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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the restructuring/reform efforts in Louisiana public schools. The population for this study was defined as Louisiana public school principals who were employed for the year 1997-1998 in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools. The Louisiana High School Coaches Association Constitution and Directory (1997-98) and the Louisiana School Directory (1997-98) (Bulletin 1462) published by the Louisiana Department of Education provided the frame for the study. A simple random sample, with replacement, of principals from Louisiana public high schools participated in the study.

A three-part researcher designed instrument was used to collect the data. The demographic data included principal and school characteristics, internal and external forces. The second part included six component scales (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach, and Information Technology). Each component was divided into two scales: awareness of elements of restructuring/reform and extent of school restructuring/reform implementation. A write-in section asked principals to identify barriers and successful interventions. Two full mailings and two follow-up attempts resulted in a total response rate of 64.9%.

Factors that were found to be related to the extent of restructuring/reform implementation included the principal demographic variables of race,
number of state professional meetings attended, highest degree and year earned. The school demographic variables included: honors curricula, tech prep curricula, mainstreamed special education curricula, self-contained special education curricula, number of full time classroom teachers, curricula offerings, and the racial makeup of the school.

Using multiple regression, a model was found which explained a significant portion of the variance (31%) in the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation in Louisiana public high schools. The nine variables that entered the model included mainstreamed special education curricula, honors curricula, principal's level of education, Tech Prep, civic organization support, years respondent has held position, school board support, the race of the principal and business and industry support.

A follow-up study is recommended to test the model.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Education Today's state by state examination of public school education reveals alarming news. The general condition of American education is mediocre at best (Edwards, 1997). This is not only a national issue, but a state concern as well. A 1996 poll by Mumane and Levy found that public education is one of the greatest concerns in America. This poll showed that, overall, confidence in public education has fallen.

The American high school, designed for another age and another task, is in deep trouble. Symptoms of distress are building all around. They are high on the agenda of a public exasperated by the inability of educators to develop coherent remedies to the school's most pressing problems: dropout rates, in some cases as high as 50-70%, and teachers and administrators who are demoralized and who have given up on truly educating students (Tewel, 1995, p.2).

Business and industry continually lament the fact that graduates of public schools are coming to them without even the most rudimentary skills. Clearly the demands of the labor market have changed. Successful businesses quickly change as conditions change. The same cannot be said for education.

Cawelti (1994a) listed the following criticisms of public schools in America:

Low achievement, both on tests of basic skills and of tests of general knowledge in core subjects.

The need to move beyond only teaching basic skills and factual information to developing higher-order thinking and problem solving, and to provide classroom learning experiences that help students derive their own meaning from learning.
Curriculum fragmentation, which prevents students from seeing the connections between school subjects and real life.

The impersonality of large high schools in which many students feeling no sense of belonging to the institution.

The failure to provide learning experiences that provide students with the skills needed for transition to meaningful jobs in the world of work after graduation.

The predominance of students as passive learners and the failure to actively engage them in the learning process (Cawelti, 1994a, pp. 1-2.

Americans want world class schools, but do not feel that this is what they are getting (Chalker & Haynes, 1994). National reports have proclaimed that the American educational system is in serious trouble, i.e., A Nation at Risk, Carnegie Reports. Statistics concerning U.S. education constantly bombard the public with numbers showing an increase in the dropout rate combined with a decrease in SAT and ACT scores and higher and higher failure rates. Less than one half of those tested on the National Assessment of Educational Progress were able to do challenging work at their grade level (Olson, 1997).

The 28th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward Public Schools (Elam, Rose, & Gallup, 1996) queried 1329 Americans who were at least 18 years old regarding educational issues. Adults believe that the U.S. lags behind other countries in basic skills like reading (69%) and math (54%). In addition, 61% of the parents surveyed were in favor of using public school money for private school education, i.e., vouchers and school choice.
A poll commissioned by The Center for Education Reform in 1996 revealed 93% of those surveyed believed the quality of their public school could be improved, and 86% of those surveyed supported some type of school choice option, rather than being restricted to sending their child to a school to which he or she is assigned (Allen, 1997, p. 1).

Statistics reveal that Louisiana ACT scores are second lowest among states where the ACT is the dominant college entrance exam (Williams, 1994). Fifty-three percent of students in Louisiana attend college. However, of that 53%, 48% of those students graduating from a public school must enroll in college remedial courses (Edwards, 1997).

In 1995, the last year for which statistics were available for Louisiana, the data shows that 3,034 freshmen, 2,073 sophomores, 1,591 juniors and 1,080 seniors dropped out of school (Louisiana Department of Education, 1996-97). Louisiana is tied with West Virginia for the highest dropout rate in the nation (Edwards, 1997).

Shepro (1995) pronounced restructuring/reform efforts “a frenzied journey to nowhere” (p. 43) because academia has ignored the cries for change in the way in which students are educated. Documentation from literature is scarce when it comes to proof that changes have been made in the way students are being educated.

“The question is not whether public schools are better or worse than they used to be. The question is whether public schools are good enough to prepare all children for the next century” (Edwards, 1997, p. 7).
The climate is right for a change in the ways that schools operate. “It is an issue that should concern every American. A mediocre education will act as a ball and chain in the high-tech information society in which we now live” (Edwards, 1997, p. 7).

Statement of the Problem

Despite the myriad of recommendations made by various groups, it appears little work has been done to ascertain whether schools have accepted and applied the recommendations. Many articles have been written as to the value of the suggestions, but nothing has been published regarding their execution (Edwards & Allred, 1993).

No data could be located regarding the restructuring/reform efforts in Louisiana. Therefore, a basic need exists to know about the restructuring/reform efforts in Louisiana public schools and the interventions which principals deem necessary for enhancing restructuring/reform efforts in Louisiana public schools. This study will provide baseline data on the restructuring/reform effort in Louisiana. Information obtained through this research is needed to provide a foundation for future restructuring/reform efforts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the restructuring/reform efforts in Louisiana public schools.
Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Describe Louisiana public high schools (which contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools) on selected variables. These characteristics included: current enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, racial makeup of the student body, and size of city/town in which the school was located.

2. Describe Louisiana public high school principals (in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools) on selected demographic characteristics. These characteristics included: principal's current position in school, years in this position, years of classroom teaching experience, age, gender, race, highest degree and year earned, number of professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended per year, and attendance in a leadership academy.

3. Determine if Louisiana public high school principals perceive that each of the following support school restructuring/reform: mandates, grant funds, school board, superintendent, community, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, and religious groups.

5. Assess the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation as perceived by public high school principals regarding components of school restructuring/reform (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology).

6. Determine if differences existed between groups for selected variables. Principal characteristics included: gender, race, and attendance in a leadership academy. School characteristics included: curricula offerings (advanced placement, honors, vocational, college prep, tech prep, general, special education, mainstreamed, self-contained, and gifted and talented). Internal and external variables included: mandates for school restructuring; superintendent mandates; community, school board, superintendent, parent, business and industry, civic organizations, religious group support; and receipt of grant money.
7. Determine if relationships existed between the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation by component (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology) as perceived by public high school principals, and selected demographic characteristics of principals (years in current position, years of classroom teaching experience, highest degree and year earned, number of professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended per year) and selected school characteristics (current enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, racial make-up of the student body, size of city/town in which the school is located).

8. Identify any barriers that existed in the school restructuring/reform process as identified by Louisiana public high school principals.

9. Identify any successful interventions that existed in the school restructuring/reform process as identified by Louisiana public high school principals.

10. Determine if a model existed which explained a significant portion of the variance in extent of school restructuring/reform implementation. The predictor variables used in these analyses...
included those reported by the high school principal (awareness of restructuring/reform, selected demographic variables of the school and principal, internal forces, external forces). School demographic variables included: curricula offerings: advanced placement curricula, general curricula, special education, self-contained curricula, mainstreamed special education curricula, honors curricula, tech prep curricula; number of full time high school classroom teachers, and percentage minority. Principal demographic variables included: years in position; gender; race; highest degree; number of professional memberships; and number of state meetings attended. Internal or external forces included: support for restructuring/reform by the community, school board, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, religious groups; and mandates.

Significance of the Study

The primary benefit of this study would be to provide Louisiana with baseline data on which school leaders could build a more viable educational system. Polen (1992) substantiates the need for this study by emphasizing the relevance it will have to those who have to plan and implement an educational restructuring/reform plan. This could include educational preparation for administrators, State Department of Education supervision and evaluation of schools. Educators and planners will have a better
perspective of the problems and potential solutions for improving Louisiana schools.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following three terms were operationally defined and their definitions are provided below. Definitions for other components and elements of restructuring/reform have already been defined on the survey instrument; therefore, they are included only in Appendix A.

Reform - Allen (1997) has defined reform as "concepts or proposals that institute fundamental change in the system" (p.3). Cawelti (1994) defines restructuring/reform as "...significant changes designed to contribute to productivity and effectiveness" (p. 3). Reavis and Griffith (1992) defined it as "a complete change in the culture, organizational assumptions, leadership, curriculum, instructional approach, and accountability of the school" (p. 2). Koppich (1990) simply described it as a synonym for change. The researcher has operationally defined reform as implementation of current reforms in curriculum, classroom, teacher professional development, school structure, community outreach, and technology. In addition, it is systemic rather than piecemeal.

Restructuring - The Center on Organization & Restructuring of Schools defined restructuring as "...a continuum of departures from conventional practice, from a greater to a lesser extent; rather than as simply restructured or conventional" (Newmann, 1996, p. 6).
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CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides background information that served as the basis for the necessity of this research. The chapter is organized into the following sections: theoretical framework, national and state restructuring/reform efforts, and components of restructuring/reform.

Concerns about the educational system are reverberating at the national, state, and local levels. A heated debate involving American education has raged in the press. A diverse group of individuals have engaged in writing about what appears to be a major crisis (Heffner, 1993, p. iii).

Society is mandating that education make more changes than have been made in the last decade (Wiebe, 1992). The public no longer supports public school education and criticisms abound (Olson, 1997). Cawelti (1994a) listed the following criticisms:

Low achievement, both on tests of basic skills and of tests of general knowledge in core subjects.

The need to move beyond only teaching basic skills and factual information to developing higher-order thinking and problem solving, and to provide classroom learning experiences that help students derive their own meaning from learning.

Curriculum fragmentation, which prevents students from seeing the connections between school subjects and real life.

The impersonality of large high schools in which many students feeling no sense of belonging to the institution.

The failure to provide learning experiences that provide students with the skills needed for transition to meaningful jobs in the world of work after graduation.
The predominance of students as passive learners and the failure to actively engage them in the learning process (Cawelti, 1994a, pp. 1-2).

Cawelti (1994b) saw many schools "as mediocre or simply failing to educate large numbers of students well" (p. 19). He studied 10,363 accredited public and private high schools in the United States and found that "most high schools have yet to address many of the problems that face them" (p. 19). He continued by saying that "high schools are too large and impersonal; classes are boring, dominated by teacher talk; and schools do not meet the needs of culturally diverse students, making them feel like forgotten parts of the system" (p. 19).

Theodore Sizer (1988) saw schools as Model T Ford cars. His analogy asserted that the structure of schools date back to the beliefs of the 1890's and operate as though designed for another era. Because schools have isolated themselves from the real world, they have not been responsive to the needs of a changing society.

Pipho (1989) stated that one of the immediate needs of the American educational system is a new vision, or a new way of doing business. As we approach the year 2000, there is a nationwide discussion regarding the role of schools in planning for a globally competitive and technologically advanced America. This discussion centers on the organization of schools, their curricula and its effectiveness. Ambitious projects to rebuild schools have been initiated by various states. In addition, the federal government has pushed for reform in the proposed structural changes advocated in America.
The federal government proposes that the educational delivery system be modified to include vouchers so that parents would have the right to choose an educational setting for their children. Social changes have affected both the poor and upper-middle class as the dynamics between school and families have been modified (Strickland, 1994).

Theoretical Framework

Shanker (1990) found that intensive efforts have been made by thousands of school districts, but to little avail. Two unsupported explanations have been given for this failure. First, the reforms have not been carried out because of special interest groups who have derailed the efforts and second the reforms have been watered down in response to the school districts resistance to change. In truth, many of the reforms have been implemented, but the results in student learning have been disappointing. The traditional model of education is no longer working.

The bureaucratic model proposed by Max Weber is the management style found in most high schools in the United States (Reavis & Griffith, 1992; Bedeian, 1989). It is characterized by a division in labor in which authority and responsibility are clearly defined, positions of authority are arranged in a hierarchical structure, formal rules govern performance, and duties and impersonal rules are uniformly applied to employees. It is “based upon the assumption that most teachers are minimally competent and therefore require close inspection and supervision” (Watts & McClure, 1990, p. 767). Weber felt that this model would encourage orderliness and efficiency in an
organization. "By the beginning of the 20th century, the bureaucratic model of supervision was well-entrenched in American education. . . ." (Watts & McClure, 1990, p. 766).

The principles that govern schools were simply borrowed from the scientific management theory used in business and industry. It worked like an assembly line with neat little rows of desks and teachers filling students heads with information. This method is extremely passive for the student (Rodkin, 1995). Cunningham (1997) has characterized that same educational system as a "rote learning factory model" (p. 32) which is sequential, compartmentalized and abstract. Reavis and Griffith (1992) and Shanker (1990) likened this to 'batch processing' of students as well as teachers. The only criteria for this to work is that both the students and the teacher be pliable enough that they can be 'batch processed'.

Our schools are based on a fundamentally mistaken idea about the role of students in their own education. The traditional model of education sees students either as vessels into which knowledge must be poured or as raw materials that the education process turns into finished products — high school graduates. . . . The student, therefore, is a worker. The job of the school system is to figure out how to keep the student working. In that respect, teachers and principals are much like managers of a factory or a business. Their job is to get workers to want to come to work every day and to do their jobs, even when no one is watching (Shanker, 1990, p. 349).

He found the traditional model of schooling incompatible with active learning or with students who learn in different ways and at different rates.

