success and blame
for failure; requires a great deal of skill on the part of
the leader to be used effectively.

Hansen (1988) notes that it is not always best to
make decisions close to the level of implementation. At
times, he contends, decisions should be removed from the
point of action because people are so completely immersed
in the problem that they cannot view it objectively. He
also feels that consensus decisions, the most advocated format for participatory decision making, may not be superior to other forms of decision making, such as majority vote, since individualism may be somewhat stifled and the most perceptive thinking moderated by group pressure.

Duke et al. (1980) discovered five disadvantages in participatory decision making for teachers: increased time demands (time devoted to participation in decision-making processes is time not devoted to teaching); loss of autonomy; risk of collegial disfavor; risk of jeopardizing the collective bargaining position of teachers at the district level; threats to career development due to likelihood of becoming known as a troublemaker or a malcontent.

Speaking to the dilemmas of building-based councils participatory decision making in the workplace, Kanter (1981) discusses eight limitations of which six seem especially pertinent to the field of education: the problem of releasing power on the part of the managers; increased time demands in making decisions; the knowledge gap between workers and managers; the internal politics of teams--democratic procedures are not ensured; high expectations of the new systems or relationships not
being fulfilled; and, all organizational problems not disappearing.

In summary, the literature indicates that there has been an increase of teachers involved in the process of making school decisions. Providing teachers opportunities to share in formulating policies is viewed as the most positive aspect of participatory decision making. Involvement in this manner increases the morale of teachers and promotes enthusiasm along with building teachers' satisfaction with the profession of teaching. Research also suggests that involving teachers in making decisions will improve the quality of the decisions made and the effectiveness of their implementation within the schools.

The issues of the shift of power in organizations and the increased time demands on participants are cited as negative aspects of participatory decision making. Other disadvantages noted include: lower quality decisions if subordinates lack relevant expertise; and, ineffectiveness of decisions and apathy in participation as a result of an unskilled leader.

Community Involvement/Parents

Popkewitz, Pierce and Apker cited in Clark (1979) that there is a belief that individuals should assume
responsibility for decision making in institutions that affect their lives on a day-to-day basis. Human development is closely tied to the ability of people to actually participate in their community life. Parents and students are more interested in their particular school than in the district as a whole. Although people do not generally have confidence in education, they become enthusiastic about their local school. According to David (1996), as public support for public education diminishes, community members' engagement in their local schools offers the most promise for rebuilding this waning support.

Another element is injected into decision making when lay citizens become involved in the process. Although the United States has a long history of lay control of schools through boards of education, recent decades have seen a push for more lay involvement and a shift of the focus of policy and decision making from these elite school boards to school sites. Pierce (1977) found during the 1960s and 1970s the surge of interest in participation in schools was especially evident in large cities, such as New York and Detroit, where citizens felt that the schools were highly unsuccessful and unresponsive to the needs of their students.
The lack of lay influence on public education was a recurring theme in the literature and increased centralization became a growing practice. Marburger (1980) writes of the typical authority structure in public school systems, and depicts administrators at the tip of the power line with teacher organizations, school boards, courts, legislatures, state departments, citizens, and students exerting influence in the stated order. He warns that if power remains in the hands of the few, the responses of the powerless will be predictable: perceived apathy; anger, confrontation, demands, and taking on of the establishment (parent unions); and, vouchers, tuition tax credits, irrational "back to basics", and the flight to home schooling.

Because of the heightened awareness of the failings of education and the feelings of helplessness, outcast groups demanded community participation and control. Writing in the field of public administration, Herbert, as cited in Wiles (1974), argues that participation in decision making: may be essential to offset the feelings of helplessness, frustration, powerlessness, and bitterness in our public schools; will challenge traditional management values and beliefs regarding efficiency and the need for hierarchy; and must fully
incorporate *citizen* perceptions of the program's effectiveness.

Over the decades, advocates of parent involvement in school decision making have discussed its positive effects on school policies. Research reports (David, 1996, and Reddyk, 1994) have repeatedly shown that school authorities must acknowledge the powerful influence that parental involvement has on student achievement and success. In order to establish genuine partnerships, the parents must be satisfied with the school, and must reinforce its aims. In addition, since parents and community members are the true clients of the school and its resources, they should therefore be entitled to participate effectively in its operation (Marburger, 1980).

Stated in another way, Clark (1979) indicates that schools should respond directly to consumer demands, i.e. to parents and citizens for the benefit of their children. Thomas (1980) notes that involving parents in building-based decision making "will increase support, provide the schools with important ideas, and make parents accountable for helping the schools execute their many jobs" (p. 2). Berges (1993) contends that a cycle of positive effects will begin when citizens are involved in building-based
decision making/management by first increasing their satisfaction with the school, which will increase their willingness to work toward the success of the school and contribute tax monies, which will increase citizen attraction to the schools, thereby, increasing their involvement.

However, research findings have not always supported these positive effects of community participation in building-based decision making/management. Conway (1984) summarizes several such studies in his article. Cotton (1992) stated that participation on formal decision-making bodies does not insure more favorable parental attitudes. According to Thomas (1980), increased parental participation leads to increased school support only if the parents are positive about the participation process. Conley, and Bacharach (1990), in their research findings, determined that although most participants feel increased self-worth and personal growth, those who take active roles over a long period of time do not report more positive feelings toward schools than those who do not. Many acquire negative feelings, especially toward administrators. Finally, McKenzie (1991) found that there is some evidence that site-based management, although limited and sketchy, may, under favorable conditions,
produce improvements in student learning and school climate.

After surveying advisory council members in schools throughout Florida, Fisher (1979) reports that members are not involved in budgeting or staff evaluation and that they seldom succeed in getting changes made. Gittel (1979) notes that, although Community School Boards in New York City are given power over curriculum, they have had minimal involvement in basic education programs. Where involvement has been encouraged and training provided, however, results have been positive.

Some writers argue that professionals have designed citizen participation to guarantee a lack of true involvement of citizens and to avoid accountability for their actions. For example, Popkewitz (1979) argues that "Much of the effort to decentralize schools in New York can be viewed as an attempt to make government seem benevolent without providing concrete changes in the actual control of schools" (p. 60). In 1971 Andes conducted a study of the organizational structure of school systems by surveying local school administrators of schools in two large U.S. cities. Results of their study implied that, for citizen participation, local schools are closed systems of professional decision making. It was
reported that the concept of local school community participation has three different operational forms. The forms included were: participation was allowed; participation was perceived as outside attacks to be guarded against; and, participation was viewed as a political alliance for the principal to counteract the existing institutional structure and authority (Cited in Wiles, 1974).

Almost two decades later Malen and Ogawa, (1988) found the following patterns of influence, as exerted by formally sanctioned site-based governance councils in Salt Lake City, Utah. First, although the site councils were authorized policymakers, they functioned as ancillary advisors and pro forma endorsers. Second, teachers and parents were granted parity, but principals and professionals controlled the partnerships. Third, although teachers and parents had access to decision-making arenas, their inclusion has maintained, not altered, the decision-making relationships typically and traditionally found in schools. Thus, a pecking order in decision-making influence was discovered in which principals control the decisions of the councils and were often joined by teachers in an attempt to exclude parents.
In a study of six school-based improvement programs distributed throughout the United States, David and Peterson (1984) found that teachers and administrators present a united front. They used the group as a means of keeping parents informed rather than for the intended purpose of identifying problems and decision solutions, especially in the area of instruction.

Alluto and Belasco (1972) conducted a study to observe and hypothesize about the school-community conflict phenomena. School personnel and community members were asked who they thought should have control over a series of economic, administrative, and educational issues. The researchers concluded there is clear potential for conflict between school and community groups concerning the distribution of authority, especially with regard to economic issues. In general, the community desires greater control for itself and less for school personnel than school personnel desire.

Some researchers have pushed teachers to the front of this professional/patron debate. Baron (1981) notes that "the involvement of laymen in matters of intimate professional concern...is seen as constituting a threat to the professionalism of the teacher, since it implies that his knowledge and skill is so unremarkable that it can be
appraised by others who do not share either his training or experience" (p. 18). He and Jennings (1981) insist that teacher unions fight citizen involvement because it threatens their unified power to bargain and the changes they bargained to gain.

On an individual basis, Becher (1986) notes that researchers have found teachers reluctant to encourage parent involvement because they are uncertain about several issues. The first concern is about how to involve parents and still maintain their role as specialized "experts." Second, they are anxious about how to balance their concern for the group of children against a personalized concern for each individual child, which would be expected if parents were more involved. Third, they question whether parents will keep commitments, refrain from sharing confidential information, and avoid being overly critical.

Although loss of autonomy is often cited as a cost of parental involvement, Duke et al. (1980) insist that parental involvement should not assume a lessening of teacher authority. When teachers object to the thought of giving parents extensive decision-making authority, it may be due to the simple fact that teachers themselves lack such authority, at least at the school level. When
parents and teachers form effective coalitions to press for change, it can be argued that school administrators benefit directly from situations in which teachers and parents compete for involvement in school decision making. Administrators can maintain their own authority by pursuing or accepting a divide and rule policy.

Elmore and Associates (1991) discuss the growing tensions in schools as being the restructuring and emphasis on technical education. They advocate the use of scientific knowledge to structure teaching and learning. A second model, the professional, emphasizes the central role of teachers as professionals who exercise both systematic and judgmental knowledge in their work. A third model, the client, emphasizes the success of schools in terms of their ability to meet the needs of their consumers. Elmore indicates that the first two models gain their power from people with expertise in education, while the client model gains its power from parents and students. Although there does not have to be conflict between the groups, Elmore feels that tensions will arise over the content of pedagogy. He also feels that where parents and professionals are successful in overcoming this tension and in restructuring their schools, significant gains will be made.
Fullan (1982) speaks to the use of community power to stop innovation in the schools. Open education is cited as an example of an ambiguous innovation that was often implemented without involving communities, and which died quickly in many places when teachers could not explain what they were doing. Gross and Gross (1971, p. 95) "launched the focus on 'failed implementation', a classic example of disregarding the community, adopting progressive undefined innovations, and paying the price—failed and eventually abandoned innovation". Often, however, this censorship only occurs in communities where parents are educated and able to demonstrate their efforts to fight inappropriate changes.

As with teacher involvement in decision making, the question concerning community involvement in building-based decision making/management is not "Involvement—yes or no?", but "Involvement to what extent or under what circumstances?" (Rogers, 1993, p. 181). Hansen and Marburger (1988) describe parent participation as falling on a continuum from those who will come to school only when their child is in serious trouble to those who are ready to run the schools, with most parents falling appropriately somewhere in between. Davies (1980b) offers the following rules to assist in evaluating the
circumstances of community participation in the schools: participation must be equitably distributed across race, class, and sex; policies must be inventive, flexible, and sensitive to local context; communication between professionals and the community must be enhanced; a balance must be maintained between local and societal interests; and, citizens must be involved in issues that are significant to them. In addition to the above, Mann (1974) argues that successful participation requires that: citizens need to be involved at an appropriate point in the chronology of the decision, e.g. not when the issue has already been decided; all of the stakeholders in the school must be included and must be able to express their interests; communication must flow freely from the school to all of them; participants from the community have a right to express legitimate opposition to functions of the school; and, the principal must actively support the participation of the community in the school. Bartunek and Keys (1979) suggest that a number of factors determine the relationship between participation and the quality and acceptance of the decision including 1) the characteristics of the decision under consideration and 2) the reasons individuals desire to participate. The following is a summary of the models of participatory
decision making as described in the literature reviewed and then research findings reported.

**Models**

Barnard (1964) notes that subordinates have a "zone of indifference" within which administrator's decisions will be accepted without question. Based on this assumption, Bridges (1967) proposes that 1) as individuals are involved in participatory decision making located in their "zone of acceptance" (Barnard's "zone of indifference"), participation will be less effective and 2) as individuals are involved in participatory decision making outside their "zone of acceptance", participation will be more effective. To identify the "zone of acceptance", Bridges suggests two tests: 1) the test of relevance--Are the personal stakes high for the individual?--and 2) the test of expertise--Are the matters within the scope of experience and competence of the individual? Therefore, in decisions directly relating to or affecting a teacher/parent, that individual will actively participate in the decision-making process more effectively if it personally involves him. In areas of the teacher/parent expertise, knowledge and experience will encourage active participation in decision making.
Working in the field of educational administration, Owens and Lewis (1976) expanded Barnard's model to a triad of zones: 1) the "zone of sensitivity", which includes areas in which individuals have a personal stake; 2) the "zone of ambivalence", which involves areas in which individuals have some concern but not a great deal, and 3) the "zone of indifference", which includes areas in which individuals accept administrators' decisions without question.

Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) proposed a model for organizational behavior under uncertainty—"A garbage can model of organizational choice." The focus of this complex model is organizations, such as schools, which have unclear goals, uncertain means of achieving their goals, and changing participants in decision making. The part of the model dealing with member willingness to participate in decision making states that members will be more willing to spend the time needed for the process if they see participation as one of their routine duties, if they assume that their participation will make a difference in the decision, if the outcome is important to them, and/or if they have nothing better to do.

Newman (1993) identifies three domains of organizational decisions: technical, managerial, and
community or institutional. Qualitatively different kinds of decisions are made within each domain: 1) teaching, which is related directly to the core operation of the organization, is at the technical level; 2) action to direct efforts of groups of teachers toward a common goal or to acquire resources are examples of managerial tasks; and 3) decisions related to the larger social system, such as seeking financial support for the school from the state or community, are at the institutional level.

Research Findings

Using Belasco and Alutto, Best (1975) found that 50% of the teachers surveyed were not involved in participatory decision making to the degree that they preferred, and that very few teachers participated more than they desired.

Conway (1984), using Belasco and Alutto's situations, found that "the relationship between perceived and desired participation in school decisions and the perceptions of the organization appears curvilinear, with the peak of the curve occurring where present and desired levels of participation are about equal. Both deprivation and saturation detract from the individual's satisfaction with the organization". (p. 23)
Knoop and O'Reilly (1977) found that teachers perceive the principal to be the sole decision maker to a larger degree than they desire, and that teachers express a strong desire for group involvement in decision making using the parliamentarian or participant-determining procedure.

Lucas, Brown, and Markus (1991) findings, in their study of principals' perceptions of site-based management and teacher empowerment, revealed that respondents believe they have enough autonomy over instructional personnel, subject matter, and instructional methods. The authors concluded that it appears that the degree to which principals are willing to share decision making with teachers is directly proportional to the perceptions of their own discretion and decision making. Attempts to restructure the current decision-making process or change the administrative culture of decision making will require time and interventions that differ significantly from current practice in Southeastern states.