When the factory was touted as the ideal organization for work and when most youngsters were headed for its assembly lines, making a mass public education system conform to the model of
a factory may have seemed like a great achievement. When we were content to educate a small percentage of our students and flunk the others or let them drop out, the limitations of that model were not much apparent and did not seem serious. But America's old-fashioned factories are dead or dying and will not be resurrected as we know them. . . . The limitations of America's traditional factory model of education have become manifest, and they are crippling" (Shanker, 1990, p. 350).

Murphy (1991) states that "the hierarchical, bureaucratic organizational structures that have defined schools over the past 80 years are giving way to more decentralized and more professionally controlled systems—systems that ‘can be thought of as a new paradigm for school management’ (p. 18).

Educational Restructuring/Reform

National Restructuring/Reform Efforts

When taking a look at restructuring/reform through the eyes of a historian, one is able to understand the environment under which reform efforts were undertaken and the politics involved in those movements (Bacharach, 1990).

"The federal government entered the educational realm during the 1960's and 1970's" (Chalker & Haynes, 1994, p. 34). During this period the attitude of educators was permissive and a laissez-faire ethos permeated education. Concurrently, other concerns related to education occurred. These included a downward spiral in academic standards, a decline in standardized test scores, an increase in dropout rate, student gravitation toward seemingly easier courses, inflation of grades, dumbed-down textbooks, and the public's perception of lax student discipline (Guthrie,
1986). As these conditions became more apparent, America's public schools were castigated and accused of placing the nation at risk. All problems of the American society were blamed on the public schools (Martinez, 1993; Simmons & Resnick, 1993).

Educational restructuring/reform has been seen as the savior of public school education. Efforts to promote restructuring/reform began as early as 1966 with the publication of the Coleman Reports (Equality of Educational Opportunity) (Coleman, 1966). "This landmark study shook the very foundations of education in America and paved the way for historic educational changes" (Towers, 1992, p. 138). Coleman and his committee reported that without changes in the number of course offerings, pupil-teacher ratios, and the locus of decision-making, schools would not be of the quality necessary for preparing students to work in the twenty-first century (MacPhail-Wilcoxon & Guth, 1983). The Coleman Reports (Equality of Educational Opportunity) (Coleman, 1966) aroused considerable controversy and was dissected by dozens of critics. The report caused the public to become more critical of public school education (Towers, 1992).

Children and young people have long viewed schools as joyless, puritanical, nose-to-the grindstone places from which they want to escape as quickly as possible. Nelson (1989) reported that Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi and Jane McCormack found, "...of all the places teenagers hangout, the school is the one place they least wish to be. Moreover, when they are in school, the classroom is the one place they most strongly wish to avoid" (p. 634).
Educational Restructuring/Reform: First Wave

Educational historians generally agree that the first wave of educational restructuring/reform occurred between 1983 and 1986 (Koppich, 1990; Bacharach, 1990). Public dissatisfaction with schools and a desire to make educators more accountable for the achievement of students led to the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983; Chalker & Haynes, 1994). The authors of this report viewed teachers as both the problem and the solution to the problems facing education (Watts & McClure, 1990). The focus was on making students work harder (Heffner, 1993). Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) characterize this as the efficiency wave. The report called for “higher standards, increased graduation requirements, more homework, and greater parental involvement” (p. 35). Americans were warned of a “rising tide of mediocrity” which was infiltrating the educational system and which would result in students inability to remain competitive in the world's economic arena.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education concluded that course work was not rigorous enough and that children were not allowed sufficient time to learn adequately. Recommendations included allowing students sufficient time to learn, increasing the number and complexity of courses required for graduation, more effective use of time spent in school, and making teaching a more rewarding and respected profession (Edwards & Allred, 1993).
A Nation at Risk (Gardner, 1983) resulted in top-down state-initiated restructuring/reforms that attempted to raise the standards in order to emphasize excellence in education (Wenzel, 1992). This move "served to reinforce the bureaucratic model" (Watts & McClure, 1990, p. 767). The first wave of educational restructuring/reform was characterized by a concern for accountability and achievement and its primary focus was the concept of excellence (Long, 1991). Watts and McClure (1990) saw it as focusing on teachers as the cause and solution to the problems in our schools. However, Bacharach (1990) noted that fundamental change in the educational system did not occur (as cited in Heffner, 1993).

Educational Restructuring/Reform: Second Wave

Three years later, the publication of both the Carnegie Report (Carnegie Foundation, 1988) and A Nation Prepared (Carnegie Forum, 1986) and Time for Results (Nathan, 1986) proclaimed the beginning of the "second wave" of educational restructuring/reform. These reports were largely a reaction to the first wave reports (Long, 1991; Heffner, 1993). As in the past, public interest in these reports was widespread and the focus was on improving conditions and the quality of teaching in our nations schools. Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) characterize this as the teacher-proof curricula wave. "Decentralization became the dominant theme" (Bacharach, 1990 as cited in Heffner, 1993, p. 9). The focus continued to put teaches in the spotlight (Watts & McClure, 1990), however, the 'powers that be' wanted to restructure the basic educational system itself (Wenzel, 1992). To a
degree these reports focused on a professional model of schools, rather than a bureaucratic model. They identified "initiatives designed to enhance the process of teaching and learning from the bottom up..." (Watts & McClure, 1990, p. 766). For the first time there was a concern for changing the model under which schools operate.

"Second Wave" educational restructuring/reform efforts included restructuring/reform the role of teachers to allow them more control and authority within the school. The central message was to replace the bureaucratic organization within the structure of the school thus allowing teachers greater professionalism, increased influence, and participation in decision-making. This move was viewed as a powerful means of making the profession more attractive to talented people, increasing the motivation and work effort of the teaching force, and making better use of the talent and expertise of the teachers (Orr, 1993).

The Carnegie Report (Carnegie Foundation, 1988) established the need for attracting, holding, and enlivening the best teachers and the professionalization of teaching. For the first time, recognition was given to the fact that professionalization of teachers would attract the more highly educated to the field of education and make teaching a profession the more qualified professional would want to join (Timar, 1989). However, the big argument centered on reorganization of the school itself (Koppich, 1990).

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (Carnegie Forum, 1986) was seen as having a major impact on education and is credited with
being the key report in the development of the second wave of educational restructuring/reform. It advocated that top-down management be replaced with teacher empowerment (Bacharach, 1990). “The disagreements over restructuring/reform were confusing at best. Restructuring/reform was a reaction to empowerment, which was a reaction to excellence” (Heffner, 1993, p. 58).

**Educational Restructuring: Third Wave**

From the mid-1980’s to the present this call for educational improvement during the past decade was often expressed as restructuring rather than simple reform. The word signaled an appropriate response to reports of widespread educational failure . . . Terms like *improvement, innovation,* or *reform* were not robust enough to describe the challenge. Moreover, the accumulating research showed that prior approaches to school reform had made at best only incremental improvements on a national scale (Newmann, 1993, p. 4).

The third wave of restructuring/reform was more student centered and was identified with consensus building or collaboration between teachers, administrators, and parents. The major promise in this wave of restructuring/reform was to correct the mistakes made in the first two waves (Heffner, 1993). The third wave reforms focused on less micro management and less regulation and intrusion by the Federal and state governments (Bacharach, 1990).

Tye (1992) believed that for the first time in 25 years the current move to restructure the American school was the most sincere endeavor to change the mode of operation in our schools. This move has been viewed as a grassroots or local level approach and seen as a bottom up movement that
involves all major societal groups (Koppich, 1990; Saranson, 1990).

Administrators have finally realized that local communities must take action to improve their own schools (Bacharach, 1990).

President Bush unveiled America 2000, Excellence in Education Bill, as the panacea to all the ills of education. America 2000 goes a step farther by purposing major structural changes in the delivery system for education. Governors in all states began to realize that change in the educational system will be necessary if students are to become world class citizens. A report by those same governors, "Time for Results: The Governor's Report on Education" (Nathan, 1986) acknowledges that along with knowledge of basic skills students must become thoughtful, responsible problem solvers (Nathan, 1986). "The most significant and overarching development in education since World War II has been the growing professionalization of teachers and teaching" (Watts & McClure, 1990, p. 766).

The new paradigm became:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top-down Bureaucratic Management</td>
<td>School-based Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Graded Classes &amp; Curriculum</td>
<td>Heterogeneous Grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Teachers</td>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Assignment</td>
<td>School Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Newmann, 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Louisiana Education

Louisiana is one of the nation's poorest states with a median income of $27,949, ranking it 43rd in the nation. Louisiana spends only $4,914 per pupil, ranking it 36th in the United States. Jackie Ducote, president of the
Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, sees the Louisiana educational system as one of a bureaucratic monopoly. Louisiana's educational ranking is dismal at best as it consistently ranks 49th or 50th in the nation (Edwards, 1997).

"According to the U. S. Bureau of the Census, Louisiana has the eighth highest percentage of children in private schools nationwide—12.1%. The national average is about 8.6%" (p. 117). This concept has been expanded to include charter schools. In the 1995 session of the legislature passed Act 192 that allowed the creation of eight charter schools, three of which opened. The 1997 legislative session (House Bill 2065) allowed creation of additional charter schools, with a maximum of 42 statewide.

Under the leadership of the Louisiana Governor, State Superintendent of Education, State Board members and various educational organizations educational restructuring/reform efforts are being mandated. The major thrusts for this restructuring/reform are improvement in student performance and students better prepared for the workforce. To achieve this goal, accountability and higher standards are the top initiatives for the state. The state has created Louisiana LEARN (Louisiana Educational Achievement and Results Now) for the 21st Century to address much needed restructuring/reform. The 11 main points of this restructuring/reform effort are:

1. High academic standards and appropriate assessment
2. School accountability
3. District and school-level decision making
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4. Effective use of funding
5. Parent and student responsibility
6. Technology access and use
7. Safe schools
8. Professional growth and development
9. Parent and community partnerships
10. Children’s readiness for school

In 1996-97 the governor implemented comprehensive restructuring/reform efforts and introduced a strict school accountability system. This initiative includes:

1. Higher expectations of what students should know and be able to do

2. Revisions to the testing program to include higher order thinking skills and different grades to be tested

3. Intervention and remediation for both elementary and middle students not meeting minimum performance levels

4. Mentoring and assessment for teachers

5. An accountability system that holds schools responsible for results (Edwards, 1997).

A five-year ongoing plan is being developed for standards-based assessments in the core content areas with emphasis given to communication, linking and generating knowledge, problem solving, resource access and utilization, and citizenship. The state content standards are meant to be a framework on which local districts can develop their own curricula, instructional strategies, and assessments (Mahler & Bernstein, 1996, p. 3).

In 1994, following the passage of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA), Louisiana developed its own school-to-work system, Louisiana PARTNERSHIPS. It works in conjunction with LEARN, the State Job Training

The new school restructuring/reform effort requires every school to have a broad-based school improvement team. Forty-three Louisiana high schools have already school improvement teams functioning using the Southern Region Education Board (SREB) High Schools That Work (HSTW) network, the heart of the State's emerging school-to-work system (Mahler & Bernstein, 1996, pp. 1-2).

Act 1124 of the Louisiana Legislature is called the Career Options Law. It is a comprehensive plan that will require all schools to have a career major curriculum by the 2005-2006 school year. The goal of Act 1124 is to three fold: (1) to have students complete a challenging program of study with an upgraded academic core and a major, (2) to involve students, parents and teachers in a career guidance and individualized advisement system to ensure completion of the program, and (3) to provide students the opportunity to develop skills that will prepare them for the twenty-first century (Louisiana Department of Education, 1997-98). Career awareness will begin at the elementary level, continue at the middle school level with career orientation and finish at the high school level with career preparation. It consists of a core curriculum, at least four credits in a career major with a sequence of related specialty courses, at least two credits in related career or technical fields, including credit in a basic computer course. Students will focus on the
core curriculum during the ninth and tenth grades and “major” in their selected fields during the eleventh and twelfth grades.

Demographic Variables

School Size

Raywid (1996) found that most schools of today were constructed to accommodate 2,000 to 4,000 students. He further asserts that 30 years of research suggests that small schools are of greater benefit to students. Dissension among educators about the perfect size exists, but most recommend one that serves 100 to 1000 students. Another advantage noted by Raywid is that students, teachers and the institution itself all benefit from these small schools. Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996) by the National Association of Secondary School Principals states that in order for schools to become more personalized they must break into units of no more than 600 students. This school size would enable teachers to use a greater variety of teaching techniques that would accommodate the learning styles of all students.

A study of 744 comprehensive high schools by researchers Robert Pittman and Perri Haughwout found that the dropout rate at schools with more than 2000 students was twice that of schools with 667 or fewer students. A 1988 study of 357 high schools by Chicago researchers Anthony Bryk and Mary Erina Driscoll revealed higher rates of class cutting, absenteeism and classroom disorder in large schools (Toch, T., Wagner, B., Glastries, K., Lennon, N., Daniel, M., Sieder, J., Jennings, M., & Tharp, M., 1996, p. 3).

Students benefit for several reasons. “Small schools are related to slightly higher rates of student achievement overall and have an especially
powerful impact on the average achievement of poor and minority students" (p.15), according to a recent report by the Chicago-based Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform. Good small high schools are identified as those that have 500 or less students, students who feel they belong, a cohesive faculty, focused curriculum, high parental involvement and high expectations ("Small Schools", 1998; Raywid, 1996). Other benefits include "...better attendance and retention; better behavior, attitude, and engagement; enhanced academic performance; and increased involvement in extracurricular activities" (Raywid, 1996, p. 1).

Teachers are more committed to student achievement and are willing to do everything possible to allow students to achieve. The school itself becomes more effective in gaining student support, improving staff satisfaction, enhancing the curricula and advising students. "Further, small schools are easier to 'restructure' than large ones and reform strategies are easier to implement there, so models for successful change within them are emerging" (Raywid, 1996, p. 1).

Small school structures can be designed in several different ways depending upon the needs of a community. One such approach is called House Plans. This arrangement allows students and teachers to remain together for some or all course work. It can operate on a one-year or multi-year basis. It is normally found within the traditional structure of a high school where it is housed. It is slightly restricted as to the amount of change it can create. Mini schools is similar to house plan and is also dependent upon a
host school. However, it always serves students over a several-year period. It usually has its own instructional program and is more distinctive than house plan. Another plan that is gaining in popularity is School-within-a-School. These are separate and autonomous units that operate within a larger school. Though resources and principals are shared, they have their own personnel, budget, and program. Students choose to affiliate with these programs.

... Downsizing experience to date has been mixed, although optimistic about its potential. It appears that, besides limited resources, the greatest inhibitors to a small school's ability to realize its potential is lack of autonomy--constraints imposed by stringent regulations, bureaucratic regularities, and longstanding labor agreements; and the need to mesh with policies and practices of the board of education, the school district, and the host school--and the hesitation of some education personnel at all levels to make fundamental changes in the way they function (Raywid, 1996, pp. 2-3).

Pupil Teacher Ratio

"Smaller classes allow for more personal interaction between teachers and students, and they tend to reduce paperwork so teachers can spend more time planning lessons. While there is no ideal number of students per class, studies show that small classes work best. ..." (Wulf, 1997, p. 6). Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996) asserts that "full-time teachers should not be responsible for more than 90 students a term so that they can give more attention to individual students" (p. 5).
Curricula Offerings, and Size of City/Town

Nothing in the literature addresses the effect of the number of curricula offerings or the size of the city/town as they relate to school reform.

Principal’s Position, Year’s in Position, Years of Teaching Experience, Age, Attendance in a Leadership Academy and Racial Makeup of the School

In a study by Zheng (1996) which “examined how principals’ instructional management behaviors are conditioned by contextual factors such as principals’ personal characteristics, school district conditions, and other external factors. . . . Overall, factors such as gender, age, education, work experience, school size, urbanicity, and percentage of minority enrollment were tested as significantly related to principals’ perceived effectiveness in instructional leadership, either positively or negatively. Some factors that previously assumed to be important factors were found to be insignificant. (p.1).

Gender

In addition, a survey of 195 elementary school principals in Alberta, Canada showed that female principals were more likely to participate in collaboration regardless of age, experience, or number of years in present principalship (Young, 1993).

Moreover, a study of 307 Ohio schools was conducted to measure their affective, cognitive, and behavioral responses to change. However, there was a low level of cognitive agreement with the changes. Despite their resistance to change, principals expressed their willingness to participate because it benefitted the school. Women principals were more likely to agree to change than were men and they tended to support and participate to a larger scale than did the men (Klecker, B., & Loadman, W. E., 1996).
Race, Highest Degree Earned, Professional Memberships and Number of State and National Professional Meetings Attended

The relationship between race, highest degree earned, professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended and school restructuring/reform have not been addressed in the literature.

Support for Restructuring

Community. School-community relations are being redefined as a central component of restructuring/reform. *Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution* (1996) encourages community groups to become knowledgeable about programs that improve student achievement and to help the schools with financial support. Their willingness to serve as volunteers and mentors will increase the effectiveness of education for all students.

School Board. Restructuring schools will not require that the roles of the school board members be little altered, however, they may have to make significant changes in the way they view the functions of administrators and teachers (Lindelow, 1981). In addition, philosophically board members will need to be in agreement the tenets of restructuring if parent and school staffs are to be successful. It will become necessary for administrators, teachers, and parents to rethink the pedagogy, organization and management of schools (Finn & Clements, 1989). Individuals who are school board members must demonstrate support for and understand the need for change (Barkley & Castle, 1993).

It is the responsibility of the school board to engage the community in a process to establish a vision, goals, and policies
for high school and to ensure that needed resources are provided. . . . The school district should support and facilitate activities that enhance teaching and learning and create an environment that encourages educators in the high school to take the risks necessary to improve student achievement (Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996, p. 13).

**Superintendent.** For schools to make the change to a restructured school, the central office, especially the prevailing view of the superintendency (Clune & White, 1988; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987). In addition, Harrison, Killion and Mitchell (1991) agree by stating that the work of superintendents changes dramatically in restructured school systems. The new role of the superintendent is one of coordinator rather than director and controllers (Bradley, 1989).

**Parents.** "Parental involvement is perhaps the most important determinant of a student's success in school" (Shenk, 1996, p. 11). Parents are true partners, developing learning programs for students along with the teacher, participating in the classroom on a regular basis, making suggestions that are heeded by the professionals, and taking responsibility for creating an environment in the home that supports education.

**Business and industry.** The roles of businesses, civic groups, local government, and social service agencies are vital to the success of restructuring/reform in the public schools of America. They can be of service in a number of ways. They can coordinate their programs with those in the public schools, serve as volunteers and tutors, offer educational opportunities
at work sites, help teachers develop new skills and knowledge and become more involved with the youth in their community (Amster, 1990).

Civic organizations, religious groups and mandates. The effect of support from civic organizations, religious groups and mandates from the state department of education or local school boards on school restructuring/reform have not been addressed in the literature.

Components of Restructuring/Reform

Research related to the constructs of educational restructuring/reform are presented below.

Curriculum Innovations

Schools have typically used curriculum, to focus on what is known. Knowledge explosions in every curricula field and the continued rate at which this knowledge base is growing forces educators to change curriculum as it is needed (Inzerello, 1993). A curriculum such as the one described would enable the student to deal with changing technology and the diverse needs of the global marketplace (Wirth, 1992). Many educators have attempted to redesign curriculum to enable learners to make connections and construct meaning as they actively participate in the learning process (Brooks, 1990). It was noted by Beane (1995) that technology would cause the world around the school to become a source for curriculum. Information from around the world is available to teachers and students and can serve to help students understand and examine local issues. When connections are made a
Curriculum is created that allows students to understand global events in relation to the world in which they live.

Curriculum Innovations in the restructured American school are represented by many elements. Integrated Disciplines (Weibe, 1992), Outcome-based-education (Cawelti, 1994a), and School-To-Work Transitions (Cawelti, 1994a) are constructs/elements of restructuring/reform that have been identified in the literature. Each construct/element plays a vital role in ensuring the schools of tomorrow will be able to provide a quality education for all students.

Integrated disciplines. Tewel (1995), Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996) and Newmann (1996) found that integration of curriculum or interdisciplinary teaching is critical in education because of the need for students to develop a deeper understanding of complex subjects and to acquire the ability to connect knowledge and skills found in the various disciplines.

Curriculum integration, in theory and practice, transcends subject-area and disciplinary identifications without abandoning them. The goal is integrative activities that use knowledge without regard for subject or discipline lines. As boundaries disappear, curriculum integration may engage knowledge not easily ascribed to particular disciplines (Beane, 1995, p. 1).

A study by two UCLA researchers of an interdisciplinary curriculum in 29 Los Angeles schools found that students in the program wrote better than their peers, had a stronger grasp of abstract concepts and as a group, were absent from school less and dropped out at lower rates. In addition, lengthier
classes combined with interdisciplinary teaching provide a more in-depth understanding of the subject and allow students to understand the relationships among subjects (Toch et al., 1996). Several different subject matter teachers are assigned a group of students. The teachers work together to combine the content of the separate subject matter areas. Subjects are integrated to increase higher-order thinking skills. The subjects cut across several disciplines and become more outcome-based and help to assure mastery and understanding of subject matter (Polen, 1992; & Wiebe, 1992; Willis, 1995).

**Outcomes-based-education.** The goal of outcomes-based-education is for students to demonstrate proficiency on a clearly defined set of instructional objectives. Students are given the time necessary to master a set of skills. This is accomplished through testing and remediation. Before graduation, the student is expected to master the educational objectives by demonstrating proficiency in certain areas (Cawelti, 1994a).

As schools nationwide continue their efforts to improve, some restructuring/reformers suggest that a fundamental reexamining of the purpose and organization of education is needed. Outcome-based education (OBE) is one model for restructuring/reform currently being examined nation wide (McNeir, 1993, p. 1).

"There is no single, authoritative model for outcome-based education. Frameworks for OBE share an emphasis on systems-level change; observable, measurable outcomes; and the belief that all students can learn" (McNeir, 1993, p. 1). William Spady's model focuses on giving students more
time to master material, teacher coaching, team teaching, grouping, and second chances to make the grade. Albert Mamary’s Outcomes-Driven Development Model (ODDM) stresses the need for a school leader who can generate strong support for OBE. OBE programs have had tremendous success in Phoenix, Arizona and the Sparta School District in Illinois. Performance by students has shown tremendous gains (McNeir, 1993).

School-to-work. The Clinton Administration enacted the School-to-Work Opportunities Act in 1994 (Grubb, 1996; Imel, 1995). “School-to-Work (STW) is a shift in educational priorities because it recognizes the purpose of education is to prepare our youth—whether they go to college or into the workplace—for productive citizenship and lifelong learning” (Pinelands, 1997, p. 1) The purpose of school-to-work has a threefold purpose: (1) Enable students to enter high-skill and high-wage careers upon graduation, (2) to provide top quality academic instruction, and (3) give students the skills necessary for entering a post-secondary education (Halperin, 1994).

Moving from school to work is not something that every student is prepared to do successfully. This national initiative means changing the curriculum to make it more rigorous and relevant to today’s workplace needs. It connects school-based learning to the workplace through structured internships in local businesses. This combination prepares students for higher paying, higher skilled jobs and continuing education (Pinelands, 1997, p. 1).

Boyer (1983) stated that students should be prepared for a life of work and learning. By this he meant that they should be grounded in the basic skills, core curriculum, a cluster of electives, and assessment and counseling
so that their transition from school to jobs or higher education would be smoother.

Productive, continued success in the world of work is one of the primary goals of students enrolled in America's secondary and post-secondary institutions. Yet for many young people, the transition from school to work is a difficult one. Some cannot understand the relevance of their classroom instruction to jobs or careers. While most young Americans do have jobs, these are mostly low-skilled, low-wage positions. The paths to more challenging, better paying occupations are unclear, full of false starts and wrong turns (Boyer, 1983, p. 167).

To smooth the transition from school to work and to improve long-term employment opportunities, Congress recently passed the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. Emphasizing the integration of classroom instruction with work-based learning, the legislation encourages states and localities to develop improved systems of education, work, and connecting activities (School-To-Work Facts, p. 1).

Cawelti (1994a) found that most of the emphasis in past educational restructuring/reform had been on the college bound student. The non-college bound student has not been targeted in the past. However, in a nationwide study, he found that this movement is more typical of the public school than the private school. Cawelti (1994a) has defined this system as one in which the "schools work with the local technical colleges and businesses to provide training in the skills needed for positions that are likely to be available for them upon graduation; such efforts include apprenticeships and "tech prep" programs (p. 12)."

Tech Prep is the name given to programs that offer at least four years of sequential course work at the secondary and post-secondary levels to prepare students for technical careers. Programs typically begin in eleventh grade and result in the award of an associate's degree or certificate after two years of
post-secondary training. . . . Tech Prep is designed to build student competency in academic subjects and to provide broad technical preparation in a career area. Course work integrates academic and vocational subject matter and may provide opportunities for dual enrollment in academic and vocational courses at secondary and post-secondary institutions ("School-to-Work Glossary of Terms", 1996, p. 59).

**Classroom Methodology**

The teacher-directed model of instruction that has dominated traditional classrooms is being replaced by a model that stresses a variety of approaches when teaching for understanding (Newmann, 1996; Murphy, 1991). Alternative Assessment (Conley, 1992; Shepard, 1994; Gillman & McDermott, 1994; Cawelti, 1994a & b; Tewel, 1995; Checkley, 1997), Brain-based Learning (Armstrong, 1994; Hoerr, 1994; Sternberg, 1994; Cohen, 1995; Parnell, 1996;), Cooperative Learning (Weibe, 1992; Inzerello, 1993; Cawelti, 1994a; Roy & Hotch, 1994; Tewel, 1995; Newmann, 1996; Silver, 1996; & Peel & McCary, 1997), Critical Thinking Skills (Murphy, 1991; Newmann, 1996), Flexibly Organized Learning Time (Breaking Ranks, 1996), Heterogeneous Grouping (Silver, 1996; Casey & others, 1995) are elements of restructuring/reform that have been identified in the literature. Each element plays a vital role in ensuring the schools of tomorrow will be able to provide a quality education for all students.

". . . .The focus in schools that are restructuring teaching and learning is on helping all students master similar content using whatever pedagogical approaches seem most appropriate to different individuals and groups" (Murphy, 1991, p. 53).
Alternative assessment. Educators have long been critical of the inability of pencil and paper tests to measure a student's true ability. These tests do little to prepare students for an adult role and they reinforce the feeling that the ability to remember facts is more important than understanding what is happening (Checkley, 1997). In response to that criticism schools have begun to develop alternative methods of assessing achievement. These methods have included portfolios, projects, and performance-based assessment for skills in place of pencil and paper tests (Tewel, 1995).

Educators theorize that these alternative approaches to assessing student ability will lead to improved instruction and will improve student learning (Gilman & McDermott, 1994). “Open-ended assessment tasks not only prompted teachers to teach differently, but criteria were made explicit, and children learned more” (Shepard, 1994, p. 43).

“The National Education Association has proposed many alternatives to standardized tests. Among them are judgment, observation, samples of student work, contracts, rating scales and checklists, interviews, teacher-made tests, and criterion-referenced tests” (p. 73).

Portfolios are grounded in learning theory and are recognized as an important component in individualized learning, performance-based education and cooperative education (Gilman & McDermott, 1994). They are used by schools to maintain collections of student work and are used as an indication of the students academic success.
Portfolios may be used for a variety of purposes including: increasing student learning opportunities; helping students demonstrate a wide variety of skills; assisting students in recognizing their own academic growth; and teaching students to take greater responsibility for their own learning and development. Instructors report that the portfolio process can increase collaboration with students, provide an alternative means of observing students' cognitive and academic progress, help drive program improvement, and foster professional development by helping teachers to organize and manage curriculum (School-to-Work Glossary of Terms, 1996, p. 42).

Assessment provides feedback to students, allowing them to improve their performance continuously, rather than simply to judge performance at some arbitrary ending point. Learning is being analyzed in a more integrated fashion through increasingly larger constellations of skills and abilities (Conley, 1992, p. 2).