Duke et al. (1980) conducted a survey in which teachers were polled concerning their involvement in: 1) instructional coordination, 2) curriculum development, 3) professional development, 4) evaluation, 5) school improvement, 6) personnel, 7) rules and discipline,
8) general administration, and 9) policy making. Most teachers in this study indicated that they are not eager to participate in school-level decision making and that they derive little satisfaction when they do participate. From their data the researchers concluded that, while involvement in participatory decision making offers teachers significant potential benefits, the opportunities for participation must provide teachers actual influence over decisions, not merely involvement.

In 1988 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching conducted a survey of 20,000 teachers in all 50 states to determine their involvement in: 1) choosing textbooks and instructional materials, 2) shaping the curriculum, 3) setting standards for student behavior, 4) tracking students into special classes, 5) designing staff development and inservice programs, 6) setting promotion and retention policies, 7) deciding school budgets, 8) evaluating teacher performance, 9) selecting new teachers, and 10) selecting new administrators. From this study, the Carnegie Foundation determined that the levels of teacher involvement did vary widely from state to state on each of these issues. They concluded that there were not any specific or significant findings as a result of their surveys.
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching reported on Ernest Boyer's High School study in 1983. They concluded that teachers were not sufficiently involved in making critical decisions, nor did they have little influence over education procedures. Teachers may help choose textbooks and shape curriculum, but most do not help select faculty and administrators at their schools. They, also, were not asked to participate in such crucial matters as teacher evaluation, staff development, budget, student placement, promotion and retention policies, and standards of student conduct. These results were confirmed by teachers in the Chicago public school system through a survey conducted by Ogletree and McHenry (1990). After a year of locally legislated reform and five years of state legislated reform, teachers reported that no gains had been made with their involvement in decision making. The Consortium on Chicago School Research (1993) also found that in schools with "adversarial politics", conflicts about power tended to dominate discussions, and the schools' ability to focus on improvement efforts was greatly diminished. Taylor and Bogotch's (1994) study of a large metropolitan Louisiana district indicated that school-based decisions consistently approved at the district level in prior years
using the participatory decision-making process are now being overturned.

In summary, although reformers continue to urge schools to respond to teacher needs, community needs must be met by involving citizens in decision-making processes. Evidence suggested that in recent decades professionals have blocked citizen involvement in the core issues of schooling. Due to the lack of research involving parents/community members, positive outcomes of community involvement in building-based decision making/management were difficult to prove. Therefore, the question remains, "Would there be a positive impact on schools if councils operated as intended?" If they did operate as intended, then the councils need to understand whether they are a decision-making body or an advisory one and their roles in site-based management.

**Building-based Decision Making and Management**

Although building-based decision making and management can be tracked back to the 1960s (New York City, Detroit, Wisconsin) and 1970s (Florida, California, and Salt Lake City), and even to 1954 in one district studied by Clune and White (1988), the practice has become increasingly popular in the last decade. The amount of literature on building-based decision making and
management is growing rapidly. For example, a search of the ERIC files from 1980 until the present yielded 400 entries as compared to 20 entries from 1970-79. The literature, however, describes such a wide range of practices that it is difficult to determine a common vocabulary or to isolate standard characteristics, practices, or consequences. While different terms may indicate like models of decision making and/or management, the same term may be defined differently by various researchers and practitioners. Seemingly interchangeable terms include site-based decision making, participatory decision making, collegial management, school-based budgeting, school-site management, decentralized management, administrative decentralization, and others. In addition, building-based decision making and management is closely associated with teacher empowerment, school autonomy, school improvement, and restructuring. Although school based management is the most commonly used term in the literature, I have decided to use building-based decision making/management as the model term in this work, since it includes both decentralized management and participatory decision making defined in a majority of the currently used models.
Definition

Lindelow (1981a) defines building-based decision making and management as "a system of educational administration in which the school is the primary unit of educational decision making . . . . Most decisions regarding expenditures, curricula, and personnel are made by school-site personnel in consultation with parents, students, and other community members". (p. 98) He emphasizes the reduction of the dominance of the central office and the leadership role of the principal; numerous other researchers (Goodlad, 1990; Clune and White, 1988; Lieberman, 1988; Maeroff, 1988; David and Peterson, 1984) highlight enhanced teacher access. Berges, 1993; David, 1989; and Guthrie, 1986 highlight both teacher and parent access to and influence over decisions.

In his 1988 book, One School at a Time, Carl Marburger states that school based management differs from the traditional way of running schools in that a number of policy and budgeting decisions are made at the school building level rather than by the school board or the central administration of the school district. This represents a unique opportunity for planning to be conducted "bottom up", rather than the traditional "top down." The other essential feature of true school based
management is that all those involved with that local school will participate in making those decisions. While this alternative form of school governance provides the principal with increased responsibilities and authority, it also gives parents and teachers the right to participate in important school decisions. This call for participatory decision making and decentralized management is repeated throughout the literature.

According to Mojkowski and Fleming (1988), building-based decision making and management "is a process for devolving decision-making responsibility to the stakeholders at the school building level" (p. 3) and that the parts of that process are 1) the involvement of a wide group of stakeholders, 2) the empowerment of those stakeholders to make and implement decisions, 3) the restructuring of curriculum and instruction, and 4) the reporting of evaluation results to the consumers. They advance four fundamental assumptions that form the basis of building-based decision making and management systems: 1) the schools are the focus of change and improvement, 2) the authority of the school should be expansive, 3) the teachers should be treated as professionals, and 4) the primary focus of schools is on learning and the learning process.
In a systematic study of building-based decision making and management programs, David and Peterson (1984, pp. 70-84) found three common, central features: 1) focus on the school as a whole, 2) involvement of teachers, and 3) elements of rational planning. They contend that building-based decision making/management is broader in scope than earlier approaches to decentralized management and that the authority structure of the whole district, not just the school, must be changed. Elmore et al. (1991) expand this thinking by noting specific changes in the size and roles of central office staff that need to be made under building-based decision making/management.

Malen et al. (1989b) view building-based decision making/management as "a formal alternation of governance structures, as a form of decentralization that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement and relies on the redistribution of decision-making authority as the primary means through which improvements might be stimulated and sustained" (p. 2) and specify three features. First, some formal authority to make decisions in the central domains of budget, personnel, and program is delegated to the school site. Second, this formal authority may be delegated to the principal or distributed among principals, teachers, parents, and
others. In most cases, the formal authority to make decisions is broadly distributed. A formal structure (council, committee, team, board) often composed of principals, teachers, parents, and at times, students and community residents is created so that these actors can be directly involved in school-wide decision making. Third, while the authority granted site participants may be circumscribed by existing statutes, regulations or contractual agreements, site participants are afforded substantial discretion.

Rationale

The rationale for establishing building-based decision making/management rests on the primary assumptions that decisions should be made at the lowest possible level in an organization and that they should be made with the input of those affected by them (English, 1989). Hansen and Marburger (1988) offer several assumptions as they apply to schools. 1) People can be trusted. Those interested in and responsible for the education of children hold the welfare of those children in high regard. 2) People are more likely to change when they have a voice in the change process. 3) Without bureaucratic interference, decisions are made more swiftly at the local level, and involving those affected. 4) It
is easier to change people's behavior than to alter their beliefs. If the structure of an organization is changed so that risk-taking and innovation are encouraged, people will behave accordingly. 5) When people work together on common concerns, they lose the sense of being from separate camps. 6) The resources for change and improvement are already in the school community. All we must do is release the energy that is now contained. 7) Parents are important contributors to the educational success of their children. In addition, Henderson (1988) argues that those held accountable for results should share in decision making and that those involved in decision making are more committed to decisions than those who are not.

Drawing primarily from Malen et al. (1989a), Henderson (1988), Guthrie (1986), Van Meter and Scollay (1984), and Prasch (1984) suggest that building-based decision making/management will: enable site participants, notably teachers and parents, to exert substantial influence on school policy decisions; enhance employee morale and motivation; strengthen the quality of school-wide planning processes; stimulate instructional improvements; foster the development of characteristics
associated with effective schools; and, improve the academic achievement of students.

Additional advantages offered by the American Association of School Administrators concerning building-based decision making/management emphasize that the process: increases the quantity and quality of communications within the school; nurtures leadership among the professional staff; focuses accountability for decisions close to the issue; and, brings financial and instructional resources in line with school goals.

David and Peterson (1984), however, argue that the rationale for building-based decision making/management has more intuitive appeal than strong evidence. People are more likely to change when they have had some voice in the decisions to change and in the way the change is effected. Also, the fact that a school is an organizationally distinct unit of seemingly manageable size plays a part in this argument. Furthermore, building-based decision making/management comes from frustration with previous reforms that have focused on levels other than the school level.

Outcomes

Working for the Center for Policy Research in Education, Clune and White (1988) interviewed people from
over 30 building-based decision making/management programs and drew the following conclusions. Organization and operation of building-based decision making/management programs are very diverse. Budgets are the most often decentralized process, followed by hiring and then curriculum development. The principal is the central figure in building-based decision making/management and he/she must have the support of the superintendent. Teachers allegedly have better access and more influence on decision making. Participants say that both accountability and autonomy are enhanced. However, systematic monitoring of building-based decision making/management is rare. Role changes required of principals and teachers are difficult to make, and training and staff development are inadequate.

From a review of the literature, White (1989) makes these additional observations about building-based decision making/management. Communication among the school staff and community is improved. Staff morale, efficiency, and self-esteem may be enhanced. Power struggles may exist between teachers, parents, and administrators.

In a synthesis of research written by David (1989), the following conclusions are drawn. School faculties
make different decisions about elements of staffing, schedules, and curriculum when they are given actual control over their budgets and relief from restrictions. Teachers report increased job satisfaction and feelings of professionalism when the extra time and energy demanded by planning and decision making are balanced by real authority; conversely, marginal authority coupled with requirements for site councils, plans, and reports result in frustration. School-based management affects the roles of district as well as school staff; to change their roles and relationships, teachers and administrators need extra time and a range of opportunities to acquire new knowledge and skills. The leadership, culture, and support of the district have a far greater impact on the success of school-based management than its operational details. Implementing school-based management involves a lot of pieces and takes a long time, 5 to 10 years; it is premature to pass final judgment on districts in the early stages of implementation.

From their work, Malen et al. (1989b) provide the following summary information contradicting many of the assumptions discussed above. Teachers, and especially parents, do not exert substantial influence on school policy when using building-based decision making
management (See complete discussion in Community Participation section). Although building-based decision making/management may have an initial, positive effect on the morale and motivation of participants, the effect dissipates. Although building-based decision making/management directs attention to planning in schools, there is little evidence that the quality of planning is significantly improved. There is little evidence that building-based decision making/management stimulates the development of implementation of major innovations in instructional programs. There is no consistent link between improved student achievement and building-based decision making/management.

The contradictions of building-based decision making/management can be effectively illustrated by the juxtaposition of statements from M. Donald Thomas, Superintendent of the Salt Lake City, Utah, Schools and Malen along with her associates who did much of their research in the Salt Lake City system. According to Thomas (1980), Parker (1979) stated that school based decision making/management is the best thing that ever happened to public education. Malen et al. (1988) concluded that site-based management does not achieve its stated objective.
Because of the lack of empirical research concerning building-based decision making/management and the difficulties with terminology in stating the advantages and disadvantages as discussed above, it is appropriate to review the issues of school council membership and authority.

Council Membership and Authority

Two critical issues remain with regard to building-based decision making/management: 1) membership of school councils and 2) authority of school councils. As with previous discussions, establishing a common understanding of the term "council" is difficult. Often researchers speak of school/community advisory groups or teacher management teams as school councils although the two are very different in composition and function. In general, early studies focused on school/community advisory councils associated with the decentralization movement, while more recent studies focus on teacher empowerment and/or combined community/professional participation. The Individually Guided Education (IGE) school improvement programs of the 1960's were the first attempts in recent decades to set up councils in which authority for school decisions is shared among administrators, teachers, parents, and students.
Membership

Site-based management plans, in the words of Malen et al. (1990), "could include provisions that school council membership reflect the diversity of the school community and incorporate strategies to enlist participants with different backgrounds, orientations, and points of view" (p. 55).

Hansen (1988), Marburger (1988), and other researchers suggest that non-certified staff, other community members, and students should be involved on school councils and that the size and selection procedure for the councils should be identified by the schools. The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA), specifically identifies membership (one principal, two parents, three teachers) and selection (teachers shall be elected by a majority of the teachers; parents shall be elected by parent members of the parent/teacher organization or, if none exists, the largest group of parents formed for this purpose). The School Reform Act, passed by the Illinois state legislature in November, 1988 and implemented in the summer of 1989, turned Chicago school governance upside down--and, in the process, empowered parents. Rogers (1993) and Harrington (1990) found that school reform in Chicago significantly dilutes the power of the central
administration and school board and places authority for hiring, planning curriculum, and budgeting with local school councils, which are made up of a majority of parents. School-based councils (541 in Chicago) consist of six parents (elected by parents of students in the school), two community representatives elected by area residents), two faculty-elected teachers, and the principal (Rist, 1990).

While Guthrie (1986) contends that an election is essential for the selection of council members, Marburger (1988) outlines several options and suggests that the last two choices in each list are the most representative methods. Teacher Selection Alternatives are: appointment by the principal; appointment by some faculty representatives, such as department heads, faculty council, union representatives, etc.; self-selection--those faculty who express an interest in the concept and a willingness to participate; and, election by the faculty. Parent Selection Alternatives are: appointment by the principal; appointment by members of an existing parent group or legally mandated council; election by the parents or parent group; election of a majority by the parents or parent group with a percentage appointed by those elected or by some other mechanism.
David and Peterson (1984), however, argue that "Requiring elections...is as likely as not to result in a time-consuming arrangement that no more insures representation than self-selection does". On the other hand, they argue that principals should not handpick members for their docility and contend that staff feel better represented when School Improvement Council members are identified with specific constituencies rather than serving at-large. Constituency identification is reflected in the Salt Lake City (Utah) School District plan in which councils are structured differently at the elementary and secondary levels to respond to the structures of the schools.

Henderson (1988) expresses still another view. "(We) recommend self-selection or election by a majority. Appointment by principal or by organization such as a faculty council or parent group can result in charges of favoritism or manipulation". (p. 87)

While Stribling (1993) and Herman (1989) point to the need for representation by all the stakeholders in the school community, Rogers (1993) and Faber (1990) discuss the particular dilemma in doing this with only two parents as prescribed by Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). In addition, they point to the misrepresentation of
stakeholders who are elected and are likely to come from the more popular, visible segments of the community to the exclusion of minority populations.

Studies by Jennings (1981) and Davies (1980a) note that advisory councils have few male, poor, and ethnic minority members. They warn that councils have come to be largely made up of the traditional supporters of the schools and the status quo.