In a study done by Shepard (1994), it was found that performance assessments had great potential for redirecting instruction toward more challenging and appropriate learning goals. Performance assessment is a hands-on approach to learning coupled with higher-order thinking skills (Bartz, Anderson-Robinson, & Hillman, 1994).

**Brain-Based Learning/Learning Styles/Multiple Intelligences.** Howard Gardner developed a theory of multiple intelligences as a model of learning. He described these seven intelligences as follows:

1. **Linguistic or intelligence of words**
2. **Logical-mathematical or intelligence of numbers and reasoning**
3. **Spatial or intelligence of pictures and images**
4. **Musical or intelligence of tone, rhythm and timbre**
5. **Bodily-kinesthetic or intelligence of the whole body and hands**
6. Interpersonal or intelligence of social understanding

7. Intra personal or intelligence of self-knowledge (Armstrong, 1994).

The process of brain-based learning involves making connections between the subject content and the application of that content to real world situations. Unless connections are made, little long-lasting learning occurs for the majority of the students. The brain tends to discard information for which it finds no connection. This is because the brain is designed to perceive patterns and connections (Parnell, 1996). “Every time and individual experiences something that ‘connects’ with a previous experience, that experience will tend to ‘stick,’ and something will be learned. The reverse is true for experiences that don’t connect or hold any perceived meaning” (p. 20). Linking instructional objectives to words, numbers, or logic, pictures, music, the body, social interaction, and/or personal experience (Armstrong, 1994). A preferred way of using one’s abilities (Sternberg, 1994). Interdisciplinary instruction is a centerpiece of brain-based education restructuring/reform.

“Schools are typically organized around the linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences. If a child is strong in these intelligences, success comes easily, but not all children are strong in these areas” (Hoerr, 1994, p. 30). Students who do not make connections tend to be the ones who drop out of school (Parnell, 1996).
A system of teaching based on rewards, punishment and time limits may cause students to ‘downshift’ in the use of their brains. Under the threat of a failed test or a low grade, or in a timed learning situation, the student will tend to call upon the memory brain for help rather than the thinking brain. Nevertheless, for the student to see meaning and to make as many connections as possible for long-term learning to take place and higher-order thinking skills to develop, the thinking brain must be involved (p. 20).

Learning how to apply research related to the brain helps to rejuvenate teachers and make teaching more meaningful (Cohen, 1995).

**Cooperative learning.** From educational theories to workplace realities, the importance of teamwork is constantly emphasized.

The use of group activities can help students improve academically due to increased engaged time. Grouping offers the opportunity for students to interact with their peers in a structured setting. This is often very beneficial for high ability students who are sometimes low in social interaction skills. In addition, communication skills will be enhanced. Cooperative learning is characterized by: positive dependence on one another, individual accountability, face-to-face interaction among students, and students using interpersonal and group skills (Silver, 1996, p. 1).

Research suggests that cooperative learning strategies used regularly in the classroom make a positive difference in both academic achievement and social interaction at both the elementary and secondary level of education. In five different studies at both the elementary and secondary level those utilizing cooperative learning demonstrated higher levels of academic achievement and social interaction then did those taught with the whole class method. It was noted that cooperative learning seemed to enhance a child’s ability to construct knowledge, lessen the incidence of
classroom disruption, and improve the self-confidence of students (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). "Engaging in active learning while producing high-quality work helps students understand that accomplishing tasks is the form that most knowledge work takes in the real world" (Peel & McCary, 1997, p. 703).

The cooperative learning process involves students working together as a team. It is designed to teach students collaborative social skills, foster independence, and force individuals accountability. Groups work together to reach an instructional goal. Each student is responsible for his/her own learning and for helping other to learn. The strengths of each person are utilized in a way that ensures success for both individuals and the group (Cooperative Learning: Today's Teen, 1994). Those tasks best accomplished in cooperative groups include lessons that involve higher order thinking skills, including concept attainment, verbal problem solving, and the retention, application, and transfer of information, concepts, and principles (Roy & Hoch, 1994).

When cooperative learning is used correctly and consistently, "students show higher achievement, better social skills, better self-discipline, fewer discipline problems in school, higher self-esteem, and more acceptance of ethnic, racial, and other differences" (Tewel, 1995, p. 84).

Both cooperative learning and outcome-based education have been touted as instructional strategies that might improve the ability of students to learn. According to a study done by Cawelti (1994a) these two strategies were reported to be the most widely used restructuring/reform elements.
Critical thinking skills. Thinking skills are cognitive abilities used to organize, evaluate, and process information. According to the SCANS Report (Copple, Kane, Matheson, Meltzer, Packer, & White, 1992) for America 2000, thinking skills may be divided into six distinct categories:

1. Creative thinking – freely, combines ideas or information in new ways, makes connections between seemingly unrelated ideas, and reshapes goals in ways that reveal new possibilities.

2. Decision-making – specifies goals and constraints, generates alternatives, considers risks, and evaluates and chooses best alternatives.

3. Problem solving – recognizes that a problem exists, identifies possible reasons for the discrepancy, devises and implements a plan of action to resolve it, evaluates and monitors progress, and revises plan as indicated by findings.

4. Seeing things in the mind’s eye – organizes and processes symbols, graphs, objects or other information.

5. Knowing how to learn – recognizes and uses learning techniques to apply and adapt new knowledge and skills in both familiar and changing situations and is aware of learning tools such as personal learning styles, and formal and informal learning strategies and information.

6. Reasoning – discovers a rule or principle underlying the relationship between two or more objects and applies it in solving a problem. Uses logic to draw conclusions from available information, extracts rules and principles to a new situation, or determines which conclusions are correct when given facts (School-to-Work Glossary of Terms, 1996, p. 62).

The emphasis is on critical thinking skills for all students, not simply for those in higher ability groups with more emphasis on problem solving rather than on memorization and rote learning (Murphy, 1991).
**Flexibly organized learning time.** In allowing ample time for mastery of material by all students the teacher is meeting the individual needs of each student (Stembert, 1994). “Teaching and learning need room for flexibility” (Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution, 1996, p. 5).

**Heterogeneous grouping.** A Master’s Action Research Project by Linda Casey and others (1995) “revealed that teachers tend to teach to average students and do not sufficiently address the special needs of the upper and lower ability ranges, resulting in students not being actively engaged in the learning process and failing to take responsibility for their learning” (p. 1). When students are grouped heterogeneously, each teacher will get a class of students with mixed ability (Tewel, 1995).

In homogeneous grouping, research has shown that the only people who significantly improve are students in the high ability group. In heterogeneous grouping, average and below average students improve academically more than the high ability students. However, high ability students have been found to match the gains of those high ability students who work individually and surpass those same students in retention (Silver, 1996, p. 1).

**Teacher Professional Development**

Gerstner, Semerad, Doyle & Johnson (1995) emphasize that there is not a single model or formula to define the new roles of teachers in the twenty-first century. However, they find that teachers are

...transforming their relationships with each other, with their students, with technology and tools, with their careers, ...

.Rather than remaining in their traditional position, isolated from each other and from the community outside the school, teachers are becoming more integrated into teams and networks that
extend beyond the school (Gerstner, Semerad, Doyle, & Johnson, 1995, p. 144).

The elements in this category are: Collegial Planning Time (Hunter, 1989; Weibe, 1992; Raywid, 1993; Kaplan, 1997), Mentoring (Holmes Report, 1986; Simon, 1989; Feiman-Nemser, 1996), Peer Coaching (Sousa, 1995), Peer Observation (Sousa, 1995), Professional Leave Support (Boyer, 1983; Patterson, 1995), Recognition and Reward System (Toch, 1996), Shadowing (Kubuto, 1993; Lankard, 1995), Targeted In-Service (Cawelti, 1994a; Breaking Ranks, 1996; Hirsh, 1997; Lammel, 1997), Teacher Support Teams (Cawelti, 1994a), and Team Teaching (O'Neil, 1995; Breaking Ranks, 1996; School-To-Work Glossary of Terms, 1996).

**Collegial planning time.** Collegial planning time is a period of time for a group of teachers to be free of students and duty in order jointly to plan. It provides time to examine, reflect on, amend, and redesign programs (Hunter, 1989; Weibe, 1992; Raywid, 1993). Teams work because the skills and experiences brought together exceed those of any individual on the team. Communication among team members result in problem-solving and eliminate the feeling of isolation often felt by individual team members (Kaplan, 1997).

**Mentoring.** Simon (1989) defines mentoring as a support system for helping beginning teachers adjust to their first year of teaching. Simon's study found that mentors provided personal assistance and psychological support to beginning teachers by acting as a sounding board and offering a sympathetic ear when problems occurred. They became the cheerleader by
providing ideas, encouragement, advice, counseling and guidance. He noted that “mentors grew professionally as they accepted responsibility for the professional development and success of a younger inexperienced teacher” (p. 220).

Mentoring is a favored strategy because the rate of attrition of teachers during the first three years is a critical problem facing education. Over 30 states mandate some form of mentoring support for beginning teachers. The Holmes group (1986) called for teacher candidates to work closely with experienced teachers.

The hope is that experienced teachers will serve as mentors and models, helping novices learn new pedagogies and socializing them to new professional norms. This vision depends on school-university partnerships that support professional development for both mentors and teacher candidates (Feiman-Nemser, 1996, p. 1).

**Peer coaching.** The observing teacher provides feedback on the results obtained from a mutually agreeable observation (Sousa, 1995).

**Peer observation.** A supervisory method that pairs two teachers who periodically observe each other in class. The observing teacher is looking for the use of a particular strategy or technique that was identified in a pre-observation conference (Sousa, 1995).

**Professional leave support.** Teachers are provided leave time for quality professional growth activities such as sharing effective teaching.
strategies, reflecting on issues of curriculum and instruction, analyzing student achievement results, developing innovative instructional programs, or conducting action research. In addition, attendance at professional conferences is encouraged (Patterson, 1995). Boyer (1983) found that most schools are lacking in this area. In his interviews with teachers he found the most basic need not to be higher salaries, but contact with colleagues in the profession. He proposed that each school set up a fund to make it possible for teachers to travel occasionally to keep current in their field.

**Recognition and reward system.** Career ladders are aimed at attracting and retaining the best teachers. “A study of the Mesa Unified School District, Arizona’s largest, found that the district’s career ladder played a key role in reducing the rate of teacher attrition from 10% to 4% in 1990-91” (Toch et al., 1996, p. 8).

**Shadowing.** This restructuring initiative allows a teacher to spend part of the summer “shadowing” a professional in a particular career field. This enables the teacher to bring back new and relevant information about various careers. Students benefit because they are made aware of the changes in business and industry. According to Lankard (1995) the goal of this partnership between businesses and schools is to expose teachers to new technology, give teachers authentic work experience in real world situations, allow teachers to interact with experts in a particular field, and to assist them in transferring that work experience into the classroom. Both teachers and businesses benefit from the experience. Kubuto (1993) says “the impact of
experiences such as this one are the trust and belief that 'partnerships are a necessary investment in the future and that they will, indeed, make a difference' (p. 4).

Moreover, Lankard (1995) states that “In the new economy, where school and work are intertwined, a dual approach to public school reform apparently has appeal and that business and education partnerships will continue to flourish in an attempt to improve the educational capacity of the nation” (p. 3).

Targeted-in-service/professional development/staff development. High schools will not improve unless the teachers and principals are given the proper preparation to take on new roles and responsibilities. Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996) supports the need for each educator to have a Personal Learning Plan (PLP).

Teachers, administrators, and other educators who are part of a high school staff must recognize that their own learning is integral to their professional roles. High schools must create learning communities that provide substantive professional development linked to a strong content knowledge base and to instructional strategies (Lammel, 1997, p. 1).

It must be based upon standards representing the latest knowledge available.

...Effective staff development not only includes high-quality ongoing training programs with intensive follow-up, but it must also employ other growth-promoting and job-embedded process such as study groups, action research, teacher networks, and peer coaching (Hirsh, 1997, p. 4).
Teachers are provided six or more days of school or district staff development in areas that will increase their repertoire of teaching strategies or decrease problems related to students and school (Cawelti, 1994a).

**Teacher support teams.** Novice teachers are paired with a group of veteran teachers who provide support and assistance with problems encountered during their first three years of teaching (Cawelti, 1994a).

**Team teaching.** Ted Sizer (O'Neil, 1995) stated that teachers student load should be reduced and that this could be accomplished by team teaching. Each teacher would see half the number of students for twice as long each day.

Team teaching is when two or more instructors work together to design and teach curricula in multiple subjects that are presented to the same group of students. Merging teacher talents and knowledge of different disciplines with new instructional materials can help students to better understand relationships across and within their educational programs. Participating instructors may choose to teach classes together, or may present material individually based on a commonly agreed format. To encourage material development, teachers typically share common planning periods so that they may work together to coordinate their subject matter, and participate in joint staff development programs (“School-to-Work Glossary of Terms”, 1996, p. 58).

"Collaboration at its best enables teachers to fit together their individual contributions like pieces in an intricate jigsaw puzzle, each teacher handling portions of the curriculum appropriate to his or her expertise" (Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution, 1996, p. 14).
School Structure

The learning environment of high schools is being redefined. Beginning with, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Restructuring/Reform* (1983) recommended that significantly more time should be devoted to learning the new basics, requiring more effective use of the existing school day, a longer school day, or a lengthened school year (Edwards & Allred, 1983). "Restructuring/reform must deal with the roles, rules, and relationships that are necessary to enable all those who work in education to meet society’s higher and different expectations for schools" (Peel & McCary, 1997).