Authority

Malen et al. (1990) report that,

Site-based management plans must specify what authority is delegated to site participants, how that authority is distributed, and the manner in which the discretion of site participants is conditioned and constrained by contractual agreements, by district, state, or federal policies...without this detail, site participants; have no basis for determining what they can and cannot do. (p. 54)

Although there are repeated calls in the literature (Marburger, 1988; Lindelow, 1981b; etc.) for clearer pictures of the roles and functions of school councils, the issue is not easily resolved. Hansen and Marburger (1988) speak of the confused roles of principals and teachers on school councils. They submit that,

The council has the responsibility for setting the goals for the school, advising the staff on implementation of any programs which flow from the goals, and for evaluating the results of the effort. The principal and staff are advisory to
the council in the goal setting and evaluation processes, but are the decision makers on the implementation of the program. (p. 15)

Thus, the principal and teachers on the council are both decision makers and advisors.

Marburger (1988) speaks to the differentiation between school board and school council authority. School boards have the sole responsibility for establishing the district's education policy and this responsibility cannot be delegated to any other individual or group. They can and do delegate the responsibility of implementing those policies. Some of those responsibilities can be delegated to local school principals and to school based management councils. Decker (1977) urges that these delegated responsibilities be clearly described. In an attempt to do this, the Mount Diablo Unified School District developed a decision-making matrix with three categories—"council", "board", and "shared". For example, in the area of the testing program, councils would start specialized testing, boards would adopt testing program policy, and both would share in the discussion of the group testing program. Although this is a rational attempt to sort out the issue, the matrix demonstrates the difficulty in eliminating the "gray areas" in which decision-making authority remains
ambiguous. Bargaining agencies and agreements may also complicate attempts to define these responsibilities.

Researchers, such as Havinghurst (1979) and Davies (1980a), point to the areas of involvement in decision making for school councils. For example, they recommend:

1) setting and evaluating school goals; 2) selecting and evaluating personnel; 3) planning and developing curriculum, extra curriculum, and student services; 4) establishing priorities for building and equipment needs; and, 5) improving school-community relations.

Duke et al. (1980) insist that, not only is the area of involvement important, but that the phase of the process in which involvement begins is also critical. They identify five phases of decision making: deciding to decide; determining the guidelines on which decision making will be made; providing information to assist in the process of reaching a decision; designing a choice or choices; and, expressing a preference for a particular choice. If councils are not involved in the first two phases, the final three phases may become insignificant.

For example, a principal might include only trivial items on a school council agenda and/or might set very narrow guidelines under which the council must operate rendering the council's work unimportant.
Rogers (1993) explains, although the Kentucky Education Reform Act vaguely defines the scope of authority of site-based decision making, in some cases the opposite is true. Hess (1991) found that each Chicago district must set a policy to clarify the scope and method of operation of councils within the district. In the final analysis, the role and function of the school council is defined by the expertise and interest of its members within the context of district and state policy.

**Conceptual Framework**

Political systems theory views educational policy making as an interactive process through which inputs, including demands for change, are converted into outputs, including authoritative decisions. Attention is directed toward relationships among formal actors—the board of education, the superintendent, the building administrator, the building-based councils—at each stage of policy making: issue definition-proposal formulation, alternative consideration, and official enactment. In addition, attention is directed toward the institutional arrangements and environmental conditions that constrain these actor relationships.

In replicating previous research for this study, attention was directed toward relationships among certain formal actors—the building administrator, the building-based councils—at each stage of policy making. Attention was also directed toward the institutional arrangements and environmental conditions that constrain these actor relationships. Therefore, the full conceptual apparatus of the political systems approach was not employed in this study. The political systems approach served two important purposes. First, it was used to clarify the
unit of analysis and integrate the research findings.
While the building-based councils were the focal point, the School Improvement Councils (SICS) composed of building administrators and grade level chairs and Parent Advisory Councils (PACS) composed of parents and administrators, were viewed as a set of actors in a system comprised of multiple, independent actors who translate diverse and conflicting demands into educational policy decisions. Thus findings acquired from an in-depth investigation of one segment of educational policy making did relate to broader dimensions of the process (e.g., policy making in the district, literature on shared governance policies in other settings). Second, it was used to portray context, and describe the policy making environment and institutional features of Louisiana schools. Since building-based councils operate within the boundary of the school district, such a backdrop facilitated the examination of their role and impact.

In accordance with Rogers (1993) and Malen and Ogawa (1985), the systems theory provided a comprehensive overview of policy making, but it was limited in its capacity to uncover the dynamics of the conversion process. Analytical categories drawn from organizational models of participatory decision making described below
were needed to examine the interactions within/among the building-based councils and the interactions between building-based councils and other actors.

Participatory Decision Making (PDM) refers to involvement of two or more actors in the determining of a particular choice or action. In this study building-based councils' decision making/management was examined along the dimensions of: 1) format, 2) process qualities, and 3) outcomes.

Format

This dimension addressed the properties of various internal (administrators and teachers) and external (teachers and administrators with parents) participatory decision-making arrangements for building-based councils. The distinguishing properties included: a) Mandated versus Voluntary--Mandated forms are created by federal-state statutes for local board policies. Voluntary forms are created by teacher or parent request for committee representation. b) Formal versus Informal--Formal types are linked to the administrator through regular meeting schedules. Informal types are linked to the administrator through casual conversations or intermittent meetings. c) Direct versus Indirect--In direct forms, the total group enters into the process. In indirect forms, elected or
appointed representatives act on behalf of a larger constituency.

Process Qualities

This dimension encompassed major aspects of actor interactions, namely: a) Degree of Participation--The degree or extent of an actor's participation may be described in terms of a continuum. At one end, actors have no involvement. They are unaware of or excluded from decision making arenas. At the other end, actors have full involvement. They are able to make authoritative, binding decisions. Between those poles, actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations (Malen and Ogawa, 1988, pp. 251-270). b) Content of Interactions--The content of interactions refers to issue subjects and issue salience. Subject reflects topic areas, such as budget, program, personnel, and facility. Salience reflects topic stakes, that is the intensity of individual or group commitment to the issue. Issues may fall into zones of indifference, acceptance, or contest. Zones of indifference embrace cases where actors do not seek to influence decision making because the issue is not salient; the issue falls in their interests or their expertise. Zones of acceptance embrace cases where actors do not seek to influence decision making because
they grant others the legitimate right to act on the subject. Zones of contest embrace cases where actors attempt to influence decision making because the salience is high and the subject legitimate involvement (Malen and Ogawa, 1988). c) Stage of Involvement--This dimension is identified when participation occurs. Actors may be involved at the issue definition-proposal formulation stage, when problems are defined and approaches are generated. Actors may be involved at a later phase, alternative consideration, the point of selecting from among a set of options. Actors may also be involved at the official enactment phase, when a binding decision is made (Malen and Ogawa, 1988).

Outcomes

This dimension addressed the effect of participatory decision making on the institution. While some have investigated the impact of participation on levels of productivity, acceptance of change, and quality of decisions, this study's concern for outcomes was limited to effects on personnel, program, and budget-building policy.

Involvement of individuals in the decision-making process need not translate into influence in the decision-making process. Malen and Ogawa suggests that influence
can be assessed through an analysis of the degree of involvement (i.e., whether groups discuss, recommend, decide, or affirm decisions of others), the content of involvement (i.e., the salient or core domain areas of personnel, program, and budget); and the stage of involvement (i.e., before or after issues and alternatives have been defined and set).

The conceptual framework assumed that schools could be viewed as political systems that manage diverse constituency demands as well as social organizations which perform specified functions (Bacharach et al., 1990).

Organizational participants could be viewed as political actors who mobilized their resources to promote multiple and competing tasks and responsibilities. Organizational participants had their own aims and they developed strategies to achieve those aims. (Clift, Johnson, Holland, and Veal, 1992; Hansen, 1988; Lindelow, 1981; Duke et al., 1980).

The concept of decision making allowed for the investigation and integration of both organizational and political dynamics. Decisions provided a focal point for observing how actors mobilized power resources to advance their preferences and the manner in which organizational features conditioned and constrained their exercise of

The dynamics of the decision-making process did vary by issue, or more specifically, by the zone in which the issue falls. (Lewis, 1989; Malen and Ogawa, 1985; Cohen et al., 1972; Barnard, 1964).

The comparative case studies design employed by Malen and Ogawa was replicated for specific reasons. First, this design was congruent with the exploratory nature and process emphasis of this research. While participatory decision making did receive considerable scholarly attention, the results of inquiries in industrial and educational settings were limited and contradictory. Literature suggested common sense proposals utilizing issues of content and systematic linkage of critical variables (Newman, 1993). Malen and Ogawa (1985) state, "a clear and convincing overarching theory for predicting significant factors is not provided. Therefore, a systematic search for critical variables is needed." Second, shared governance structures were quite distinctive. They differed from the participatory decision making arrangement typically investigated in that they were permanent, site-encompassing rather than temporary, program-specific councils. Most site-based
councils functioned as advisors, but within the context of local empowerment, some functioned as deciders through collaborative consensus ("Budgeting Plan Works", 1994).

**Summary of the Review of Literature**

After reviewing the above literature, I concluded that the issues surrounding teacher and parent involvement in decision making were extremely important to the success of site-based decision making. Since site-based decision making was a very time consuming and intense process, the issues for teachers as well as for parents with regard to decision making were, "Did the councils address and affect school policy outcomes and change relationships between educators and parents?"

The model of Malen and Ogawa effectively and efficiently dealt with the stated issues, focusing on format of participatory decision-making arrangements and the process qualities of actor interactions among/between councils and their decision-making authority to address and affect the school policy outcomes (personnel, program, and budget). Chapter Three discusses the research methodology used in this study which is based on parts of Malen and Ogawa's work. It provides an in-depth discussion of the sample selected, the procedures for
collecting data, descriptions of the instrumentation, the statistical techniques used, and limitations of the study.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore building-based councils' decision-making authority to address and affect school policy outcomes. This study investigated the relationship between school policy outcomes and the decision-making influence of parents and teachers as members of building-based councils.

With this purpose in mind, Chapter Three details the following: 1) research design, 2) data collection, and 3) data analysis to be employed in the research.

The approach taken here reflects a commitment to the mixed methodology strategy of research, using both qualitative and quantitative research techniques. Despite the fact that this study was primarily dependent on qualitative results, descriptive statistics from the quantitative survey provided the knowledgeable sample used for the qualitative interviews. This survey also provided answers to questions concerning the background information needed about the eight sample schools. The qualitative issues of budget, personnel, and program were evaluated through the use of in-depth interviews of actual council members. Qualitative methods allowed the researcher to study selected issues in-depth, while quantitative methods
used standardized measures, which can be fit into predetermined categories to which numbers are assigned. By using both strategies, the results are thought to be strengthened and more robust (Patton, 1990).

Research Design: Phase One

This research project was conducted in two phases: survey mail outs (quantitative) and telephone interviews (qualitative). Phase one involved the use of the survey technique.

Sample

The target population was building-based councils in Lafayette Parish. Under the administration of Dr. Max Skidmore, Superintendent of Lafayette Parish Schools, the decision to engage in school improvement was made on the district level. The Parish adopted the Effective School Process as their means to implement this goal.

The Effective School Process is a management program that uses structured committees that work collaboratively in order to allow input from all members of the school staff. This is a form of quality management that makes use of the "bottom up" leadership style.

Consultants were hired to train leaders in Lafayette Parish and each school developed a School Improvement Plan. Statistics on student backgrounds and achievement
were examined and this information was used to determine the needs of each school on an individual basis. The school then had to build programs and strategies under six given Correlate areas in order to address these problems. The Correlate areas designated by the parish included: Home/School Relations (parental involvement), Instructional Leadership (staff development, budget, personnel, morale issues), Academic Emphasis (student achievement), High Expectations (Higher Order Thinking Skills), Monitoring Student Progress (student incentives, assessments), and Positive School Climate (discipline, environment). Each school was responsible for establishing its own policy under these directives from the school board. Superintendent Owen Bush supervised the implementation of this process and Dr. Michael Zolkowski, his successor, will continue the process.

The demographics of Lafayette Parish include 24 elementary schools, 11 intermediate schools, and 5 high schools. In order to obtain an adequate representation of each level, the sample included 4 elementary, 2 intermediate, and 2 high schools from this parish. Schools were selected on the basis of the following criteria: 1) had an experientially accessible population; 2) have implemented a SIC (School Improvement Council);
3) covered a variance in grade level (elementary, intermediate and high schools); and, 4) be comprised of at-risk students from a low socioeconomic area.

Instrumentation

This research was conducted in two phases. Phase one was designed to 1) provide a general profile of all building-based councils in the parish, 2) gauge their compliance with central office regulations, 3) identify the topics addressed, 4) estimate their impact on school policy, 5) index members' satisfaction with their council experience, and 6) provide a knowledgeable sample of council members as subjects for the phase two interview process. (See Appendix C)

Compliance criteria data were obtained from information recorded from: 1) the Lafayette Parish School Board policy, 2) administrator training manuals, and 3) each building-based council's purpose.

The following items were distributed to all teachers and administrators in each of the eight sample schools: 1) a cover letter requesting their participation; 2) a statement re: the purpose, scope, and use of this project to be shared with all informants; 3) a nominal survey reviewed, analyzed, and adapted from Malen and Ogawa, 1985.
Validity and Reliability

Following its development, the original interview guides and surveys were developed by Malen and Ogawa (1985) in relation to the conceptual framework and field tested with groups of site-based councils in order to collect reliability and validity evidence. The interviews and surveys were then revised and used in their official study.

Data Analysis/Quantitative

Coded responses on the School Faculty Survey given by individual faculty members at each participating school were aggregated and compared across school sites for each variable dimension of interest. Summary statements of observed themes and patterns on dimensions of interest were also reported. Independent dimensional variables and their categorical levels as discussed in the Conceptual Framework were the format of participatory decision-making arrangements, a) mandated vs. voluntary, b) formal vs. informal, c) direct vs. indirect. Process qualities of actor interactions were a) the degree of participation (group discusses, recommends, decides, affirms), b) the content of interactions (subject - budget, program, personnel, facility; salient - individual and group commitment; zones--indifference, acceptance, contest).
and c) the stage of involvement (before or after issues and alternatives have been defined and set). The dependent dimensional variables of budget, personnel, and program and their categorical topics were considered to be the effects on school policy outcomes. Influence effects were assessed through an analysis of the degree of involvement, the content of involvement, and the stage of involvement.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to detect the significant differences between the eight schools sampled. Descriptive statistics, also called summary statistics, were used to describe the data collected on a research sample. The advantage of descriptive statistics was that it enabled the researcher to use one or two numbers to represent all of the individual scores of subjects in the sample. Inferential statistics were used to make inferences from sample statistics to the population parameters. These statistics were important in this research because samples were studied, yet the conclusions reached were about the larger population from which they were drawn. In other words, inferential statistics allowed the researcher to generalize from the situation that was studied to the situations not studied (Borg & Gall, 1989). There was not
a considerable difference in the aggregated data compared across the eight school sites with respect to the dependent variable outcome (Building-Based Decision-Making Process). In analyzing the research question concerning schools using shared governance as defined by 1) school board policy, and 2) each building-based councils purpose, the survey items under the heading "Content of SIC (School Improvement Council) Interactions" indicated the sample frequencies that actually fell within certain categories.

The percentage of faculty surveys submitted to the researcher as well as the number of schools that submitted agendas and minutes of council meetings were reported in order to validate the research. Statistical information gathered from the agendas and minutes concerning budget, personnel, and curriculum were aggregated.

Research Design: Phase Two

Phase two of this study used the telephone interview.

Sample

Phase two included: telephone interviews with informants from 1) all SICs (School Improvement Councils), composed of building administrators and teachers and 2) PACs (Parent Advisory Councils) composed of parents and administrators. Informants included the principal, the parent president of PAC, and a simple random sampled
teacher member of the SIC in all the schools that participated in the Phase One Survey. Simple random sampling was used because it provided all the individuals in the defined teacher population an equal and independent chance of being selected as a member of the sample (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Instrumentation

Phase two was designed to capture a detailed description of council dynamics. Therefore, case studies of select councils were conducted.

Previously mentioned primary data for parallel case studies included in-depth, individual interviews of one principal, one teacher on SIC, and one parent on PAC conducted by the researcher augmented by council agendas, minutes, and faculty surveys. (See Appendices B and C)

Validity and Reliability

According to Yin (1984), cross-referencing methodological procedures that move through the chain of evidence provide reliability.

External validity of qualitative findings refers to the degree to which the findings were generalized to the population from which the sample is drawn (Borg and Gall, 1989). In the qualitative component of this study, generalizations were drawn from the eight case study SICs
and PACs to refer to the work of all beginning SICs and PACs. Qualitative research examines a research area holistically in order to gain a better understanding of the problem. While expansion of the scope of a study increases generalizability and comparability, in-depth analysis of a smaller group also adds deeper meaning to the comparison (Rist, 1982). According to Patton (1990), qualitative methods are used to gather data on any number of aspects of the setting to put together a complete picture of the problem area.

To increase generalizability in this study, the multiple case design was used (Yin, 1984). The results of the multiple-case study analysis did suggest that similar patterns would be found in other groups of beginning SICs and PACs. Also, the results of the study were used to clarify aspects of the socialization process in need of further study.

Data Collection

Summary statements of observed themes and patterns on dimensions of interest were acquired from the findings of the phase one study. Data sources from phase one and phase two did include interviews, surveys, and documents. Structured open-ended interviews were conducted with the school principal, one teacher on SIC, and one parent on
PAC. Documents of SIC and PAC proceedings (i.e., minutes, agendas, correspondence), when available, were acquired.

Data Analysis/Qualitative

Interview, document, and survey data were organized around the categories of the conceptual framework (Yin, 1984). Case narratives for each site were developed, audited, then aggregated in a cross case comparative account (Malen and Ogawa, 1985). The replication approach to multiple-case studies indicated that the initial step in designing the study must consist of theory development, and then show that case selection and the definition of specific measures were important steps in the design and data collection process. Each individual case study, from the eight sample schools, consisted of a "whole" study in which convergent evidence was sought regarding the facts and conclusions for the case; each case's conclusions were then considered to be the information needing replication by other individual cases. Both the individual cases and the multiple-case results were the focus of a summary report. For each single-case analysis, the report did indicate how and why a particular proposition was demonstrated (or not demonstrated). In the cross-case analysis, the report indicated the extent of the replication logic and why certain cases were predicted to
have certain results, whereas other cases were predicted to have contrary results (Yin, 1984).

**Conclusion**

Chapter Three described the procedures used in the study relative to the selection of the sample, the procedures for collecting data, descriptions of the instrumentation, the statistical techniques used in the analysis, and possible limitations of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR: QUANTITATIVE RESULTS (PHASE ONE)

The School Faculty Survey (See Appendix D) was dispensed to all certified teachers and administrators at each of the eight sample schools. All teachers in each school were asked to answer the survey in an effort to obtain a random sample of teachers and administrators who had knowledge of the operations of the School Improvement Council (SIC). This random sample was used in the interview process of Phase Two. Therefore, the results of this survey were limited to the fact that the majority of the teachers were not members of SIC and had not ever been members. Thus, they were unable to answer any questions concerning the interactions of the committee in the decision-making process with regards to programs, personnel, and budget. The percentages in the cross tabulations of the descriptive statistics reflected this limitation.

Phase One was designed to provide data on background demographics and procedures for the eight sample schools. The first objective was to obtain a general profile of all building-based councils in the parish. Information obtained from the surveys demonstrated that the eight sample schools were located in low socio-economic areas and single parent families were prevalent. Students were...
transient within the district and the school populations were diverse. The faculty had been on staff for an average of seven years. The available number of knowledgeable teachers that had been or were members of the School Improvement Council was limited due to the fact that such councils had only been in existence for three years. Council members were elected to their positions, therefore, the arrangement of said councils was considered to be indirect. These elected representatives acted on behalf of a larger constituency/fellow teachers. The council in Lafayette Parish held regularly scheduled meetings, which indicated that their arrangement was of an indirect form.

The second objective of the quantitative survey was to gauge each school's compliance with central office regulations. Survey results indicated that all eight schools were mandated by the school board district to implement a School Improvement Plan using the management program of the Effective Schools process. All eight of the schools had complied with central office regulations and each was at a different stage of implementation. The process was not started at the same time district-wide.

The third objective of this survey was to identify the topics addressed by the School Improvement Councils at
each of the eight sample schools. Using descriptive statistics, independent variables for School Improvement Councils were examined to search for possible relationships with the dependent variables. Through this process, the dependent variables of programming, personnel, and budget were each examined separately. The independent variables used in the descriptive statistics were as follows: arrangements, degree of participation, content of interactions, and the stage of involvement at the issue definition, alternative consideration, and official enactment stages of policy making. The independent variables, obtained from interviews in Phase Two, will be addressed in the qualitative research results.

All respondents were asked if the four topics: budget, personnel, programming, and curriculum adequately addressed their needs (See Appendix C, Content of Interactions, questions 1 and 2). 66.7 percent responded “Yes”, indicating that most respondents felt that their needs were adequately met. These percentages are shown in Table 4.1 on page 77.

**Program as the Dependent Variable**

The descriptive statistics of the dependent variable program were divided into two subcategories: curriculum and overall programming.
The most significant impact that SIC committees had in the shared decision-making process was in the overall programming area. All respondents were asked if programs were evaluated by the SIC. 95.7 percent responded, "Yes". Table 4.2 illustrates this data and can be found on page 78.

All respondents were asked if curriculum was discussed at SIC meetings. 87 percent responded, "Yes". 13 percent responded "No". Two of the eight sample schools indicated a strong need for change in this area. The negative responses from these faculties illustrated the importance of the need for their input in the area of curriculum. The summary of these data is shown in Table 4.3 on page 79.

**Budget as the Dependent Variable**

All respondents were asked if the budget was discussed at SIC meetings. 60.9 percent responded, "Yes", indicating that budget was discussed at SIC meetings. The responses from the eight sampled schools were mixed on this topic. Four schools responded with "Yes" replies, whereas, four schools responded with "No" replies. Table 4.4 on page 80 depicts the responses of each of the eight sample faculties with regard to budget issues discussed at SIC meetings.
Personnel as the Dependent Variable

The responses on the School Faculty Survey (Appendix C) concerning personnel fell in direct opposition to the percentages reflected for budget as a dependent variable. All respondents were asked if the subject of personnel was discussed at SIC meetings. Only 39.1 percent of the respondents agreed that personnel was discussed at meetings, indicating that most respondents felt that SIC was not allowed to make decisions, and therefore could not influence personnel issues. The survey results regarding personnel discussed at SIC meetings are depicted in Table 4.5 on page 81.

The fourth objective of the quantitative survey was to estimate the SIC's impact on school policy. All respondents were asked if the SIC decide themselves what is to be done. Only 33.3 percent responded, "Yes", indicating that most respondents felt that SIC is not allowed to make decisions, and therefore could not influence. Of the one third who thought they could influence what is to be done, 87 percent believed that their decisions do get implemented.

The fifth objective of the survey was to index members' satisfaction with their council experience. All respondents were asked if they were satisfied with their
School Improvement Council experience and would serve again. 77.3 percent responded, "Yes", indicating that most respondents were satisfied and would serve again.

Summary

The results of Phase One School Faculty Surveys were not significant predictors of the relationship between school policy outcomes and the decision-making influence of teachers on building-based councils. The data analysis provided evidence that School Improvement Councils have been implemented as directed by the district. The foundations for these Councils have been laid and there is a positive move toward participatory decision making on the part of the teachers. Evidence of the inclusion of teachers in the discussions of program, personnel, budget, and curriculum gives some validity that teacher influence on councils and their decision-making ability is increasing.
Table 4.1 Four Topics Adequately Address Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in four topics adequately address needs</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in four topics adequately address needs</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in four topics adequately address needs</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Programs Evaluated at SIC Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>school code</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in programs evaluated at SIC meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in programs evaluated at SIC meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in programs evaluated at SIC meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 Curriculum Discussed at SIC Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in curriculum discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in curriculum discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in curriculum discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4  Budget Discussed at SIC Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in budget discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in budget discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in budget discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 Personnel Discussed at SIC Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% w/in personnel discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% w/in personnel discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% w/in personnel discussed at SIC meetings</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% w/in school code</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative research has often been used in an exploratory manner to gain insight into areas where little information has previously been available. Qualitative research can also be used as a tool for adding depth and detail to previously completed quantitative data analyses. Quantitative results may suggest general patterns found across a given sample, whereas, extending the meaning of those patterns through qualitative methods may provide additional information. Used in this way, quantitative analysis identifies the areas of focus, and qualitative analysis gives richer meaning to those areas (Patton, 1990).

In this study, the qualitative component was designed to capture a detailed description of council dynamics in regard to the Conceptual Framework. The Conceptual Framework addresses three issues: degree of participation (no involvement-full involvement); content of interactions (topics and topic stakes); and, the stage of involvement at each stage of policy making (issue definition, alternative consideration, and official enactment). Issues may fall into zones of indifferences, acceptance, or contest. Zones of indifference embrace cases where actors do not seek to influence decision making because
this issue is not salient; the issue falls in their interests or their expertise. Zones of acceptance embrace cases where actors do not seek to influence decision making because they grant others the legitimate right to act on the subject. Zones of contest embrace cases where actors attempt to influence decision making because the salience is high and the subject is legitimately involved. The qualitative data for this study were obtained through interviews of the formal actors from the eight schools in Lafayette Parish, Louisiana, that were sampled. Attention was also directed toward relationships among these formal actors. In addition, attention was directed toward the institutional arrangements and environmental conditions that constrain these actor relationships. The distinguishing properties of these arrangements included mandated versus voluntary, formal versus informal, and direct versus indirect forms. Mandated forms are created by federal-state statutes for local board policies. Voluntary forms are created by teacher or parent request for committee representation. Formal types are linked to the administrator through regular meeting schedules. Informal types are linked to the administrator through casual conversations or intermittent meetings. In direct forms, the total group enters in the process. In indirect
forms, elected or appointed representatives act on behalf of a larger constituency. Therefore, the full conceptual apparatus of the political systems approach was not employed in this study.

In an effort to capture a detailed description of council dynamics, case studies of the councils from the eight schools sampled were conducted. The data included in-depth, individual interviews of one administrator, one teacher on SIC, and one parent on SIC\PAC conducted by the researcher. The schools, whose policy it was to use council agendas and/or minutes, have provided a sampling of these documents (See Appendices F and G).

**Single-Case Analyses**

**Elementary School A**

The school community is predominantly African-American whose incomes fall in low socio-economic levels. Single parent families are prevalent. The population is mobile within the school district due to several government low-income apartment complexes in the neighborhood. The student population is homogeneous consisting of minority socially disadvantaged students.

Elementary School A does have a School Improvement Council (SIC) in place, as mandated by the district, consisting of teachers, one administrator and one parent.
The teachers were elected by their peers. The administrator was appointed by the district. The parent was recruited based on the philosophy of having his/her child's education as a foremost priority. Thus, Elementary School A is arranged according to the indirect property. This SIC meets formally on a monthly basis using a prepared agenda and formal minutes (See Appendices F and G).

The degree of participation for this school is best described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussion included program, personnel and budget. According to the teacher and administrator interviewed, the program issues discussed were: testing, student achievement, discipline, attendance and documentation/record keeping. The parent stated that discipline was the program issue handled by the committee. Personnel topics addressed were morale incentives (teacher), school climate (administrator), and dress code (teacher and parent). The budget was indicated as a topic by the teacher, who had been a member of the SIC since the beginning of the school year; however, it was not indicated as a topic by the administrator, who had been a member of the SIC for only three months. The parent did not indicate budget as a
topic either. The level of interaction in the graph below
is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to
influence decision making in these subject areas.

Table 5.1 Single-Case Content of Interactions
for Elementary School A (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School A Program Personnel Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference—does not seek to influence or issue is not
important
C-Contest—does attempt to influence because issue is
important or person has knowledge in that area

At Elementary School A, the SIC was actively involved
in defining issues and formulating proposals concerning
program and personnel topics. Alternative consideration
was employed in budget areas as the council was allowed to
select from among a set of options. Official enactment of
the dress code aspect of programming was implemented.

Table 5.2 Single-Case Stage of Involvement
for Elementary School A (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Participation Occurs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School A Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See definitions of Acceptance, Indifference, and Contest
in Table 5.1 above.
Elementary School B

Like Elementary School A, this school community is predominantly African-American whose incomes fall in low socio-economic levels. Single parent families are prevalent. The population is mobile within the school district due to several government low-income apartment complexes in the neighborhood. The student population is homogeneous consisting of minority socially disadvantaged students.

Elementary School B does have a School Improvement Council (SIC) in place, as mandated by the district, consisting of teachers, one administrator and one parent. The teachers volunteered for the positions. The administrator was appointed by the district. The parent (grandparent) was elected from the parent group based on her expertise and school affiliation. Her children had attended the school. Thus, Elementary School B is arranged according to the indirect property. This SIC meets formally on a monthly basis using a prepared agenda and minutes (See Appendices F and G).

The degree of participation for this school is described best as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussion included program, personnel, and
budget. According to the teacher, the administrator, and the parent interviewed, the program issues discussed were: setting curriculum, evaluating and/or revising the school program. The budget was indicated as a topic by all three members. The teacher and the administrator stated that interviewing school employees and staff development were personnel issues. The level of interaction in the graph below is designated as contest as the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas.