In 1991 congress passed the Education Council Act. The sole purpose of this commission was to review the relationship between time and learning in United States schools. The report concluded that to be successful schools must modify the hours and number of days spent in school. The report found that less than half of a school day is spent on academic subjects. It maintained that restructuring/reform efforts would fail unless sufficient time was devoted to academic subjects. Eight recommendations were made by the commission: Reinvent schools around learning, not time; fix the design flaw: use time in new and better ways; establish an academic day; keep schools open longer to meet the needs of children and communities; give teacher the time they need; invest in technology; develop local action plans to transform schools; and share the responsibility: finger pointing and evasion must end (Progress of Education, 1995).
Elements identified in the literature include: Block Scheduling (Carroll, 1990; Conley, 1992; Cawelti, 1994; Newmann, 1996; School-To-Work Glossary of Terms, 1996; West, 1996), Extended School Day (Canady, 1993; Cetron, 1993), Extended School Year (Cetron, 1993; McAdams, 1994; Breaking Ranks, 1996), School-Within-A-School (Cawelti, 1994a; Tewel, 1995; Raywid, 1996; Weaver, 1997), Site-Based Management (DiNatale, 1994; Anderson, 1993; Lucas, Brown, and Markus, 1991; David, 1989; Cocoran, Walker, & White, 1988; Meier, 1987); and Teacher Advisee System (Voors, 1997; Cawelti, 1994; Wiebe, 1992).

**Block scheduling.** Conley (1992) found time to be the one structural dimension where experimentation is occurring. “Blocks of time are being created that allows teachers to spend more time with fewer students in order to encourage more complex learning interactions” (Carroll, 1990, p. 358). Cawelti (1994b) found that the school schedule is an important facet of the school organization. The typical high school is fragmented into six and seven period days.

The traditional six- or seven-period day necessarily involves frequent class changes and time lost, multiple preparations for teachers, and little opportunity for interdisciplinary work. Such a structure tends to discourage using a variety of learning activities and probing ideas in depth (Cawelti, 1994b, p. 23).

Cawelti found that only ten percent of the high school principals reported that they had instituted longer class periods or block scheduling. Newmann (1996) found that extended blocks of time allowed teachers the
time to plan more complex and open-ended activities. Block scheduling is the
trend in schools of today.

Block scheduling is a means of reconfiguring the school day. The traditional school day is typically divided into six or seven
classes, each lasting from 45 to 55 minutes. With few exceptions, classroom instruction begins and ends within the
allotted time period. Blocked courses may be scheduled for two or more continuous class periods or days to allow students
greater time for laboratory or project-centered work, field trips or
work-based learning and special assemblies or speakers ("School to Work Glossary of Terms, 1996, p. 6).

A typical block schedule is based on four periods per day at 90 minutes
per class (Cawelti, 1994b). Another variation is an alternating day schedule,
composed of 3 102 minute periods per day. A survey administered to
students, staff, and parents after the first year of implementation of block
scheduling at Chaparral High School in Las Vegas, Nevada showed a 90% support rate for the program. It was reported that block scheduling had
provided "calmer campus atmosphere, more positive teacher-student
relationships, a slight increase in some standardized test scores, and a
constant attendance rate" (West, 1996, p. 1).

Extended school day. An extended school day is one that is longer
than seven hours (Canady, 1993). The average school day in America is 6.5
hours. However in Japan, students are in school for eight hours per day with
an additional two hours spent in private "cram schools". Japanese high
school graduates can be trained in complex statistical quality-control
procedures while American industries find it necessary to hire someone with a
master's degree in mathematics to do the same job. This had lead American businesses to support the lengthening of the school day. (Cetron, 1993).

Extended school year. McAdams (1994) found that schooling in five nations with well developed educational systems share some characteristics. Foreign schools typically schedule 10 to 20 more school days each year then the 180-day U. S. standard. He advocates lengthening the school year to 200 days with vacations scheduled throughout the school year. In German schools there are 226 days, while Japanese schools schedule as many as 245 days, including 40 half-day Saturday sessions. He feels that the extra time would be a more humane daily routine and provide time needed for effective student assessment. In addition, Japanese graduates are better prepared for the job market upon graduation than are American youth (Cetron, 1993). He also found that American businesses support stretching the school year. In addition, Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996) asserts that schools should operate 12 months a year and full-time teachers should not be responsible for more than 90 students a term so that they can give more attention to individual students.

School-within a school. The idea for schools-within-schools originated in Great Britain. However, schools in Britain tended to be smaller than their counterparts in the United States (Cawelti, 1994b).

These are separate and autonomous units with their own personnel, budget, and program, authorized by the board of education or superintendent. They operate within a larger school, sharing resources and reporting to the school principal on matters of safety and building operation. Both students and
teachers choose to affiliate with such a school (Raywid, 1996, p. 2).

Tewel (1995) states that a school-within-a-school preserves the conventional school for most students, but creates alternative programs for students to elect with the idea being to organize high schools into smaller units. Cawelti (1994b) stated that this is a concept whose purpose is to create smaller student bodies within the same school. This process encourages students to become more involved and increases their sense of belonging.

This idea, sometimes called a vertical house plan, is more appropriate for large high schools and has been used off and on for several years. The most common pattern is to establish three or four smaller schools within a larger institution each of which includes a cross section of ninth through 12th graders with largely its own faculty and student activities. These houses may or may not have a particular instructional focus (Cawelti, 1994b, p. 22).

Louisiana has keyed in on this concept through the implementation of career academies. Career academies, school-within-a-school, build a curriculum around a particular career path" (Weaver, 1997, p. 2). School-to-Work consortiums have implemented the concept. "Retrovision leads the state with 11 (27 planned); Pinelands 7; and Northeast 3. Examples: banking/finance, computers, culinary arts, health care, and law (p. 2).

Site-based management.

SBE varies from school to school, but generally it gives increased budgeting, curriculum, and staffing responsibilities to principals and teachers or to parents and community members in conjunction with school staff. The influence each group has
varies from school to school, but the goal remains the same: to improve children's schooling (Anderson, p. 1).

School-based management is rapidly becoming the centerpiece of the current wave of restructuring/reform. Current interest is a response to evidence that our educational system is not working, and, in particular, that strong central control actually diminishes teacher morale and, correspondingly, their level of effort (Meier, 1987; Cocoran, Walker, & White, 1988).

The only way school-based management can succeed is when it involves individuals who are responsible for making decisions at the school level. This would include the principal, teachers, parents, school board members, and district-level staff (DiNatale, 1994).

Successful site-based management and its concomitant teacher empowerment, appears to be a function of the readiness of building-level administrators to share their autonomy, however extensive, or limited, with those whose commitment is necessary to make the educational program function at the highest degree of efficiency (Lucas, Brown, & Markus, 1991, p. 56).

In addition, the previously mentioned researchers found that a principal’s willingness to share decision-making rights with teachers is directly proportional to the teachers’ perception of their discretion and decision-making.

Teacher advisee system. This is a system in which each individual student is paired with an adult or teacher who will provide support and encouragement in their educational endeavors (Wiebe, 1992). Each teacher provides their selected students with counseling and personal assistance.
The teachers meet with each student and make home contact at times designated by the school principal (Cawelti, 1994a). Voors (1997) has suggested such a program because he found that "students who feel that they belong in their schools and that their teachers care about them become more comfortable and successful in those schools" (p. 62).

**Community Outreach**

*When restructuring/reforming schools, "...educators must rethink the roles, rules, and relationships that connect the organization to its external customers. External customers include parents and those community members who employ the schools’ apprentice workers" (Peel & McCary, 1997, p. 702).* Input from these stakeholders is critical if we are to produce students capable of performing in the real world. Building an effective partnership between the school and the community could involve such things as providing health and welfare services, youth employment programs and parental support. This partnership can do much to alleviate the adversarial feeling often felt among, faculty, administrators and the home (Newmann, 1993). Townsend-Butterworth (1992) believes that community resources can be used to enrich the educational experiences of students.

Elements identified in the literature include: Adult Volunteer Programs (Cawelti, 1994a & b), Business and Industry Alliances (Lankard, 1995; Cawelti, 1994a; Usdan, 1994; Boyer, 1983), Community Service Programs (Breaking Ranks, 1996; Cawelti, 1994a; Boyer, 1983), Community Use of Schools (Cawelti, 1994a; Breaking Ranks, 1996), School/College
Partnerships (Riley, 1993; Cawelti, 1994a; Parnell, 1996) and School/Technical College Partnerships (Cawelti, 1994a).

**Adult volunteer programs.** The school has an ongoing program to recruit and coordinate efforts of adults who volunteer to tutor or assist with other school functions, i.e. parent patrols (Cawelti, 1994a).

**Business/industry alliances.** Usdan (1994) asserts that as educators we must accept the input of influential political and business leaders ad important allies of public education. “These men and women who understand the need for quality schools can provide a more competent and well-trained work force in an increasingly competitive and interdependent world economy” (p. 19). In addition, these community leaders will undergird the educational support base that is being eroded by demographic changes. Cawelti (1994a) found that business and industry alliances were most often found in large cities. Boyer (1983) believed that an alliance between schools and business/industry yielded a special profit. It allowed the businesses the opportunity to work with future employees and to cultivate in them a sense of responsibility and excitement of discovery. Another benefit is that it also enriched the teachers who in turn were more turned onto teaching.

...when businesses engage in collaborative partnerships, they look for benefits that affect their operation, productivity, and profit line — elements that enable them to be competitive in a changing society. Such benefits as improved public relations, better prepared entry-level employees, decreased training costs, increased productivity and heightened potential for local economic development will all affect their bottom line (Lankard, 1995, p. 2).
Community service programs. Cawelti (1994a) has defined community service as students being required by their school to perform a specific number of hours of community service in order to graduate. As far back as 1983, Boyer suggested that schools should provide opportunities for students to be of service to others. He believed that this service would build a sense of community and common purpose within a school and at the same time teach values that would help students understand that to “be fully human one must serve” (p. 215). As recently as 1996 Breaking Ranks: Changing the American Institution stated that “the health of our democracy depends on students gaining a sense of their connection to the larger community” (p. 94). Service learning is the vehicle by which this can be achieved.

Community use of schools. High schools are forging links with the community by opening their school buildings to the community before and after school. In addition, social service agencies such as student health and welfare have made inroads into the school itself (Cawelti, 1994a). Schools cannot be expected to deliver all services to students, therefore, developing a working relationship with social service agencies to provide for the health and social services needs of their students is important for schools. Some agencies may be allowed to deliver services in the school (Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996).

School/college partnerships.

The roots of higher education grow deep into the soil of secondary and elementary schools. Yet there has been precious little communication between U. S. College and high
school faculty and few efforts at smoothing the transition from secondary to post-secondary schools. For easier articulation to take place for students — and articulation is a form of connection — the inner walls of separation within the academic community must be broken down (Parnell, 1996, p. 18).

This partnership can be viewed as a process of collaboration and cooperation between a local school and a college/university. It is designed to improve teacher training, staff development, or preparing students for the transition from school to college. The network allows for sharing of ideas, solving problems and building improvement in the school (Riley, 1993; Cawelti, 1994a).

School/technical college partnerships. This partnership allows students to attend high school and at the same time spend some time on the technical college campus earning credits toward a specifically chosen program of study. Resources between the two institutions are shared and a collaborative effort is made to insure that the student is prepared for the transition from school to the technical college (Cawelti, 1994a).

Information Technology

Technology is an integral component of educational reform.

"Technology provides students with basic skills instruction, the ability to talk with sources outside their school, increases student creativity, tracks student achievement, aids teachers in preparation for instruction, and allows students to control their own learning (Collins, 1991).

Boyer (1983) said "The potential of technology is to free teachers from the rigidity of the syllabus and tap the imaginations of both teacher and
teacher to an extent that has never been possible before” (p. 200). He believed that this would give more students the ability to study on their own. Boyer states that over time, through technology teachers will be able to enable students to exchange information, ideas, and experiences. This will be carried out more effectively than in the traditional classroom. Technology will enrich the study of literature, science, mathematics, and the arts through words, pictures, and auditory messages.

The use of computers and other technologies has been on the list of restructuring/reform efforts since 1978. In 1983, Boyer reminded educators that teaching students only the use of computers and not making them technology literate would create problems. It is up to educators to ensure that students understand how technology is reshaping our society and how that technology relates to science. This information will allow them to make responsible decisions about its use. Robert Pearlman, a computer specialist, believes that computers and other technology will support teachers and allow them to turn students into active educational workers (Molnar, 1978 as cited in Inzerello, 1993). Bennett (1997) believed that “with computerized education, learning of all students from the very brightest to the slowest would improve dramatically” (p. 1). He also stated that students would benefit because their basic need to succeed would be met. However, Hoffman (1997) found that technology use in the classroom was hindered by lack of equipment, infrastructure, and teachers’ dislike and discomfort with computers.
The United States Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement conducted a study to determine how technology supports teaching at the classroom level. Schools included in the study all served substantial numbers of disadvantaged students. Barbara Means and Kerry Olsen (1995) reported that increased use of technology had positive effects, leading to increased motivation and improvements in student performance. “Seven of the eight schools in the study reported lower teacher turnover, six reported higher student attendance rates, and five had higher test scores than a comparison group. In addition, fewer disciplinary incidents were reported” (Conley, 1997, p. A31).

Elements identified in the literature include: CD-ROM Technology (Cawelti, 1994a), Distance Learning (Opitz, 1994), Interactive Video (Blair, 1993; Leonard, 1992), Internet/World Wide Web (Wulf, 1997; LaQuey & Stout, 1993), Multi-Media Systems (Toch et al., 1996; Cawelti, 1994a; Blair, 1993), Networked Computers (Foley, 1993), and Video Instructional Programs.

**CD-ROM technology.** Cawelti (1994a) found that progress in the area of technology was not widespread enough. He ascertained the use of CD-ROM and multimedia are more complex than most computer applications and that they can help students store, retrieve, and synthesize large amounts of information. However, in a nationwide study he found that only forty-two percent of the principals reported regular use of the CD-ROM technology.
Distance learning. Distance learning involves a live telecast from an originating classroom to other classrooms in distant locations. In addition, it allows for interactive discussions across the distance, simultaneously with the live telecast. The benefit to the student is that they are able to take classes not regularly offered at their home based school. Students receive a broader spectrum of viewpoints on the subject because they are able to communicate with other students who are based at a different location. The teacher can also critique and monitor learning (Opitz, 1994).