Table 5.3 Single-Case Content of Interactions for Elementary School B (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
<th>Elem. School B</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

At Elementary School B, the SIC was actively involved in defining issues and formulating proposals concerning program and personnel topics. Alternative consideration was employed in budget areas as the council was allowed to select from among a set of options. Official enactment of the Success For All Reading Method aspect of programming, as verified by the minutes, was implemented. The following table illustrates this participation.
Table 5.4 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for Elementary School B (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance—grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference—does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest—does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

Elementary School C

Again, the school community is predominantly African-American, whose incomes fall in low socio-economic levels. Single parent families are prevalent. The population is mobile within this school district due to the fact that the housing in that area is small and old. Thus, it is a low rent district. The student population is homogeneous consisting of minority socially disadvantaged students.

Elementary School C does have a School Improvement Council (SIC) in place, as mandated by the district, consisting of teachers, one administrator and one parent. The teachers and parent were recruited by the school community based on their expertise and his/her philosophy of having the children’s education as a foremost priority. The administrator was appointed by the district. Thus,
Elementary School C is arranged according to the indirect property. This SIC meets formally on a monthly basis. No prepared agenda or formal minutes were available.

The degree of participation for this school is described best as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussions included program, personnel, and budget. According to the administrator and parent interviewed, the personnel issues discussed were hiring or participating in the interviews or evaluations of school employees and staff morale. All three members stated that program issues consisted of setting curriculum goals or priorities, evaluating and/or revising the school program. The administrator and teacher examined budget issues. The level of interaction in the graph on the next page is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas.

Table 5.5 Single-Case Content of Interactions for Elementary School C (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
<th>Elem. School C</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area
At Elementary School C, the SIC was actively involved in defining issues and formulating proposals concerning program and personnel topics. Alternative consideration was employed in budget areas as the council was allowed to select from among a set of options. Official enactment of the School Improvement Plan aspect of programming was indicated as implemented.

Table 5.6 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for Elementary School C (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School C Issue Definition Alternative Consideration Official Enactment</td>
<td>Program: C</td>
<td>Personnel: C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

Elementary School D

Yet again, the school community is predominantly African-American whose income ranges fall in the low socio-economic area. Single parent families are prevalent. The population is mobile within the school district due to low rent housing. The student population is homogeneous consisting of minority socially disadvantaged students.
Elementary School D does have a School Improvement Council (SIC) in place, as mandated by the district, consisting of teachers, one administrator and one parent. The teachers and the parent were recruited by the school community based on their expertise and his/her philosophy of having the children's education as a foremost priority. The administrator was appointed by the district. Thus, Elementary School D is arranged according to the indirect property. This SIC meets formally on a monthly basis using a prepared agenda and minutes (See Appendices F and G).

The degree of participation for the School Improvement Council at this school is best described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussions included program and budget. According to the responses of the administrator and the parent, program issues discussed were as follows: setting curriculum, and evaluating and/or revising the school program. According to the responses of the teacher, in addition to program, budget was also a topic of discussion at council meetings. The level of interaction in the following graph is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas.
Table 5.7 Single-Case Content of Interactions for Elementary School D (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
<th>Elem. School D</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance—grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference—does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest—does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area*

At Elementary School D, the SIC was actively involved in defining issues and formulating proposals concerning the program. Alternative consideration was employed in budget areas as the council was allowed to select from among a set of options. Official enactment of the Success For All Reading Method aspect of programming was implemented, as verified by the minutes.

Table 5.8 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for Elementary School D (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School D Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See definitions of Acceptance, Indifference, and Contest in Table 5.7 above.*

Elementary School D does have a Parent Advisory Council (PAC) in place, consisting of parents and one administrator. The administrator was appointed by the
district. The parents volunteered to serve based on the philosophy that the child's education is a foremost priority. Thus, Elementary School D is arranged according to the direct property where the total group enters into the process. They do not elect or appoint representatives to act on behalf of a larger constituency. This PAC meets formally on a monthly basis. No agendas and formal minutes were available.

The degree of participation here is described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. The administrator and parent discussions included the topics of budget and program. Program issues indicated were curriculum, student motivation, and parent workshops. Fundraisers were a major focus to enhance the budget. The level of interaction is contest as actors attempted to influence decision making.

Table 5.9 Single-Case Content of Interactions for Elementary School D (PAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
<th>Elem. School D</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area
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At Elementary School D, the PAC was involved when alternative considerations for budget were employed. Official enactment of the PAC’s decision was implemented in the program area. Also enacted was the PAC’s decision to change the location of the school’s annual pageant.

Table 5.10 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for Elementary School D (PAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Enactment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance—grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference—does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest—does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

Middle School E

The school community is a racially mixed population whose incomes fall in middle to low socio-economic levels. Single parent families are prevalent. The population is permanent in structure. The student population is diverse racially and economically.

Middle School E does have a School Improvement Council (SIC) in place, as mandated by the district, consisting of teachers, one administrator, and one parent. The teachers and parent were recruited by the school community based on
their expertise and his/her philosophy of having the children’s education as a foremost priority. The administrator was appointed by the district. Thus, Middle School E is arranged according to the indirect property. This SIC meets formally on a monthly basis using a prepared agenda and minutes (See Appendices F and G).

The degree of participation for this school is best described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussions included program and budget. According to the teacher and the administrator, budget issues were discussed. All three members indicated the program issues of setting curriculum, evaluating and/or revising the school program. The level of interaction in the graph below is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas.

Table 5.11 Single-Case Content of Interactions for Middle School E (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
<th>Middle School E</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area
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At Middle School E, the SIC was actively involved in defining issues and formulating proposals concerning the program. Alternative consideration was employed in budget areas as the council was allowed to select from among a set of options. Official enactment of the School Improvement Plan of programming, as verified by the minutes from their council meetings, (See Appendices F and G) was implemented.

Table 5.12 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for Middle School E (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid. School E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Enactment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

Middle School F

The school community is predominantly African-American whose incomes are varied. Single parent families are prevalent. The population is mobile within the school district due to several government low-income apartment complexes in the neighborhood. The student population is diverse and consists primarily of males.
Middle School F does have a School Improvement Council (SIC) in place, as mandated by the district, consisting of teachers, one administrator, and one parent. The teachers were elected by their peers. The parent was recruited based on his/her philosophy of having the children's education as a foremost priority. The administrator was recruited by the principal as part of the district policy. Thus, Middle School F is arranged according to the indirect property. This SIC meets formally on a monthly basis. No prepared agenda or formal minutes were available. District policy does not require this documentation procedure.

The degree of participation for this school is best described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussions included program, personnel, and budget. According to the teacher, the administrator, and the parent interviewed, the program issues discussed were: student discipline, curriculum goals, monitoring student progress and parent involvement. The personnel and budget issues were indicated by the administrator. The level of interaction in the graph below is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas. The parent interviewed
further indicated that the members with the least experience look to the members with more experience or more expertise in that area for advice and guidance in making decisions that affect the school.

Table 5.13 Single-Case Content of Interactions for Middle School F (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle School F Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

At Middle School F, the SIC was actively involved in defining issues and formulating proposals concerning the program. Alternative consideration was employed in budget areas as the council was allowed to select from among a set of options. No official enactment of issues was evident, there were no official agendas or minutes kept.

Table 5.14 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for Middle School F (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid. School F Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See definitions of Acceptance, Indifference, and Contest in Table 5.13 above.
Middle School F does have a Parent Advisory Council (PAC) in place, consisting of parents and one administrator. The administrator was appointed by the district. Parents volunteer to serve based on the philosophy that their child's education is a foremost priority. Thus, Middle School F is arranged according to the direct property where the total group enters into the process. This PAC meets formally on a monthly basis. No agendas and formal minutes were available. District policy does not require this documentation process.

The degree of participation for this school is best described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Parent involvement and discipline were program issues discussed. The level of interaction in the graph below is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to influence decision making in this subject area.

Table 5.15 Single-Case Content of Interactions for Middle School F (PAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
<th>Middle School F</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area
At Middle School F, the PAC is involved when alternative considerations for program are employed as the council was allowed to select from among a set of options. However, no official enactment of the program was implemented.

Table 5.16 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for Middle School F (PAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-PAC (Participation Occurs)</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid. School F</td>
<td>Issue Definition</td>
<td>Alternative Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A-Acceptance—grant others the legitimate right to act
  I-Indifference—does not seek to influence or issue is not important
  C-Contest—does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

High School G

The school community is combined rural and suburban, middle to low socio-economic levels. The majority of students come from two parent homes, with some coming from grandparent families. The population is mobile within the district. The parents are employed in various professions and have different family ethics in a multicultural society.

High School G does have a School Improvement Council (SIC) in place, as mandated by the district, consisting of
teachers, one administrator, and one parent. The teachers and parent were recruited by the school community based on their expertise and his/her philosophy of having the children’s education as a foremost priority. The administrator was appointed by the district. Thus, High School G is arranged according to the indirect property. This SIC meets formally on a monthly basis. No prepared agenda or formal minutes were available. District policy does not require this documentation procedure.

The degree of participation for this school is best described as “between” since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussions included program and personnel. According to the teacher, the administrator, and the parent interviewed, the program issues discussed were as follows: student attendance, discipline, and curriculum goals. The teacher and administrator indicated the personnel issue of teacher dress code. The teacher suggested that the administrators leadership style inhibits teacher input, therefore, if the administrator were replaced the committee could function in the manner in which it was designed. The level of interaction in the graph below is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas.
Table 5.17 Single-Case Content of Interactions for High School G (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School G</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance—grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference—does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest—does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

At High School G, the SIC was actively involved in defining issues and formulating proposals concerning the program and personnel. Alternative consideration was employed in budget areas as the council was allowed to select from among a set of options. Official enactment of the program issue of the Student Handbook was verified by the presentation of the handbook itself.

Table 5.18 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for High School G (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement—SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School G Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See definitions of Acceptance, Indifference, and Contest in Table 5.17 above.

High School G does have a Parent Advisory Council (PAC) in place, consisting of parents and one
administrator. The administrator was appointed by the district. Parents volunteer to serve based on his/her philosophy. Thus, High School G is arranged according to the direct property where the total group enters into the process. The PAC meets formally on a monthly basis. No agendas and formal minutes were available. District policy does not require this documentation process.

The degree of participation for this school is best described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussion included budget, program, and personnel and centered on extra curricular concerns. The level of interaction in the graph below is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas.

Table 5.19 Single-Case Content of Interactions for High School G (PAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
<th>High School G</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

At High School G, the PAC was involved when alternative considerations for program are employed.
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Official enactment of the Student Handbook aspect of programming, as verified by the presentation of the book, was implemented.

Table 5.20 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for High School G (PAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-PAC (Participation Occurs)</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School G</td>
<td>Issue Definition</td>
<td>Official Enactment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Alternative Consideration</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A-Acceptance—grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference—does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest—does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

High School H

The school community is a racially mixed population whose incomes fall in the middle to low socio-economic levels. Single parent families are prevalent. The population is permanent in structure. The student population is diverse—a racially and economically mixed group.

High School H does have a School Improvement Council (SIC) in place, as mandated by the district, consisting of teachers, one administrator, and one parent. The teachers and parent were recruited by the school community based on their expertise and his/her philosophy of having the
children's education as a foremost priority. The administrator was appointed by the district. Thus, High School H is arranged according to the indirect property. This SIC held council meetings formally on a monthly basis using a prepared agenda and minutes (See Appendices F and G).

The degree of participation for this school is best described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussions included program, personnel, and budget. According to the teacher, the administrator, and the parent interviewed, the program issues discussed were: improving instruction; using recommendations for Title I application and Southern Association accreditation; student discipline; improving test scores; student morale; and, classroom ratio. This school places a major emphasis on programming as part of the council's responsibilities and it serve as an academic crisis intervention committee. The administrator and the parent indicated that the budget was discussed. The administrator addressed the personnel issue of teacher morale. The level of interaction in the graph below is designated as contest because the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas.
Table 5.21 Single-Case Content of Interactions for High School H (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School H Program Personel Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C C C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area*

High School H was actively involved in defining issues and formulating proposals concerning the program and personnel. Alternative consideration was employed in budget areas as they were allowed to select from among a set of options. Official enactment (program) of the School Discipline Policy was implemented (See Appendix G).

Table 5.22 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for High School H (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC - Participation Occurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School H Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School H Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School H Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See definitions of Acceptance, Indifference, and Contest in Table 5.21 above.*

High School H does have a Parent Advisory Council (PAC) in place, consisting of parents and one administrator. The administrator was appointed by the
district. Parents volunteer to serve based on his/her philosophy. Thus, High School H is arranged according to the direct property where the total group enters in the process. The PAC meets formally on a monthly basis. No agendas and formal minutes were available. District policy does not require this documentation process.

The degree of participation for this school is described as "between" since actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. Topics for discussion included budget and program. Questions addressed were: Where does the money go? How can we make things better? The level of interaction in the graph below is designated as contest as the actors did attempt to influence decision making in these subject areas.

Table 5.23 Single-Case Content of Interactions for High School H (PAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
<th>High School H</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

At High School H, the PAC was involved when alternative considerations were employed. Official enactment of the School Discipline Policy aspect of
programming, as verified by documentation, was implemented.

Table 5.24 Single-Case Stage of Involvement for High School H (PAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-PAC (Participation Occurs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School H Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance-grant others the legitimate right to act
I-Indifference-does not seek to influence or issue is not important
C-Contest-does attempt to influence because issue is important or person has knowledge in that area

Cross-Case Analyses

The format of this dimension addresses the properties of various internal (administrators and teachers) and external (administrators and teachers with parents) participatory decision-making arrangements. The distinguishing properties included the following: mandated versus voluntary; formal versus informal; and, direct versus indirect.

Mandated forms are created by federal-state statutes for local board policies. Voluntary forms are created by teacher or parent request for committee representation. Formal types are linked to the administrator through regular meeting schedules. Informal types are linked to
the administrator through casual conversations or intermittent meetings. In direct forms, the total group enters into the process. In indirect forms, elected or appointed representatives act on behalf of a larger constituency.

As shown in the table below, the arrangements of all eight of the sample schools were the same. Each school had implemented a School Improvement Council due to the fact that it was mandated by the district. All councils held regularly scheduled meetings and all had been elected or appointed to represent a larger constituency.

Research results of the eight sampled schools found the following arrangements to be in place:

Table 5.25 Cross-Case Arrangements (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Mandated</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School B</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School C</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School D</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid. School E</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid. School F</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School G</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School H</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dimension involving major aspects of actor interactions encompasses the following: degree of participation; content of interactions; and, the stage of involvement. The degree or extent of an actor's
participation may be described in terms of a continuum--none, between, or full. Actors having full involvement are able to make authoritative, binding decisions. Between those poles, actors may discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations. The cross-case analysis of the eight sample schools degree of participation resulted in the following:

Table 5.26 Cross-Case Degree of Participation (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactions</th>
<th>Degree of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the cross-case analysis the degree of participation for all eight of the sample schools fell on the continuum at the level described as "between". Therefore, these actors were allowed to discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations.