Interactive video. "Interactive video involves on-line video computing systems capable of rapid, accept-and-reject communications with human beings" (Houston, 1990). In addition, Leonard (1992) found that interactive videotdisc and the traditional laboratory approach were equivalent in instructing students, but the interactive video method was more time efficient than the traditional laboratory method.

Internet/World Wide Web. Access to the Internet allows students use a variety of databases and other outside sources not available in the school in which they are based (LaQuey & Stout, 1993).

Wulf (1997) believes that computers make kids adventurers and avid learners, taking them beyond the traditional walls of the schoolhouse. The exorbitant price of price of wiring classrooms is only one hurdle, however. Teachers must be properly trained to integrate technology into the curriculum if the costly machines are to be more than fancy typewriters (p.5).

Multimedia systems. Multimedia instruction is the integration of more than one medium in a presentation or module (Houston, 1990). "Multimedia
instruction and the lecture method proved to be equally effective in the
teaching of geriatric pharmacy course content” (Miller & Jackson, 1985, p.
32). Cawelti (1994a) found in a nationwide study of school principals that
only twenty percent reported the use of multimedia systems.

**Networked computers.** Experiences with computers has proved they
are an invaluable aid as a learning tool and are a key to lifelong employment
and learning opportunities for students. Computer networking has man
advantages such as: instant availability of information anywhere in the school
and not having to keep track of diskettes. In addition, students and teachers
can access library materials both at school and at home. Students can
complete projects during classes other than lab (Foley, 1993). In addition,
Foley advocates building an infrastructure that would support interactive
information systems throughout the school and which would be linked to other
schools in the district, as well as libraries and other community resources.

**Video instructional programs.** Teachers use video tapes to reinforce or
introduce concepts or units of subject matter to individuals and/or groups.

**Schools for the 21st Century**

The typical school is geared to a sit down shut up mentality.
Townsend-Butterworth (1992) observes futuristically oriented schools must
move away from this mentality and toward a school with certain traits. The
school should be (1) flexible, (2) well planned, (3) diverse, (4) challenging,
(5) taking advantage of resources in the community, (6) doing research, and
(7) testing hypotheses. Cawelti (1994b) theorized that “... the movement
away from reliance on 'seat time' and toward demonstrations of proficiency is
time-consuming and complex, however, it does represent an important
paradigm shift” (p. 8).

Schools of the future will face seemingly insurmountable challenges in
preparing students to enter a globally competitive workforce. The 21st
century will require the use of symbolic-analytic skills and the ability to solve,
identify and broker problems by manipulating symbols (Wirth, 1992, p. 67).
Future workers must be prepared to apply basic skills and to process and
apply information (Inzerello, 1993).

Cunningham (1997) states that twenty-first century must:

1. Incorporate ideas gleaned from brain research to provide
   more options for students who have different learning
   styles and brain functioning.

2. Recognize the importance of students' personal
   experiences and the authentic representation of life in
   knowledge building.

3. Help students develop the interpersonal skills and values
   needed to work collaboratively.

4. Provide students opportunities to use information
   technology for research, collaboration, communication,
   and problem solving. Technology will allow students to
   exercise control over their learning, extending their
   learning community to include practicing professionals
   and other mentors.

5. Encourage students to develop multiple perspectives and
   a sense of responsibility for their own development.
6. Engage students in "real world" projects that will be assessed on results, work ethic, use of information, and knowledge application.

7. Use team teaching and integrative, interdisciplinary approaches to facilitate learning (p. 33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Paradigm</th>
<th>New Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Centered</td>
<td>Learner-Centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign individual tasks</td>
<td>Collaborative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Learning</td>
<td>Active Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>Electronic Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Focus</td>
<td>Achievement Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Perspective</td>
<td>Global Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Effort</td>
<td>Collaborative Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Learning</td>
<td>Authentic Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cunningham, 1997, p. 33)

Peel and McCray (1997) found that in restructuring/reforming a school . . . unless a restructuring/reformer thoroughly understands this multifaceted organization, develops a vision of its future, devises comprehensive plans to change its every aspect, and successfully articulates the need for and a vision of change to students, staff members, parents, and the entire community, the Little Red Schoolhouse will enter the 21st century virtually in tact (p. 698).

Summary of the Literature

In recent years, Americans have realized the need to totally redesign our schools. Just improving schools will not work. Parents expect more from schools today. In years past, schools provided an educations that would equip graduates for the world of work. Those same schools are still operating as though they were designed for that same purpose. Educational needs have changed because of the increasingly technological world in which we now live. For young people to survive and succeed in the future, schools must make whole systemic changes rather than piecemeal or add-on...
programs. "Unfortunately, the knotty problem confronting schools is that they are like they used to be, while other societal institutions have changed dramatically" (Cole & Schlechty, 1992, p. 135).

A mediocre education will act as a ball and chain in the high-tech, information-oriented society in which we now live. Today, people who know more earn more, and they are less likely to be unemployed. A college graduate today earns twice as much as a high school graduate and nearly three times as much as a high school dropout (Edwards, 1997, p. 7).

As society changes, so too must the educational institutions. The demands of the information age accelerate the need for people who can gather and process information to create new knowledge in varied fields. No longer can our schools merely offer students the opportunity to learn, it is imperative that all students learn in order to become productive members of society (Gainey, 1993; Tyler, 1987).

Citizenship in the United States democracy demands the ability to think critically. Without this ability, students will be unable to see through propaganda and political wheeling and dealing. It will become even more necessary for the levels of learning to increase to even higher levels in the future. All schools should endeavor to increase their effectiveness in this area (Tyler, 1987).

Tewel (1995) says we must begin changing schools from the local level if we are to succeed in the reforming or restructuring strategy. The reform cannot be accomplished in isolated cases. Therefore, change must be comprehensively focused on the entire school and its problems. Grass root
efforts for change will achieve the best results (Cherry, 1991). In Tom Peters' (1987) book, *Thriving on Chaos*, he writes that in order to be efficient and effective in changing schools, we must involve everyone, every day of the year, in gradual change. "Most bold change is the result of a hundred thousand tiny changes that culminate in a bold procedure or structure" (p. 468).

Global interdependence and competition from abroad compel America to equip itself with a highly educated, skilled, and qualified citizenship (Hunter, 1989). The complex society in which we live today demands a higher level of education than was needed by our ancestors (Tyler, 1987). Unless educators are ready to set aside old ways of doing business, they will continue to be satisfied with a process that does not work. All professionals within our schools must feel empowered to change. "Unless we are willing to take the risks and to make this move into an unknown future, then truly, our nation is at risk" (Hunter, 1989, p. 63). Secondary schools will be forced to realign their goals to allow society to make the change from the industrial era into the information age (Dodge, 1983). Students today need real-world business skills to equip them for future success in the workplace of the 21st century.

"Guiding school restructuring efforts is the knowledge that skills required for employment should be taught in courses in which the content is allied with real world living and working" (Lankard, 1996, p. 1).
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter addresses the methodology of the study including population and sample, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis. The purpose of this study was to investigate the restructuring/reform efforts in Louisiana public high schools. The study focused on ten objectives (as outlined in Chapter 1).

**Population**

The target population for this study was defined as all Louisiana public school principals in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools. The accessible population was defined as Louisiana public school principals who were employed for the year 1997-1998 in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools. Louisiana is composed of 66 school districts. These districts include one for each of the 64 parishes and the two independent city school districts, Bogalusa and Monroe. The [Louisiana High School Coaches Association Constitution and Directory (1997-98)](https://example.com) and the [Louisiana School Directory (1997-98)](https://example.com) published by the Louisiana Department of Education were used to establish the frame for the study. According to these sources, there were 318 principals found in Louisiana public high schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12. However, these schools are not classified as alternative schools.
Sample

A simple random sample, with replacement, was drawn from the accessible population. Sample size was determined using Cochran’s sample size determination formula for continuous data (Snedecor & Cochran, 1980). The information included in the formula was a four-point Likert-type scale, a three-percent acceptable margin of error, an estimated standard deviation of .80, and a 5% risk that the actual margin of error exceeded the acceptable margin of error. The minimum required sample size was determined to be 171. The researcher determined the adjusted sample size would be 111. Based upon an anticipated response rate of 50% the sample was 222.

Calculations are shown below.

Legend

\[ d^2 = \text{acceptable margin of error} + \text{or} - 3\% \]
\[ = \text{(}.03 \times 4 \text{ point Likert-type scale)} \]

\[ s^2 = \text{the estimated variance} .8 \]

\[ t^2 = \text{risk willing to take} \]
\[ \text{(}t \text{ at } .05 \text{ for } N = 318 \text{ is } 1.96) \]

\[ N = \text{population size} \]

\[ n_0 = \text{unadjusted sample size} \]

\[ n = \text{adjusted sample size} \]

Equation

\[ n_0 = \frac{t^2 \times d^2}{s^2} = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times (.8)^2}{(.03)^2 \times (4)^2} \]

\[ n^0 = \frac{(3.8) \times (.64)}{(.12)^2} = \frac{(2.4)}{(.014)} = 171 \]

\[ n = \frac{n_0}{1 + n_0} = \frac{171}{1 + 171} \]

\[ = \frac{171}{318} \]

\[ = 111 \]
Instrumentation

A thorough search of the literature was conducted and no instrument specific for the objectives of this study was found. Therefore, a researcher-designed instrument was developed. A similar nationwide study done by Gordon Cawelti (1994a) served as the model for the design of the instrument.

Content validity was determined using an expert panel consisting of five professors at LSU, two former principals, and three principals who had completed or were in the process of completing an internship. A field test of the instrument was conducted using a simple random sample (n = 40) of those schools not used for the study. Revisions were made based upon comments made by the respondents.

The instrument included selected demographic data plus six educational restructuring/reform component scales (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology). Each component was divided into two scales: awareness of elements of restructuring/reform (yes/no) and extent of school restructuring/reform implementation (not implemented, being planned, in progress, fully implemented). A write in section asked principals to identify the barriers to restructuring/reform and the successful interventions tried in their respective schools. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix C.

To test the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's coefficient alpha was computed. The alpha was determined to be .90.
Data Collection

Data was collected using a researcher-designed instrument. To collect the data, a cover letter (see Appendix B), questionnaire coded for follow-up purposes only (see Appendix C) and a stamped return envelope was sent to each high school principal identified as a member of the sample. Approximately five days after the initial mailing, nonrespondents were sent a follow-up post card as a reminder of the need for participation. A copy of the post card can be found in Appendix D (Dillman, 1978). Approximately two weeks later, a follow-up letter (see Appendix E) and a second questionnaire (see Appendix C) was mailed to the nonrespondents. Ten days later, if the response rate had been less than expected (50%), a telephone follow-up was conducted using a random sample of a maximum of 25% of the nonrespondents, or 15 nonrespondents, whichever was greater to determine whether nonrespondents were different from respondents. As a last effort for response by the sample, a random sample of 20 of the nonrespondents were sent a third questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Procedures for analysis was based upon the requirements of each objective. The alpha level used for all statistical analyses was set apriori at .05.

Objective one was to describe Louisiana public high schools (which contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools) on selected characteristics. These characteristics included: current
enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, racial makeup of the student body and size of the city/town in which the school is located. Frequencies and percentages were used to summarize the data for those variables measured on a categorical scale of measurement. Information regarding curricula offerings was collected as nominal data. The variables measured on a continuous number scale of measurement (interval) were summarized using means and standard deviations. The variables measured on an interval scale included: current enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, racial makeup of the student body, and size of the city/town in which the school was located.

The second objective was to describe Louisiana public high school principals (in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools) on selected demographic characteristics. These characteristics included: respondent's current position in school, years in this position, years of classroom teaching experience, age, gender, race, highest degree and year earned, number of professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended per year and attendance in a leadership academy. Variables which were categorical in nature (nominal or ordinal scales of measurement) were summarized using frequencies and percentages. The variables measured on a nominal scale were gender, racial group and memberships in professional organizations. Ordinal data included: current position in school, highest degree and year earned. The dichotomous variable, attendance in a leadership academy, was
summarized using frequencies and percentages. Means and standard deviations were used to summarize interval data. Interval data included: years in position, years of classroom teaching experience, age, number of national and state professional meetings attended per year.

The third objective was to determine if Louisiana public high school principals perceived that each of the following supported school restructuring/reform: mandates, grant funds, school board, superintendent, community, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, and religious groups. Each of the variables was measured as a dichotomous variable (yes/no). Dichotomous variables were summarized using frequencies and percentages.

The fourth objective was to assess the awareness of public high school principals regarding components of school restructuring/reform (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology). Awareness was measured on a dichotomous scale (yes/no) and was summarized using frequencies and percentages.

The fifth objective was to assess the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation as perceived by public high school principals regarding components of school restructuring/reform (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology). To assess the perceptions regarding the extent of restructuring/reform in the schools represented by the respondents in the researcher computed a
restructuring score for each of the components and an overall restructuring score that was a combination of responses to all of the components identified in the study. The calculation of this score was accomplished using the following procedure: Each of the possible responses to the implementation items was assigned a value such that Not implemented = 1, Being planned = 2, In progress = 3, and Fully implemented = 4. A mean was then computed for all of the items included in each of the restructuring components that were included in the survey instrument. This yielded a restructuring score for each of the components (including curriculum innovations, classroom methodology, teacher professional development, school organization, community outreach, and information technology) which reflected higher scores for schools that had a higher level of perceived implementation on the restructuring/reform efforts. All of the items included in all of the components were used to calculate an overall restructuring mean score. To interpret these restructuring scores, the researcher developed an interpretative scale as follows: 1.0 - 1.50 = little or no restructuring/reform; 1.51 - 2.50 = low restructuring/reform; 2.51 - 3.49 = moderate restructuring/reform; and 3.50 - 4.0 = high or fully implemented restructuring/reform.

The sixth objective was to determine if differences exist between groups for selected variables. Principal characteristics that were measured as dichotomous variables included gender, race, and whether the respondent had participated in a leadership academy. School characteristics that were measured as dichotomous variables included the following curricula offerings:
advanced placement, honors, vocational, college prep, tech prep, general, special education, mainstreamed, self-contained and gifted and talented.