The content of interactions refers to issue subjects and issue salience. Subject reflects topic areas such as, budget, program, and personnel. Salience reflects topic stakes, that is, the intensity of individual or group commitment to the issue. Issues may fall into zones of
indifference, acceptance, or contest. Zones of
difference embrace cases where actors do not seek to
influence decision making because the issue is not
salient; it falls in their interest or their expertise.
Zones of acceptance embrace cases where actors do not seek
to influence decision making because they grant others the
legitimate right to act on the subject. Zones of contest
embrace cases where actors attempt to influence decision
making because the salience is high and the subject is
legitimately involved. After analyzing the interviews of
the formal actors from the eight sample schools,
conclusions were made about their content of interactions
with regard to three zones of contest: A) Acceptance—
actors grant others the legitimate right to act; B)
Indifference—actors do not seek to influence the decision
or the issue is not important; and, C) Contest—actors do
attempt to influence decisions because the issue is
important or the person has knowledge in that area. The
following charts portray these interactions.

Table 5.27 Cross-Case Content of Interactions
for Elementary Schools (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elem. School A</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest
Table 5.28 Cross-Case Content of Interactions for Middle and High Schools (SIC)

### Content of Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elem. School B</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elem. School C</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elem. School D</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest

In comparing the four elementary schools, it was noted that Elementary School B is more influential in affecting all three outcome variables of program, personnel, and budget. The only area lacking involvement would be parental input on personnel issues. In all four of the elementary schools, parental input was only allowed in two of the three outcome areas, with program being consistent.
The outcome variable program was an area of contest for all formal actors at each of the two middle schools as well as each of the two high schools. These actors did attempt to influence decision making because the subject was important to them and the personal stakes were high. However, at Middle School F and High School H, the administrator’s leadership style was more bureaucratic, thereby controlling the actors’ influence in the decision-making process.

Table 5.29 below depicts the cross-case analysis of the Content of Interactions for the four schools who have a Parent Advisory Council (PAC) in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School G</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School H</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle School F</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest
Table 5.29 Cross-Case Content of Interactions for PACs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School D Program Personnel Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C C C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-contest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle School F Program Personnel Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C C C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-contest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School G Program Personnel Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C C C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-contest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School H Program Personnel Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C C C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance I-Indifference C-contest

Program was the main issue discussed in all four of the established Parent Advisory Councils (PAC). Program topics included in the discussions were curriculum, motivation of the students, parent workshops and involvement, student discipline, student handbook, and extra-curricular concerns. The budget was discussed by both High School G and High School H. Budget issues focused on fundraisers as major contributions. The budget was not addressed by Elementary School D nor by Middle School F.
The stage of involvement dimension identifies the point at which participation occurs. Actors may be involved at the issue definition-proposal formulation stage, when problems are defined and approaches are generated. Actors may be involved at a later phase, at alternative consideration, and at the point of selecting among a set of options. Actors may also be involved at the official enactment phase, when a binding decision is made. In the official enactment phase, this study’s concern for outcomes was limited to the effects on personnel, program, and budget building policy in each of the eight sample schools. The following conclusions were drawn about the stage of involvement after interviewing the actors from these schools. Table 5.30 and Table 5.31 illustrate the conclusions drawn from these actor interviews.

Table 5.30 Cross-Case Stage of Involvement for Elementary Schools (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. School A</td>
<td>Issue Definition</td>
<td>Alternative Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest
Table continued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage of Involvement-SIC</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Participation Occurs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Elem. School**<br>B | **Issue**<br>C | **Definition**<br>Alternative Consideration | **Official Enactment**
| **Program** | C | * | X |
| **Personnel** | C | | |
| **Budget** | A | | *
| **A-Acceptance** | **I-Indifference** | **C-Contest** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage of Involvement-SIC</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Participation Occurs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Elem. School**<br>C | **Issue**<br>C | **Definition**<br>Alternative Consideration | **Official Enactment**
| **Program** | C | * | X |
| **Personnel** | C | | |
| **Budget** | A | | *
| **A-Acceptance** | **I-Indifference** | **C-Contest** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage of Involvement-SIC</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Participation Occurs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Elem. School**<br>D | **Issue**<br>C | **Definition**<br>Alternative Consideration | **Official Enactment**
| **Program** | C | * | X |
| **Personnel** | | | |
| **Budget** | A | | *
| **A-Acceptance** | **I-Indifference** | **C-Contest** |

Elementary schools A, B, and C followed the same patterns of formal actions concerning their School Improvement Councils' stage of involvement. The actors' involvement fell in the area of contest where they tried to influence programs and personnel; however, they granted others the legitimate right to act on budget.
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issues. It was indicated to the researcher that budget issues fall into the area of the administration’s expertise. The sampled elementary schools operate from more than one source of funding and budgeting can become complex for the lay person.

Table 5.3.1 Cross-Case Stage of Involvement for Middle and High Schools (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School Issue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School Issue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A-Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC (Participation Occurs)</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Issue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Table continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-SIC</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue Definition C</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Official Enactment X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A-Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest

The middle and high school actors all interacted with the outcome variable of program in the area of contest. Only two of these schools had input into the decisions concerning the dependent variable of personnel, while only one school had input into the dependent variable of budget. Involvement in the budget area was on the level of acceptance where the actors granted others the right to act on the subject.

In summary, the main area of involvement for seven of the eight sample schools was with the dependent variable of program. These seven schools were able to enact officially, their decisions.

Table 5.32 depicts the cross-case stage of involvement for the four schools sampled that had implemented a Parent Advisory Council (PAC). These councils were started in an effort to encourage active parental involvement and support.
Table 5.32 Cross-Case Stage of Involvement for PACs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-PAC</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elem. School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Issue Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Official Enactment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A-Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-PAC</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Issue Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Official Enactment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A-Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-PAC</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Issue Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Official Enactment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A-Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Involvement-PAC</th>
<th>Interaction Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Issue Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Official Enactment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A-Acceptance I-Indifference C-Contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All four PACs participated in the issue definition stage in the area of programming. The actors defined problems and generated approaches to the solution of these problems. Their interactions fell in the zone of acceptance where actors did not seek to influence decision making because they grant others the legitimate right to act on the subject. The parent members indicated to the researcher that they felt teachers and administrators had more expertise in these areas.

Summary

In Chapter Four it was concluded that the results of the School Faculty Surveys were not significant predictors of the relationship between school policy outcomes (program, personnel, and budget) and the decision-making influence of teachers on building-based councils. However, when used in conjunction with the results of the qualitative interview, several observations can be made.

The nominal survey indicated the four topics that councils discussed at meetings. The interviews of the formal actors revealed in-depth explanations as to who responded, what areas they responded in (content of interactions), how they responded (zones of acceptance, indifference, and contest), and if their decisions were implemented (stage of involvement).
The four topics discussed at meetings were personnel, budget, curriculum, and program. In the area of program, which included curriculum, the teacher, administrator, and parent interacted in the discussions. The zone of interaction was contest, where they attempted to influence decision making because the subject was important and the personal stakes were high. The decisions made concerning this area were officially implemented. This implementation was verified by minutes and agendas (See Appendices F and G).

The formal actors (54.5%) indicated that changes in the SIC should be made. Suggestions made in the interviews included the following: removal of the administrator from the council; more parental involvement to include knowledgeable parents with strong leadership abilities; maintain open communications with the entire staff; meet on a more frequent basis; assign roles for each committee member other than a chairperson (secretary, corresponding secretary, time keeper, etc.); and, bring forth more information.

The qualitative research results did show a relationship between school policy outcomes and the decision-making influence of parents and teachers on building-based councils in the area of programming.
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Building-based governance promotes decentralization and democratic educational policy-making as a strategy to renew school systems. This study was designed to explore building-based councils' decision-making authority to address and affect school policy outcomes of program, personnel, and budget. It investigated the relationship between school policy outcomes and the decision-making influence of parents and teachers as members of building-based councils.

The focus of this study was to explore the decision-making authority of SICs—teacher dominant, and/or PACs, and the extent to which they address and affect personnel, program, and budget-building policy.

The informal research questions driving this research study were as follows: 1) Have schools used shared governance as defined by: school board policy; central office guidelines; and, each building-based councils' purpose? 2) What issues do they address? Are the councils involved in personnel, program, and budget-building policy? 3) What impact are the councils having on building-based decision making? Are the councils able to achieve or progress toward their stated goals?
This study approached the problem through the mixed methodology strategy of research, using both quantitative and qualitative research techniques. Quantitative methods allowed the data to be gathered from a large sample of teachers and administrators, while qualitative methods helped to confirm the initial findings and provide more in-depth detail.

**Summary of Findings**

**Quantitative Findings**

The quantitative results of this study, based on a survey of 102 teachers and administrators, provided evidence that School Improvement Councils have been implemented as directed by the district. Furthermore, the quantitative survey results provided statistics from which a random sample of teachers and administrators who had knowledge of the operations of SIC were obtained.

The descriptive statistics indicated that the most significant impact that SICs have in the shared decision-making process is in the overall programming area. Budget and personnel were topics of discussion at SIC meetings; however, no official enactment occurred. Otherwise, the School Faculty Surveys were not significant predictors of the relationship between school policy outcomes and the
decision-making influence of teachers on building-based councils.

Qualitative Findings

Eight administrators, teachers, and parents were selected as case studies subjects, and were interviewed in phase two of this study. Case narratives for each site were developed, audited, then aggregated in a cross-case comparative account (Malen and Ogawa, 1985). The qualitative component was designed to capture a detailed description of council dynamics in regard to the Conceptual Framework. The Conceptual Framework addressed three issues (degree of participation, content of interactions, and the stage of involvement) at each stage of policy making (issue definition, alternative consideration, and official enactment).

Research results of this study found the eight sample schools SICs to be mandated by their district; to be linked formally to the administrator through regularly scheduled meetings; and, to have elected or appointed representatives act on behalf of a larger constituency in an indirect manner.

The actor interactions, when evaluated in terms of a continuum of "none, between, or full", for the eight sample schools is designated as "between". The actors
were allowed to discuss issues, define proposals, and/or make recommendations.

Research results for content of interactions reflected that topic areas of outcome such as, budget, program, and personnel were discussed at SIC meetings. Budget was indicated by 14 of the 24 actors interviewed as an area of contest. Personnel was noted as a topic by 11 of the 24 actors and was also an area of contest. Whereas, 100% of the actors interviewed stated that program was highly discussed and was an area of contest. These actors were able to attempt to influence decision making in these three topic areas because the personal stakes were high and the subject matter was meaningful.

Using descriptive statistics to examine if SIC decisions get implemented resulted in 87.0% of the formal actors stating that their decisions do officially become enacted. Only 13% replied that SIC decisions do not get officially enacted. The stage of involvement dimension identified when participation occurred. In the area of programming, seven of the eight sample schools were involved at the issue definition-proposal formulation stage, when problems were defined and approaches were generated. The actors in these situations were able to have their decisions officially enacted. Actors in five
of the eight schools were able to contest personnel at the issue definition stage with no official enactment of their decisions; budget was accepted in the alternative consideration stage in five of the eight schools with no official enactment of decisions. Therefore, the overall programming area is generalized to be the topic where the most significant impact is made by teachers and parents on SICs. It has been determined that their input is democratically heard and their decisions are implemented, at least in this area, as verified by the minutes and agendas (See Appendices F and G). When asked if the SIC needs changes, 54.5% of the persons surveyed replied "Yes" and 45.5% replied "No". The formal actors, therefore, see the need to move into the decision-making process for personnel and budget as well as programming.

PACs were organized at four of the eight schools involved in the study. Program was again the most significant topic discussed on these councils. All four of the schools were involved in the alternative consideration stage in this area. Their involvement fell in the zone of acceptance in which the actors did not seek to influence decision making because they granted others the right to act on the subject. Where personnel and budget were concerned, only one of the schools was
involved in the alternative consideration stage for each of these two topics. Its involvement fell in the zone of acceptance as well.

The PACs are arranged in such a manner as to provide a voice but not a vote. They are evidently allowed to make suggestions, which are presented at SIC meetings, but are not necessarily enacted.

Conclusions and Discussions

School Improvement Councils in Lafayette Parish have a vision about what they want their schools to be, but constraints within the organization often prevent them from placing that vision into action. Quantitative and qualitative results show that SICs are actively involved in shared decision making in regard to overall programming. Their vision is to become just as involved in the areas of personnel and budget eventually. Constraints that may affect progress include the following: administrators who refuse to share decision-making powers; teachers who do not wish to take an active role in shared decision making due to time and/or responsibility factors; teachers who do have positions on SIC but are subject to negative peer pressure; teachers who are satisfied with the status quo and do not seek
change; directives from central office; or a chaotic school context.

This study was a partial replication of Malen and Ogawa's (1985) research, which provides a critical test of the ability of site-based governance arrangements to change decision-making relationships. Results of this study support the findings of Malen and Ogawa. Malen and Ogawa (1988) found the following patterns of influence, as exerted by formally sanctioned site-based governance councils in Salt Lake City, Utah. First, although the site councils are authorized policymakers, they functioned as ancillary advisors and pro forma endorsers. Second, teachers and parents are granted parity, but principals and professionals controlled the partnerships. Third, although teachers and parents have access to decision-making arenas, their inclusion has maintained, not altered, the decision-making relationships typically and traditionally found in schools. Thus, a pecking order in decision-making influence was discovered in which principals control the decisions of the councils and are often joined by teachers in an attempt to exclude parents. The topic that most SICs addressed and implemented using shared decision making was overall programming. Constraints found in Malen and Ogawa's study were also the
same as those found in this study. As the influence of teachers on building-based councils increased, there was an increase in the success of school policies affected by council decisions in the area of programming.

In Malen and Ogawa’s findings it was indicated that parents on PACs granted the right to teachers and administrators to influence school policies. They noted that parents implied that teachers and administrators were more knowledgeable in the area of programming. Similar findings occurred in this study as well.

In comparing this study to Malen and Ogawa (1988), two differences were noted. First, administrators in Lafayette Parish are beginning to relinquish some decision-making powers, as indicated by the official enactment of decisions in the area of programming. Second, parents in Lafayette Parish are beginning to be included in the decision-making arenas. Evidence of this lies in the fact that all eight of the sample schools have parents on the SICs and four of the eight schools have implemented PACs. The district has gone one step further and has organized a SIC and PAC for the parish level.

Recommendations for Further Study

Reiterating the problem’s importance, administrators must be willing to depart from the “traditional” paradigm
and continuously search for ways to improve the educational process through the stated demands of greater involvement (Berges, 1993; Lucas et al., 1991; and the National Governor's Association, 1991). Through school-based management both teachers and parents develop ownership in the mission of the school. Parents become partners in the educational process as school-based management provides a means for increased involvement. Involving school staff in personnel selection, the budgeting process, and program improvement increases professionalism and allows the campus to better meet the needs of students more efficiently (Rogers, 1993; Stribling, 1993; Malen and Ogawa, 1985). In a time when money is tight, schools should respond by using site-based management to initiate creative budgeting plans to improve learning conditions for children ("Budgeting Plan Works", 1994).