Internal and external characteristics that were measured as dichotomous variables included the following: mandates for school restructuring; superintendent mandates; community, school board, superintendent, parent, business and industry, civic organizations, religious group support; and receipt of grant money. The t-test was used to determine if significant differences existed in the perceived extent of school restructuring/reform for each of the restructuring/reform components by the variables listed.

The seventh objective was to determine if relationships existed between the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation by component (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology) as perceived by public high school principals, and selected demographic characteristics of principals (years in current position, years of classroom teaching experience, highest degree and year earned, number of professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended per year) and selected school characteristics (current enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, racial make-up of the student body, size of the city/town in which the school was located). In assessing the extent of relationships that existed between the dependent variables (extent of restructuring/reform by component) and selected respondent and school demographics, two
statistical procedures were utilized by the researcher. For independent variables that were measured on an interval scale the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used to assess the existence of relationships between the independent and dependent variables. For variables that were measured on an ordinal scale (highest degree held), the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was used. Correlation coefficient descriptors by Davis (1971) were used to interpret the data. The descriptors are as follows:

- .7 or higher — very strong relationship
- .50 - .69 — substantial relationship
- .30 - .49 — moderate relationship
- .10 - .29 — low relationship
- .09 or lower — negligible relationship

The eighth objective was to identify any barriers that existed in the school restructuring/reform process as identified by Louisiana public high school principals. The open-ended responses to these items was summarized using frequencies and percentages.

The ninth objective was to identify any successful interventions that existed in the school restructuring/reform process as identified by Louisiana public high school principals. The open-ended responses to these items were summarized using frequencies and percentages.

The tenth objective was to determine if a model existed which explained a significant portion of the variance in the extent of school
restructuring/reform implementation. The predictor variables used in these analysis included those reported by the high school principal (awareness of restructuring/reform, selected demographic variables of the school and principal, internal forces, external forces). School demographic variables included: curricula offerings: advanced placement curricula, general curricula, special education, self-contained curricula, mainstreamed special education curricula, honors curricula, tech prep curricula; number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, and percentage minority. Principal demographic variables included: years in position; gender; race; highest degree; number of professional memberships and number of state professional meetings attended per year. Internal and external forces included: support for restructuring/ reform by the community, school board, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, religious groups; and mandates. This objective was analyzed using restructuring as the dependent variable. The other variables were treated as independent variables and entered for step-wise analysis because of the exploratory nature of this study. A variable was included in the model if it contributed one percent or more to the explained variance as long as the complete regression equation remained significant.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

The results of this study are based upon the objectives of the study. The objectives focused on: (1) demographic characteristics of the school, (2) demographic characteristics of the principal, (3) internal and external characteristics, (4) awareness of the elements of restructuring, (5) the extent of school restructuring, (6) differences between selected variables, (7) relationship between selected variables, (8) barriers to restructuring/reform implementation, (9) successful interventions for restructuring/reform implementation, and (10) a model to explain the variance in the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation. The findings are discussed by objective.

The two hundred twenty-two public secondary school principals included in the sample for this study were mailed questionnaires. Ninety-six (43.2%) responses were received from the first mail out. Of those, 90 (40.5%) were found to have usable responses. Two of the respondents did not fill in the demographic data, so the researcher called each one to get this information. This resulted in 92 (41.4%) usable responses. One of the respondents reported that their school had been converted to a middle school, so they could not participate in the study. Three were found to contain insufficient data for analysis and for the other one a principal called to indicate that he could not participate in the study. A week after the first mailing a follow-up postcard was sent to the nonrespondents. Five additional responses were received. At this point, the usable response totaled 97
(43.7%). One week later a second questionnaire was mailed to all nonrespondents. A first questionnaire was mailed to the two replacements for those schools who could not participate. From the second mail-out, 45 responses were received. Of those, 44 were found to be usable. One school reported that it had been converted to a middle school, so they could not participate in the study. This brought the total to 141 usable responses, and the response rate had reached 63.5%. To improve the response rate, a random sample of the nonrespondents was drawn by the researcher. Twenty-five of the nonrespondents were chosen for follow-up. A telephone survey was conducted. Three attempts to reach the nonrespondents were made. Five of the twenty-five responded to the telephone follow-up. All others could not be reached after the three attempts. The percentage return then became 65.7%. Still not satisfied with the response rate, the researcher sent a third questionnaire, with a personal note, along with a cover letter and a return envelope to the remaining 20 nonrespondents. Five additional responses were received from that mailing. After four follow-up attempts to gain participation of the principals, a grand total of 151 usable responses were received giving a 68% response rate.

Examination of the responses found seven which did not fit the frame of the study which was principals. Six assistant-principals and one guidance counselor were eliminated from the study. The total useable responses were 144 or 64.9%.
To determine if respondents and nonrespondents were statistically different, the groups were compared on five demographic characteristics. These characteristics included number of teachers, student population, racial makeup of the school, percent minority, and size of the city/town in which the school was located. No statistical differences were noted between respondents and nonrespondents except for the racial makeup of the school. Respondents \( (n = 144) \) had a mean of 244.9 and a standard deviation of 289.8. The nonrespondents \( (n = 66) \) had a mean of 378.7 and a standard deviation of 436.9 \( (t = -2.27, p = .03) \). Therefore, this researcher concluded the groups were similar except for the racial makeup of the school.

Objective 1: School Demographic Data

The first objective of the study was to describe Louisiana public high schools (which contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools) on selected characteristics. These characteristics included: current enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, racial makeup of the student body, and size of city/town in which the school was located.

Frequencies and percentages were used to summarize the data for those variables measured on a categorical scale of measurement. Information regarding curricula offerings was collected as nominal data. The variables measured on a continuous number scale of measurement (interval) were summarized using means and standard deviations. The variables measured on an interval scale included: current, number full-time high school
classroom teachers, racial makeup of the student body and size of city/town in which the school was located. Variables are discussed in the following sections.

**Student Body**

To determine the number of students enrolled in schools and the number and proportion of minority enrollment, the researcher used data reported by the Louisiana Department of Education in their Annual School Report. Information was based on \( n = 141 \) schools for which this information was available. The total number of students enrolled in the schools ranged from a low of 16 to a high of 2,048. The mean number of students enrolled was 564 (SD = 487.32). To further describe the participating schools in the study, the researcher used the *Louisiana High School Coaches Association Constitution and Directory* (1997-98) to classify schools into categories. This classification was based on the number of students enrolled in the school except for those schools below the “A” classification (“B” and “C” classifications). Schools with 251 or fewer students enrolled are classified as either “1A,” “B” or “C” based on other factors. When the participating schools were classified by state high school athletic classification, the largest group (\( n = 53, 35\% \)) was in the smallest school size category of “Class 1A, B, C.” The remainder of the schools were approximately evenly distributed among the other four categories. Table 1 provides the enrollment data regarding school size by that classification.
Table 1.

Louisiana High School Athletic Association Classification of Schools in Responding Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louisiana Athletic Association classification</th>
<th>Number of students in a school</th>
<th>Number of schools n</th>
<th>Percentage of schools %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 5A</td>
<td>&gt;1139.01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4A</td>
<td>711.01 - 1139.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3A</td>
<td>417.01 - 711.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>251.01 - 417.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1A,B,C</td>
<td>&lt; 251</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the minority enrollment in the schools, the number of minority students ranged from 0 to 1,279. The mean number of minority students enrolled was 243 (SD = 290.56). Since the objective of this study was to describe the schools on the racial make-up of the student body, the researcher used the absolute enrollment data (total number of students enrolled and number of minority students enrolled in each school) to calculate a more accurate measurement of the racial composition of the school. This measurement was the percent minority enrollment and was computed by dividing the total minority enrollment in each school by the total student enrollment in the school. When this variable was calculated, the mean proportional minority enrollment was found to be 39.8% (SD = 28.2). To further examine schools on this variable, the schools were grouped into six categories of minority enrollment: 0%, 1-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-99%, and
100%. When data was examined in this manner, the largest number of schools were in the 26 - 50% category (n = 51, 33.8%). There were three all white schools and three all minority schools in the sample. Data regarding racial makeup of the school is presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

Number of Schools by Racial Makeup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage minority enrolled in schools</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Percentage of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% - 25%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% - 50%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 75%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% - 99%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers do not equal to 141 because information was unavailable for one of the schools. M = 39.8 SD = 28.2

Number of Full Time Classroom Teachers

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of full time high school classroom teachers in their school. Data is based upon n = 141. Data indicated that the number of full time high school classroom teachers per school in the sample ranged from a minimum of six to a maximum of 133. The mean number of teachers was 39.9 (SD = 27.9). Thirty-nine percent (n = 141) of the responding schools had 25 or fewer teachers. Only six schools had
more than 100 teachers. Table 3 provides the data regarding number of full
time classroom teachers for grades nine through 12.

Table 3.

Number of Full Time Classroom Teachers in Responding Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Percentage of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. M = 39.9 SD = 27.9

Number of Curricula Offerings

Respondents in the study were asked to report the curricular offerings at their school by marking on the instrument from a list of curricular areas those that were available to students enrolled in their specific high school. They were asked to place a check by all of the areas that were relevant to their school. The curricular area that was reported by the largest percentage of respondents was “Special Education” (n = 132, 94.2%). One other area, “Vocational Education” was reported by more than 90% of the respondents (n = 128, 91.4%). The area that was reported by the fewest respondents was “Advanced Placement” with 43 (30.7%) indicating that this area was offered in
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their school. Table 4 provides the data regarding number of curricula offerings in responding schools.

Table 4.

**Curricula Offered in Responding Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of curricula offered</th>
<th>Number of schools offering curricula</th>
<th>Number of schools not offering curricula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main streamed</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College prep</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Contained</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted &amp; talented</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech prep</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced placement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Number of schools does not equal to 141 because one school failed to respond to this question. \( n = 140 \)

**Size of City/Town**

To ascertain the size of the city/town in which the school was located, the researcher used census data. The population of the cities in which the schools surveyed were located ranged from a minimum population of 100 to a maximum of 496,938 persons. The mean population size was 34,348 (\( SD = 82,499 \)).
Objective 2: Respondent's Demographic Data

The second objective of the study was to describe Louisiana public high school principals (in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but were not classified as alternative schools) on selected demographic characteristics. These characteristics included: respondent's current position in school, years in this position, years of classroom teaching experience, age, gender, race, highest degree and year earned, number of professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended per year, and attendance in a leadership academy.

Variables which were categorical in nature (nominal or ordinal scales of measurement) were summarized using frequencies and percentages. The variables measured on a nominal scale were gender, racial group and memberships in professional organizations. Ordinal data included: current position in school, highest degree and year earned. The dichotomous variable, attendance in a leadership academy, was summarized using frequencies and percentages. Means and standard deviations were used to summarize interval data. Interval data included: years in position, years of classroom teaching experience, age, number of national and state professional meetings attended per year.

Respondents' Position in School

Respondents were asked to write in the title of their current position. One hundred forty-one (93.4%) of the respondents were classified as principals, seven (4.6%) were assistant-principals and one (.7%) was a
guidance counselor. Two respondents did not indicate their position in the school. Based upon this information, the researcher deleted the seven assistant principals and one guidance counselor from the study because they did not fit the defined frame for the study. The remaining 141 principals were used for analysis of data.

Respondents' Years in Position

Respondents were asked to write in the number of years they had held the position in that particular school. The number of respondents answering this question was 141. The number of years ranged from a minimum of one year to a maximum of 33 years with a mean of 5.7 (SD = 5.5).

Years of Teaching Experience

Respondents were asked to write in the number of years of classroom teaching experience. The number of respondents’ answering this question was 141. The mean number of years was 16.9 (SD = 7.2). Years of teaching experience ranged from a minimum of three to a maximum of 38.

Age

Respondents were asked to write in their age. The number of respondents answering this question was 141. The age of the respondents ranged from 24 to 69 years. The mean age was 49.9 years (SD = 6.4). Over 64% (n = 91) of the respondents were between the ages of 46 and 55 years old. An additional 14.9% (n = 21) were 56 and over. Table 5 provides the information regarding the data.
Table 5.

Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of respondents</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The response rate is based upon 141 principals who responded. The seven respondents who did not fit the frame of the study were deleted from the calculations.

Gender

Respondents were asked to indicate their gender. One hundred forty-one respondents answered the question regarding gender. The respondents consisted of 76.6% (n=108) males and 23.4% (n = 33) females.

Race

Respondents were asked to indicate their race by placing a check in the blank next to the correct race. Two racial groups constituted 96.1% of the total respondents participating in the study. Seventeen percent (n = 24) reported their ethnic group as African American and 80.1% (n = 113) indicated Caucasian. The remaining groups, Asian (n = 3) and Native American (n = 1), comprised 3.3 % (n = 4) of the total sample (n = 141).

Table 6 provides the data used for this analysis.
Table 6.

Race of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race of respondents</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highest Educational Degree Earned

The respondents were asked to indicate the highest educational degree they had earned. The choices were: Bachelor's, Master's, Master's plus 30, Educational Specialist, and Doctorate. About 2% (n = 3) indicated they held only a bachelor's degree, however, 74.5% (n = 105) had higher than a masters' degree. Table 7 presents data regarding level of education.

Table 7.

Level of Education of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest degree held by respondents</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's plus 30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88
Year Respondents' Highest Degree was Earned

Respondents were asked to report the year in which their highest degree had been earned by writing it into the blank provided. The year in which the highest degree was earned ranged from 1969 to 1998. Of the 109 respondents, 71.6% (n=78) reported that their highest degree was earned before 1986. Thirty-two respondents failed to answer this question. Information regarding the highest degree earned can be found in Table 8.

Professional Organization Memberships

Respondents were asked to place a check beside the professional organizations to which they belonged. Under “other” they were to list any other professional organization to which they belonged. Of the 141 respondents, 72.3% (n = 102) belonged to the Louisiana Association of School Executives (LACE). In addition, 69.5% (n = 98) belonged to the Louisiana Association of School Principals (LASP). However, only 47.5% (n = 67) respondents belonged to their parish association. Results can be found in Table 9.