I recommend that additional research be done in the following areas:

(1) Research the effect that training has on School Improvement and Parent Advisory Council members' abilities to influence decisions of building-based councils. Flynn (1998), David (1996), Cotton (1992), and McKenzie (1991) found that
participants on building-based councils who have been trained in participant decision making, parliamentary procedure, communications, and leadership are able to make influential decisions concerning school policies.

(2) Conduct a longitudinal study of building-based councils' influence on personnel, program, and budget. Research in Lafayette Parish indicated that council members do have influence in the area of programming. Further research could determine if, with time, the areas of personnel and budget would be influenced as well.

(3) Conduct case studies of administrators who exhibit autocratic leadership style and contrast with case studies of democratic leadership style found in administrators of site-based schools. Interview statements from one case study, implicated the need for a change in leadership styles. According to Noble (1996), Oswald (1995), and Reddyk (1994), there is a need for a move toward a collaborative and shared leadership style. In contrast, Tucker and Codding (1998), state that the principal should be in charge and should be accountable.
These suggestions for additional research on site-based management warrant consideration as we continue to explore schools with building-based councils in general, and the role of administrators in these schools specifically.
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APPENDIX A

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
Appendix A: Conceptual Framework

Organizational/Political Dynamics
Of Building-Based Councils Decision Making/Management
To Address and Affect School Policy Outcomes

Independent
- PAC
  - Arrangement
  - Interactions
- SIC
  - Arrangement
  - Interactions

Building-Based Councils
Decision making
- Personnel
- Program
- Budget

Dependent
- School
  - Outcomes
- Personnel
  - Program
  - Budget
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APPENDIX B

CASE STUDY METHOD
Appendix B: Case Study Method

Design

Single-Case Data Collection & Analysis

Cross-Case Analysis

Develop Theory

- Relate study to previous theory
- Aim for explanation

Select Cases

Design Collection Protocol

- Define "process" operationally
- Define "process outcomes" (not just ultimate effects)
- Use formal data collection techniques

Conduct 1st Case Study

- Faculty surveys
- In-depth interviews
- Council agendas and minutes

Conduct 2nd Case Study

- Etc.

Conduct Remaining Case Studies

- Etc.

Write Individual Case Report

- Pattern match
- Policy implications

Write Individual Case Report

- Pattern match
- Policy implications
- Replications

Write Cross-Case Report

Draw Cross-Case Conclusions

Modify Theory

Develop policy implications
APPENDIX C

SCHOOL FACULTY SURVEY
School Faculty Survey Code ___

Profile of Informant/School

1. Have you been on staff for:
   - 1-5 years yes no
   - 5-10 years yes no
   - 10-15 years yes no
   - 15-20 years yes no
   - over 20 years yes no

2. Is your student population and the community your school serves characterized as a:
   - low socio-economic area yes no
   - middle socio-economic area yes no
   - high socio-economic area yes no

3. Are single parent families prevalent in your school community? yes no

4. Is your community population a transient one? yes no

5. Would you say that your school population is diverse? yes no

6. Are you a member of the School Improvement Council (SIC)? yes no

7. If you are a member of SIC, were you elected to this position? yes no

8. Do you play an "active" role on this committee? yes no

9. Would you like to serve on this committee for another year? yes no

10. Are your goals being accomplished through the SIC? yes no

11. Does the SIC require time beyond that spent in formal meetings? yes no

12. Are you a member of or are you involved in any other school, district, or community committees, clubs, or service organizations? yes no
Content of SIC Interactions

1. Do you discuss the following topics at the SIC meetings?
   - budget yes__ no__
   - personnel yes__ no__
   - curriculum yes__ no__
   - evaluation of school programs yes__ no__

2. Do you feel the above four topics adequately address your school needs? yes__ no__

3. Are other staff members or groups of staff members involved with these topics? yes__ no__

4. If no to the above three questions, does the administration make these decisions? yes__ no__
   (*Do you as the administrator make these decisions alone? yes__ no__)

5. Do you provide topics for the agendas for SIC meetings? yes__ no__

6. Are all topics on the agenda discussed at each meeting? yes__ no__

7. Can the agenda be modified? yes__ no__

8. Do members of the council ever strongly disagree on issues? yes__ no__

9. If yes, are the disagreements concerning:
   - budget yes__ no__
   - personnel yes__ no__
   - curriculum yes__ no__
   - evaluation of school programs yes__ no__

10. Are these disagreements handled by:
    - committee as a whole yes__ no__
    - individuals yes__ no__
    - administration yes__ no__

11. Do these disagreements influence the interactions of the members of the SIC? yes__ no__
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12. If yes, in what way do these disagreements influence the interactions?
   - expertise: yes__ no__
   - information: yes__ no__
   - formal authority: yes__ no__
   - personal style: yes__ no__
   - social status: yes__ no__

**Degree of Involvement - Stage of Involvement**

1. How does the SIC operate in your school?
   - SIC discusses topics: yes__ no__
   - SIC makes recommendations to other decision making bodies: yes__ no__
   - SIC decide themselves what is to be done: yes__ no__
   - SIC affirms what somebody else has already decided: yes__ no__

**Impact**

1. Do you view the following in a more positive way since you have been on the SIC?
   - the school: yes__ no__
   - the principal: yes__ no__
   - the teachers & staff: yes__ no__

2. Do the decisions of the SIC get implemented?
   - yes__ no__

3. Do you feel that changes need to be made in the SIC?
   - yes__ no__
APPENDIX D

PARENT INTERVIEW GUIDE
Parent Interview Guide

Profile of Informant/School

1. How long have you had children enrolled at ________?

2. What is your occupation?

3. Where did you go to school?

4. Would you describe the community served by this school?

   : What is the socio-economic status of this area?

   : Is your community a mobile one or do you have fairly permanent residents?

   : Would you say that your community is rather diverse or quite homogeneous? Why?

5. How long have you been a member of the PAC?

6. How did you become a member? (elected? recruited? volunteered?)
7. Why did you join the PAC?
   : What got you started? (issue, event duty, contact)
   : What did you want to accomplish?

8. Approximately how much time each month does your work with the SIC take?
   : Does the SIC require time beyond that spent in formal meetings? If yes, doing what kinds of things?

9. Are you a member of or are you involved in any others school, district, or community committees, clubs, or service organizations?
   : Which ones?

Content of SIC Interactions

1. What topics or issues do you usually talk about at the PAC meetings?

2. Are there other topics that you would rather discuss?
   : Which ones?

3. How does a topic get on the agenda?
   : When there are several items to consider, who influences what you will talk about?
4. Does the PAC

___discuss the building budget?

___discuss the hiring or participate in the interviews or evaluations of school employees?

___set curriculum goals or priorities?

___evaluate and/or revise the school programs?

: If no, Why not?

: If yes, What does the PAC do?

: Are other parents or groups of parents involved with these items?

: If yes, Who? How?

: If no, does the principal make these decisions? alone?
5. Do members of the council ever strongly disagree on issues?

: What kinds of topics evoke strong disagreements?

6. How are those disagreements generally handled?

: Who is particularly influential when disagreements occur?

: How do they influence the interactions?

: What makes them influential? Why are they effective? (Probe expertise, information, social status, formal authority, style)

Degree of Involvement-Stage of Involvement

1. What do you see as the role of the PAC?

: What are its major purposes, functions?
2. Sometimes school councils discuss topics, sometime they make recommendations to other decision making bodies, sometimes they decide themselves what is to be done, and sometimes they affirm what somebody else has already decided. Which of these activities comes closest to describing how the PAC operates in your school?

: Would you describe an example of that type of activity?

: Why does your council tend to operate that way?

**Impact**

1. What effect has the PAC had on your school?

: Do you view the school differently since you have been on the PAC? How is your view different?

: Do you view the principal differently? How has your view changed?

: Do you view teachers or staff differently? How has your view changed?
Would you describe what you see as the major successes of the PAC?

2. Do the decisions of the PAC get implemented?

If yes, could you describe with an example of one that was implemented and one that was not?

If no, why not?

3. What changes might make the PAC more effective?

4. Could you describe the relationship of the PAC and the SIC?

Are there, at times, tensions between these two groups?

Would you describe a situation where tension was apparent?

How did the tension get handled: (Probe-who was influential, how did they influence the interactions, why were they effective, resources-status, information, expertise, legal authority, style)
5. Does the PAC interact with district committees, with the superintendent, or the school board?

   : If yes, how do these interactions occur? what kinds of issues are discussed? What are the results?

   : If no, do you see the PAC as a group that only influences decisions in your school?

6. What has your participation on the PAC meant to you?

   : Are you more or less optimistic about being able to affect school policies and operations? Why?
   : Having had the experience, would you serve again? Why?

7. Is there anything else that you could tell me that would help me understand the SIC in your school?
8. Are there any printed materials—agendas, minutes, reports, brochures—that you could share with me?

THANK YOU!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
INTERVIEW ASSESSMENT

Interviewer ________________________ School__________________

Source_____________ Code _______ Position_______________

Date___________ Time___________ Length___________________

I. Source seemed:

Uninterested ____, ____ , ____ , ____ , ____ , interested
Reluctant ____, ____ , ____ , ____ , ____ ,
straightforward
Uniformed ____ , ____ , ____ , ____ , knowledgeable

II. Comments
APPENDIX E

SCHOOL STAFF INTERVIEW GUIDE
School Staff Interview Guide  

*Do not ask principal  **Do not ask teacher, staff

Profile of Informant/School

1. How long have you been on the staff at __________?

2. Would you characterize your student population and the community your school serves?

: What is the socio-economic status of your students?

: How prevalent are single-parent families?

: Is your community a mobile one or do you have fairly permanent residents?

: Would you say that your school is rather diverse or quite homogeneous? Why?

*3. How long have you been a member of the SIC?

*4. How did you become a member? (elected? recruited? volunteered?)
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5. Why did you join the SIC?

- What got you started: (issue, event, duty, contact)

- What did you want to accomplish?

6. Approximately how much time each month does your work with the SIC take?

- Does the SIC require time beyond that spent in formal meetings? If yes, doing what kind of things?

7. Are you a member of or are you involved in any other school, district, or community committees, clubs, or service organizations?

- If yes, which ones?

**Content of SIC Interactions**

1. What topics or issues do you usually talk about at the SIC meetings?
2. Are there other topics that you would rather discuss?
   : If yes, which ones?

3. How does a topic get on the agenda?

   : When there are several items to consider, who influences what you will talk about?

   : How does (he/she/they) do that?

   : Can the agenda be modified? How?

   : Does that occur? When?

4. Does the SIC
   ____ discuss the building budget?
   ____ interview or evaluate school employees?
   ____ set curriculum goals or priorities?
   ____ evaluate and/or revise the school program?
: If yes, what does the SIC do?

: If no, why not?

: Are other teachers or groups of teachers involved with these items?

- If yes, who is involved? How are they involved?

- If no, does the principal make these decisions alone? (*Do you as the principal make these decisions alone?)

5. Do members of the council ever strongly disagree on issues?

: What kinds of topics evoke strong disagreements?

6. How are those disagreements generally handled?

: Who is particularly influential when disagreements occur?
How do they influence the interactions?

What makes them influential? Why are they effective? (Probe expertise, information, social status, formal authority, style)

Degree of Involvement - Stage of Involvement

1. What do you see as the role of the SIC?

What are its major purposes, functions?

2. Sometimes school councils discuss topics, sometimes they make recommendations to other decision making bodies, sometimes they decide themselves what is to be done, and sometimes they affirm what somebody else has already decided. Which of these activities comes closest to describing how the SIC operates in your school?

Would you describe an example of that type of activity?

Why does your council tend to operate that way?
Impact

1. What effect has the SIC had on your school?

: Do you view the school differently since you have been on the SIC? How is your view different?

*: Do you view the principal differently? How has your view changed?

: Do you view teachers or staff differently? How has your view changed?

: Would you describe what you see as the major successes of the SIC?

2. Do the decisions of the SIC get implemented?

: If yes, could you describe with an example how that happens?
If yes, sometimes, could you give me an example of one that was implemented and one that was not?

If no, why not?

3. What changes might make the SIC more effective?

4. What has your participation on the SIC meant to you?

Are you more or less optimistic about being able to affect school policies and operations? Why?

Having had the experience, would you serve again? Why?
5. Is there anything else that you could tell me that would help me understand the SIC in your school?

**The following questions are regarding the Parent Advisory Council (PAC).**

Content of PAC Interactions

1. What topics or issues do you usually talk about at the PAC meetings?

2. Are there other topics that you would rather discuss? Which ones?

3. How does a topic get on the agenda? When there are several items to consider, who influences what you will talk about? How does (he/she/they) do that?

4. Can the agenda be modified? How?
Does that occur? When?

4. Does the PAC

_____ discuss the building budget?

_____ discuss the hiring, participate in the interviewing and/or the evaluation of school employees?

_____ set curriculum goals or priorities?

_____ evaluate and/or revise the school program?

: If yes, what does the PAC do?
: If no, why not?

: Are other parents or groups of parents involved with these items?

- If yes, who is involved? How are they involved?

5. Do members of the council disagree on issues?

: What kinds of topics evoke strong disagreements?

6. How are those disagreements generally handled?
Who is particularly influential when disagreements occur?

How do they influence the interactions?

What makes them influential? Why are they effective? (Probe expertise, information, social status, formal authority, style)

Degree of Involvement—Stage of Involvement

1. What do you see as the role of the PAC?

What are its major purposes, functions?

2. Sometimes school councils discuss topics, sometimes they make recommendations to other decision making bodies, sometimes they decide themselves what is to be done, and sometimes they affirm what somebody else has already decided. Which of these activities comes closest to describing how the PAC operates in your school?

Would you describe an example of that type of activity?
Why does your council tend to operate that way?

Impact

1. What effect has the PAC had on your school?

: Do you view parents differently since you have been on the council? How is your view different?

*: Do you view teachers or staff differently having watched them work with parents? How has your view changed?

: Do you view the principal differently having watched (him/her) work with parents? How has your view changed?
Would you describe what you see as the major successes of the PAC?

2. Do the decisions of the PAC get implemented?

   : If yes, could you describe with an example how that happens?

   : If yes, sometimes, could you give me an example of one that was implemented and one that was not?

   : If no, why not?

3. What changes might make the PAC more effective?

4. Could you describe the relationship between your school's SIC and PAC?
Are there at times tensions between the groups?

- Would you describe a situation where that tension was apparent?

- How did the tensions get handled? (Probe—who was influential, how did they influence the interaction, why were they effective, and resources—status, information, expertise, legal authority, style, etc.)

5. What has your participation on the PAC meant to you?

: Are you more or less optimistic about being able to work with parents to affect school policies and operations? Why?

: Having had the experience, would you serve again? Why?

6. Is there anything else that you could tell me that would help me understand the PAC in your school?
7. Are there any printed materials—such as minutes, agendas, council reports—that you could share with me?

THANK YOU!!!!!!!!!!!!!
INTERVIEW ASSESSMENT

Interviewer________________ School________________

Source________________ Code______ Position__________

Date______________ Time_________ Length___________

I. Source seemed:

uninterested ____, ____ , ____, ____ , ____ interested
reluctant ____, ____ , ____, ____ , ____ straightforward
uninformed ____, ____ , ____, ____ , ____ knowledgeable

II. Comments
APPENDIX F

AGENDAS
High School H

School Improvement Council Meeting
July 31, 1997

Agenda

1. Assess the implementation of the plan
2. Consider adjustments
3. Set priorities
4. Determine contact persons for various objectives
5. Plan inservice time allotted to improvement Plan
   (August 13 afternoon session)
   - Review accomplishments
   - Introduce coming year's priorities
   - Introduce and solicit contact persons for various objectives
   - Provide departments time to review and set goals towards implementing the plan
High School H

School Improvement Council Meeting
February 20, 1998

Agenda

1. Need to develop one plan.
   - School Improvement Plan
   - Schools That Work Plan
   - Title I Plan
   - Southern Association Accreditation Plan
   - Technology Plan

2. Conduct another needs assessment.
   - Surveys
   - Test Scores
   - Attendance
   - Discipline
   - Curriculum
   - Technology
   - Report Card

3. Align goals.
   - Parish
   - School Improvement
   - Schools That Work
   - Technology
   - Southern Association

4. Design a Title I Plan by April 1, 1998.

5. Set up meeting schedule.

6. Look ahead to action committees.

7. Decide on committee or council makeup.
Elementary School A

School Improvement Committee
Meeting
January 12, 1998

Coffee
Proposal: Coffee machine; survey the staff to see who is interested.
To be handled by Chancey.

Replacing Ousse on the Committee
Correlate to meet and decide, in the meantime Babineaux will be the liason

Broussard
A. Dress Code: footwear - canvas/athletic shoe is there a difference; yes; research
Board policy on jean wear; reminder - Friday is not a Spirit day
B. Announcements - to be done on the intercom in the morning and afternoon
C. Friday new secretary will be in place, Rachel Venable

Members Present
Alexander, Babineaux, Broussard, Chancey,
Duplechin, Kerlegan, Primeaux, Turpie
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Elementary School A

Meeting
February 9, 1998

Old Business - Behavior of BD students not fitting in the classroom

* discussed at two faculty meetings
* use interventions, project R.I.D.E.
* refer to student's red folder
* action taken depends on child's behavior plan, IEP

State Accountability Plan

* stated at the faculty meeting, 2/2/98, parishes 20% (8 schools) to be announced at the next board meeting
* to identify the 20% Lafayette Parish decided to use LEAP and CAT scores, attendance, and suspensions
* we will write our own plan: where, how; use 96/97 scores as the baseline; combination - CAT from 96/97, ITBS 98/99; problem 97/98 we take neither

School Profile

* school develops - use number of suspensions, discipline referrals, absences, transients, special education students, 504 students (type of modification)
* money is suppose to be attached: dream - what would you like to have
  ex. pre/post test for comparisons; staff development - type;
  lower pupil-teacher ratio; extended - day, year
* suggestions from the staff
* committee responsibility - rewrite school improvement plan
* timeline - May 1, 1998 report into the State Department

Faculty Meeting, 2/16/98

presentation by West on criteria for gifted referrals

Behavior

* problem: tardiness; average 30 a day; parish guidelines - 5 unexcused tardies, consequence - behavior clinic;
* guidelines for time of school arrival to be sent in a letter to parents along with consequences for tardiness
* behavior clinic to take place on Tuesday and Thursday from 2:30-3:30 PM, Rogers Griffin to facilitate; to begin as soon as possible
* look over plan, make corrections, suggestions

Dress Code for Substitutes

* when persons come in for the first time, they are given a copy of the dress code; all substitutes should have received a copy of the dress code

Members Present

Alexander, Babineaux, Broussard, Chancey, Duplechin, Kerlegan, Primeaux, Turpie, Williams
Students in the third, fourth, and fifth grades will begin testing on Tuesday, March 21 and continue through Friday, April 3rd. Please help us to help your student do his/her best on the test by making sure they get a good night’s sleep and eat a good breakfast. Also, please encourage your child to do their very best. We don’t want them to be nervous, but we want them to understand that this is important to them. Attendance is extremely important.

Easter Holidays will begin on April 13th and end on April 17th. Students return to school on April 20th.

April 9th is the end of the 6 weeks and report cards will go out on April 24th.

We are raffling off an Easter basket and several other prizes. The tickets are $5 and the drawing will be on April 26th.

Reminders:
- Students are not allowed on campus before 7:30 in the morning.
- Students are not to be dropped off or picked up in front of the school. Please use parent-pickup.
- Behavior Clinic ends at 3:45. Please make every effort to be prompt.
- Please read and sign your child’s Agenda Book daily.

FEA
We have just completed a site visitation from Johns Hopkins University. Our teachers and students are doing exceptionally well. We are so proud of them all! Please continue to have our child read to someone in your home at least 20 minutes daily.

Our Spring Fling will be on April 7th from 12:00 to 2:00. We are in desperate need of parent volunteers. Please call Mrs. Gary at 233-2190. We hope to see you there.
Elementary School B

Title I School Improvement Grant
Submitted by Rosemary S. Benoit, School Team Leader
March 11, 1998

After being informed on October 3, 1997 that was placed in a School Improvement Plan due to showing no growth on the fifth graders' LEAP math scores, John Lee, Principal, and the Schoolwide Program Cadre met to determine what steps should be taken to assess and improve our current situation.

All of the following events have taken place as a result of that meeting:

10/6/97 - Catherine McKay was contracted to be consultant and Rosemary S. Benoit was contracted to be the School Team Leader. See contracts for their job requirements.

- Ms. Syne was hired to oversee the Americorp tutors.

- A Planning Committee was formed and consisted of:
  Janice Moncrief, Assistant Principal
  Cheryl Robin
  Julie Malveaux
  Catherine McKay

10/13/97 - Success-For-All was getting well underway at this point to help raise all of the students' scores. All special education students were involved in full inclusion for reading.

- Mr. McDonald, a fifth grade math teacher, agreed to serve on the Lafayette Parish Text Book Adoption Committee.

- Writing of the Title I School Improvement Grant was completed.

- The Team Leader and Consultant met to discuss the grant, what their duties were, and how they would work together.

10/21/97 - Several math teachers attended a "Math Presentation" put on by McGraw-Hill.

10/23/97 - Practice LEAP booklets were made available to third through fifth grade teachers.
12/19/97 - McGraw-Hill gave permission to reproduce their "Problem of the Day" charts.

12/23/97 - The requisitions for manipulatives were "walked" through at the School Board Office.

1/9/98 - Several teachers attended the Title 1 Teaching and Learning Seminar at the Hotel Acadiana here in Lafayette.

1/17/98 - A six-hour inservice was held for all 3-5 regular and special education teachers from 7:30 - 1:30. Catherine McKay, Rose Clement, and Mary Keller were the presenters. The inservice focused on test taking strategies and making math fun and meaningful.

A committee and grade level meeting was held after the inservice. Teachers were reminded to document usage of inservice ideas in their lesson plans. Teachers felt that some students who really needed reinforcement in math were not on the tutoring list. Teachers requested that the kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers have an inservice similar to the one they participated in today.

1/26/98 - Teachers received additional information on test-taking strategies and several more math games.

The Team Leader received all math grades for the first three six weeks from the third through fifth grade teachers.

1/28/98 - Tentative tutoring schedules were sent out.

Math files were set-up for grades three through five using the materials from the textbook vendors who sent math kits to view for the textbook adoption.

All student textbooks and teachers' manuals are located in the Parent Room for Americorp Tutors to use. Quite a few manipulatives are located in there also.

2/5/98 - The Team Leader met with kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers to determine the date of their math inservice as requested by the third through fifth grade teachers.
- A revised tutoring schedule was sent out.

2/6/98 - Mrs. Booker, one of our computer proctors, researched and came up with an individual profile for all third through fifth grade students who were having difficulty and/or failing math at mid-term. These profiles listed all areas of math not yet mastered by each student. Ms. Booker printed practice work on each of these skills for these students.

2/9/98 - Portfolios were set up for each third through fifth grade student whose name was submitted by their teachers.

2/10/98 - The team leader met with the Americorps tutors at U.S.L. to discuss the changes in their tutoring schedules and to explain new guidelines for the tutoring time. The half hour sessions were to be divided into drill, application of concepts and computation, problem-solving, and test-taking strategies. Each student's prescriptions (written by their individual math teachers) are located in their portfolios and are to be used as a guide for instruction.

2/10/98 - Two of the fifth grade teachers were given a Macintosh math computer kit to view and use as desired.

- Some of the math manipulatives were received and dispersed.

2/14/98 - The second inservice day for third through fifth grade teachers was held. This workshop focused on the many uses of manipulatives and their benefits. Grade level teachers and School Improvement Team met and discussed what and how the methods and strategies learned at the workshop could be utilized. They also shared how effective they felt the activities from the first inservice were with the students.

2/26/98 - Grade level teachers and the School Improvement Team met and discussed what math skills they had not covered yet. Teachers were asked to use their "Problem of the Day" charts.

- The Team Leader met with Lelia McCullum and Evelyn Lewis to organize and plan the K-2 math inservice called "Math Our Way".

3/3-6/98 - The Team Leader, Ms. McCullum and Ms. Lewis met to prepare the
agenda and all materials needed for the Kindergarten through second
grade workshop.

3/7/98 - A six-hour inservice was held for kindergarten, first, and second grade
teachers. The presenters were the Team Leader, Evelyn Lewis, and Lelia
McCullum. They showed the teachers how to make math fun and
beneficial at the same time. The two most important areas of the presentation
were “Calendar Math” and the use of manipulatives in developing concepts.

Title I School Improvement Plan is adequate in attempting to meet the
needs of the students. The plan addressed the key problem areas and everyone worked together
do their utmost to ensure that all students were brought up to their potential. Most teachers
were extremely enthusiastic and eager to try the new strategies and methods that were presented
to them by the consultant and their co-workers.

The needs of the students can best be met by continuing the efforts of this plan and by
considering and hopefully implementing some of the following recommendations:

1. That the teachers be commended for their continued efforts and
   commitment despite all of the pressure associated with implementing this School
   Improvement Plan;

2. Students having difficulty in math should be made accountable, by
   their parents, to attend tutoring before, during, or after school hours;

3. That students who have failed the minimum standard tests not be
   promoted to the next grade level;

4. That teachers school wide or by grade level be allowed to decide
   whether to teach math to their homeroom or to group for math by ability level
   during math instruction;

5. That a complete inventory of all math manipulatives on campus, that
   belong to the school system, be compiled and be held by grade level representatives;

6. That teachers who transfer out be made accountable by the principal
   for any and all math manipulatives that have been purchased by

7. That every teacher on campus be provided an adequate supply of
   manipulatives for a whole class as funds are available.
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8 That students who require 504 modifications and are below their grade level throughout the year in math and/or Language Arts not be allowed to take any standardized or state content standards tests without modifications and that their test scores are not compiled with the other students' scores. This is pending on policies adopted by the School Board for the School Improvement Plan.

9. That teachers and administrators choose whether it would benefit the students more if they remained in multi-level grade hallways or if they returned to grade level hallways or areas.
FACULTY MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1998
3:05 p.m.

WELCOME
MRS. GWEN HARRIS

IN-HOUSE ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED

INTRODUCTION OF NEW CHAIRPERSON FOR SCHOOLWIDE
MRS. GWEN HARRIS

SCHOOLWIDE BUDGET REVISIONS
MRS. MARILYN HENDERSON

SUCCESS FOR ALL
MRS. DIANNE HERNANDEZ

UPCOMING ASSESSMENT/PROGRESS
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To: Schoolwide Committee
From: J. Neck
Re: Title I January budget revision
Date: 1-29-96

Please find the budget revision attached. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of you for your thoughts and suggestions. I hope that you find I implemented them as best I could. Below you will find explanations for each line item. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Item 430-Maintenance:
Copy machine maintenance contract (includes toner and developer)
Mac 5300 1 year warranty (no warranty for next year)

Item 610 PRT:
$300.00 left in this item as per your request for end of the year mailing to parents.

Item 115- Tutoring:
All of the funds allocated for tutoring must be spent on tutoring. Therefore, tutoring will continue through the second week of May.

Item 119-Staff consultants:
These funds are allotted of LMS staff who preside at a workshop.

Item 123-Substitutes:
Fran (Eva's sister-in-law) has been retained to help enter AR information. This item will fund her work.

Item 150-Stipends:
This money was left so that continued Schoolwide Committee meetings or faculty meetings can carry a stipend for participants. These funds must be used before May 15. (PLATO, READING RENAISSANCE)

Item 582-In-state conferences:
Funded were Louisiana Association of Computer Using Educators Teaching and Learning Title I Seminar Troubleshooting the PC (March) Louisiana Heritage Seminar
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Item 591-Tutor bus:
Because we had to use all tutoring funds for tutoring, we had to extend bus service for the students.

Item 610-Materials of instruction
The following items are either received or on requisition:
1. Computer Center office supplies
2. Accelerated Reader
   - Books-Early Reader and Classics
   - AR tests disks
3. Mega Math video program
4. Superstar Science (30 computers)
5. Money Squares (10 computers)
6. Ace Explorer-Sequencing (10 computers)
7. Reading for Critical Thinking- (grades 3-12) Site license
8. Word Problem Square Off- (grades 5-9) Site license
9. Geodsey- Teacher lesson plan management system
10. Plato Learning System
11. ITBS Test Best (grades 6-8)
12. Study Skills Series (6th grade all students, desk sets 7-8 grades)
13. Refreshments for teacher workshops/meetings

Priority for ordering:
1. Microsoft Office Pro for IBM and Microsoft Word for Mac
2. Hyperstudio 3.1 (40 computers)
3. All other requested software

Item 731-Equipment:
These items are either received or on requisition:
1. 2 PC 200 computers
2. 1 one hundred user server (Plato and Microsoft Office Pro)
3. 10 ethernet cards for Mac lab
4. 8 E-mates-mini computers which function with either a Mac or IBM

Priority for ordering:
1. 3 PC 300 computers
2. 1 high volume laser printer for IBM
3. Headphones for all computers ordered
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