Number of State Professional Meetings Attended Per Year

Respondents were asked to write in the number of state professional meetings they attended per year. The number ranged from a low of zero to a high of 10. Of the 137 respondents 8.8% (n = 12) reported that they attended no state meetings. However, eighty-two percent (n = 125) reported they attended between one and five meetings per year. See Table 10.
Table 8.

**Year Respondents’ Highest Degree was Earned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year earned</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969 - 1975</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 - 1880</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 - 1985</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 - 1990</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 - 1995</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 - 1998</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** A total of 32 respondents failed to answer this question. \( n = 109 \)

Table 9.

**Professional Organization Membership of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>% No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Association of School Executives</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Association of School Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Secondary School Principals</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Association of School Principals</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of School Executives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** \( n = 141 \)
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Table 10.

State Professional Meetings Attended Per Year by Responding Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State meetings attended</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Four respondents failed to answer this question. $M = 2.9$, $SD = 2.1$

Number of National Professional Meetings Attended Per Year

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of national professional meetings they attended per year. The number of national meetings attended by respondents ranged from zero to 20. Thirty-eight percent ($n = 52$) of the 137 respondents reported that they did not attend any professional meetings during the year. In addition, over 28% ($n = 39$) reported attendance at one professional meeting during the year. Over 14% ($n = 20$) attended two meetings per year. Over 15% ($n = 21$) attended from three to 10 meetings per year. Over 3% ($n = 5$) attended between 12 and 20 meetings per year. See Table 11 for details.
Table 11.

Number of National Meetings Attended Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National meetings attended per year</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Four respondents failed to answer this question. \( M = 1.8, \ SD = 3.2 \)

Participation in Leadership Academy

Respondents were asked whether they had attended a leadership academy (yes/no). In addition, they were asked to indicate at what level the leadership academy was held (Parish/State). Fifty-five percent (\( n = 77 \)) of the 140 respondents reported that they had attended a leadership academy and 45% (\( n = 63 \)) reported that they had not attended a leadership academy before becoming a principal. Of the 77, 66 reported the leadership academy level at which they had attended. Over 18% (\( n = 12 \)) indicated that they attended the leadership academy at the parish level. Over 59% (\( n = 39 \))
indicated that the academy they attended was conducted at the state level, and more than 22% (n = 15) reported having attended a leadership academy at both the parish and state levels. Seventy-five individuals did not answer this question.

Objective 3: Internal and External Forces

The third objective of the study was to determine if Louisiana public high school principals perceived that each of the following supported school restructuring/reform: mandates, grant funds, school board, superintendent, community, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, and religious groups.

Each of the variables was measured as a dichotomous variable (yes/no). Dichotomous variables were summarized using frequencies and percentages.

Restructuring Efforts

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their school had or was currently involved in any restructuring/reform activities (yes/no). Eighty percent (n = 106) of the 132 respondents reported that restructuring was occurring in their schools. If the respondent reported that restructuring was not occurring in their school, they were asked to skip the questions regarding mandates, support, grant money, and amount of grant money received.

Mandates and Level of Mandates

If respondents reported that restructuring/reform was occurring in their school (answered yes to the previous question), they were asked to indicate
whether the restructuring was a result of mandates (yes/no) and if so at what level (parish/state). Respondents who answered no to the question as to whether restructuring was occurring, did not answer this question. The response rate was almost evenly divided between yes and no. Forty-nine percent (n = 52) of the 105 who responded to this question indicated yes and 51% (n = 53) indicated no. Of the 105 respondents who indicated restructuring was occurring, 44 reported the level from which the mandate had come. Over 22% (n = 10) of the 44 responded that their parish had mandated the restructuring. Over 11% (n = 5) indicated that the state had initiated the restructuring. However, the majority (n=29 or 65.9%) indicated that both the state and parish had mandated the restructuring.

**Grant Money**

If respondents answered yes to the question as to whether restructuring was occurring in their school, they were asked to indicate whether a grant had been received to help with the restructuring effort. One hundred-five persons responded yes to restructuring. More than 48% (n = 50) indicated that grant money had been received and 51.9% (n = 55) reported that they had not received grant money to assist with restructuring. The amount of grant money received ranged from a minimum of $1,000 to a maximum of $200,000 (n = 34, \( M = $44,283.78, SD = $49,997.39 \)). The median amount received was $28,000. Of the 105 respondents who received grant monies over 73% (n = 34) of the schools received <$50,000. Table 12
provides data regarding the amount of grant money received by respondents to that question.

Table 12.

**Amount of Grant Money Received for Schools Responding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of grant</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>% of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,000 - $ 25,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$26,000 - $ 50,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51,000 - $ 75,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$76,000 - $100,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $100,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** n = 34, M = $44,283.78, SD = $49,997.39, Mdn = $28,000

**Support**

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they received support from the following by circling yes or no: community, school board, superintendent, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, and religious groups). The majority of the 102 respondents (n = 94, 92.2%) to this question, reported that parish superintendents supported the restructuring effort in Louisiana public high schools. Ninety-two out of 100 (92.0%) respondents indicated that the school board supported their restructuring efforts. Of the principals who responded (n=64), religious organizations were identified by the fewest respondents (n= 29, 45.3%) as supporting the effort to
restructure schools. Information regarding support for restructuring/reform can be seen in Table 13.

Table 13.

Sources of Support for Secondary School Restructuring/Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>No. supporting</th>
<th>% supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and industry</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic organizations</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentage does not total 100 because respondents were asked to mark yes to those groups who supported their efforts to restructure.

Objective 4: Respondents' Awareness of Restructuring Elements

The fourth objective of the study was to assess awareness of public high school principals regarding components of school restructuring/reform (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology).

Awareness was measured on a dichotomous scale (yes/no) and was summarized using frequencies and percentages. Awareness was computed...
by summing the number of responses regarding awareness of each element in the components of curriculum innovations, classroom methodology, teacher professional development, school structure, community outreach, and information technology.

For each of the components of restructuring/reform, respondents were asked to indicate if they were aware (yes/no) of the individual elements listed under each component (curriculum innovations, classroom methodology, teacher professional development, school structure, community outreach, and information technology). Thirty-eight elements of restructuring reform were found on the instrument. They were divided as follows:

- **Curriculum Innovations**: 3 elements
- **Classroom Methodology**: 6 elements
- **Teacher Professional Development**: 10 elements
- **School Structure**: 6 elements
- **Community Outreach**: 6 elements
- **Information Technology**: 7 elements

The percentage of respondents who were aware of the 38 elements of restructuring/reform ranged from high of 100% (n = 137) for School-to-work to a low of 61.9% (n = 83) for brain-based learning. Seven additional elements were recognized by over 95% of the respondents. These elements included: cooperative learning (99.3%, n = 137), Internet/world wide web (98.6%, n = 139), block scheduling (97.9%, n = 138), critical thinking skills (97.8%, n = 136), mentoring (95.7%, n = 134), networked computers (97.1%, n = 136),
and site-based management (95%, n = 133). In addition to brain-based learning, the lowest levels of awareness (below 80%) was reported for the following elements: interactive video (79.7%, n = 110), flexibly organized learning time (79.5%, n = 105), outcomes-based education (79.3%, n = 107), collegial planning time (73.9%, n = 102), and school-within-a-school (70.9%, n = 100). Information regarding awareness of the reform elements for each component are provided in Tables 14-19.

Table 14.

Respondents' Awareness of Curriculum Innovations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum innovations reform elements</th>
<th>Total no. of responses</th>
<th>No. of Schools responding yes</th>
<th>% of Schools responding yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-to-work</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated disciplines</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-comes-based education</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.

Respondents' Awareness of Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information technology reform elements</th>
<th>Total no. of responses</th>
<th>No. of Schools responding yes</th>
<th>% of Schools responding yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet/world wide web</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networked computers</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance learning</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM technology</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional video programs</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia systems</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive video</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16.

Respondents' Awareness of School Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School structure reform elements</th>
<th>Total no. of responses</th>
<th>No. of Schools responding yes</th>
<th>% of Schools responding yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block scheduling</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-based management</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended school day</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended school year</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher advisee system</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-within-a-school</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17.

Respondents' Awareness of Teacher Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development reform elements</th>
<th>Total no. of responses</th>
<th>No. of Schools responding yes</th>
<th>% of Schools responding yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer coaching</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer observation</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional leave support</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted in-service</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and reward system</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher support teams</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial planning time</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18.

Respondents’ Awareness of Community Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community outreach reform elements</th>
<th>Total no. of responses</th>
<th>No. of Schools responding yes</th>
<th>% of Schools responding yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/industry alliances</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/technical college partnerships</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community use of schools</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult volunteer programs</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service programs</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/college partnerships</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19.

Respondents’ Awareness of Classroom Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom methodology reform elements</th>
<th>Total no. of responses</th>
<th>No. of Schools responding yes</th>
<th>% of Schools responding yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneous grouping</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative assessment</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibly organized learning time</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain-based learning</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 5: Extent of Restructuring/Reform

The fifth objective of the study was to assess the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation as perceived by public high school
principals regarding components of school restructuring/reform (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology). To assess the perceptions regarding the extent of restructuring/reform in the schools represented by respondents in the study, the researcher computed a restructuring score for each of the components. In addition, an overall restructuring score that was a combination of responses to all of the components identified in the study was computed. The calculation of this score was accomplished using the following procedure: Each of the possible responses to the implementation items was assigned a value such that Not implemented = 1, Being planned = 2, In progress = 3, and fully implemented = 4. A mean was then computed for all of the items included in each of the restructuring components that were included on the survey instrument. This yielded a restructuring score for each of the components (including curriculum innovations, classroom methodology, teacher professional development, school organization, community outreach, and information technology) which reflected higher scores for schools that had a higher level of perceived implementation of the restructuring/reform efforts. After this, all of the items included in all of the components were then used in a similar manner to calculate an overall restructuring mean score.

To interpret the restructuring scores, the researcher developed an interpretative scale as follows: 1.0 - 1.5 = little or no restructuring/reform; 1.51 - 2.50 = low restructuring/reform; 2.51 - 3.49 = moderate restructuring/reform;
and 3.50 - 4.0 = High to fully implemented restructuring/reform. This was based upon the 4-point Likert-type scale used on the instrument. The component that had the highest restructuring score was “Information Technology” with a mean of 2.64 (SD = .70, n = 141). The component with the lowest restructuring score was “School Structure” (M = 1.89, SD = .59, n = 141). The overall restructuring score was 2.38 (out of a possible 4.0) (SD = .47, n = 141). The moderate restructuring/reform category included Information Technology and Classroom Methodology (Means 2.64 and 2.60 respectively). Four components and the overall restructuring score were in the low level category (1.51 to 2.50). See Table 20 for details.

Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform Components</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall restructuring score (Grand Mean)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Interpretation scale – 1.0 - 1.5 = little or no restructuring/reform, 1.52 - 2.50 = low restructuring/reform, 2.51 - 3.49 = moderate restructuring/reform, 3.50 - 4.0 = high to fully implemented restructuring/reform.
Objective 6: Differences In Responses by Selected Variables

The sixth objective of the study was to determine if differences existed between groups in their responses about school restructuring/reform between groups for selected variables. Principal characteristics that were measured as dichotomous variables included gender (male or female), race (African American and White), and whether the principal had participated in a leadership academy (yes and no). School characteristics that were measured as dichotomous variables included the following curricula offerings: advanced placement, honors, vocational, college prep, tech prep, general, special education, mainstreamed, self-contained, and gifted and talented (no = 0, yes = 1). Internal and external characteristics that were measured as dichotomous variables (yes/no) included the following: mandates for school restructuring; superintendent mandates; community, school board, superintendent, parent, business and industry, civic organizations, religious group support; and receipt of grant money. The t-test was used to determine if significant differences existed in the perceived extent of school restructuring/reform for each of the restructuring/reform components by the variables listed.

Gender Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent gender, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check to indicate male or female. No significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. These data are presented in Table 21.
Table 21.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>M/SD (n=108)</td>
<td>M/SD (n=33)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>1.92/.621</td>
<td>1.78/.489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=105) 2.37/.712</td>
<td>(n=32) 2.51/.649</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=108) 2.54/.694</td>
<td>(n=33) 2.66/.639</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=105) 2.41/.755</td>
<td>(n=33) 2.36/.609</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=108) 2.36/.682</td>
<td>(n=33) 2.35/.593</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=108) 2.38/.489</td>
<td>(n=33) 2.38/.382</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Race Differences

In comparing the perceived extent of restructuring/reform implementation by race of respondent, the number of racial groups represented was such that only two groups had sufficient numbers to conduct statistical comparisons. These groups were white and black. The presence of four Asian respondents and one Native American was judged by the researcher to be inadequate for meaningful comparisons to be conducted, therefore, the two groups with adequate numbers for comparison were
analyzed using the t-test procedure. The variable was dichotomous in nature.

These comparisons are presented in Table 22. A total of four significant
differences were found among the seven comparisons that were conducted.

The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of
restructuring/reform was the area of curriculum innovations. Black
respondents perceived a significantly higher degree of restructuring/reform in
this area ($M=2.86$) than did white respondents ($M=2.30$) ($t=3.81$, $df = 34$, $p = .001$). The second greatest difference was in the area of teacher

Table 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean/SD</td>
<td>Mean/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=23) 2.86/.618</td>
<td>(n=110) 2.30/.677</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional</td>
<td>(n=24) 2.77/.687</td>
<td>(n=113) 2.28/.630</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=24) 2.67/.630</td>
<td>(n=110) 2.34/.740</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=23) 2.82/.581</td>
<td>(n=112) 2.52/.698</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=24) 1.93/.631</td>
<td>(n=113) 2.63/.680</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=24) 1.94/.608</td>
<td>(n=113) 1.88/.597</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=24) 2.61/.441</td>
<td>(n=113) 2.33/.459</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.
professional development. Black respondents perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this component (M = 2.77) than did white respondents (M = 2.28) (t=3.19, df = 32, p = .003). The third difference was in the area of community outreach. Black respondents perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this component (M = 2.67) than did white respondents (M = 2.34) (t= 2.27, df = 38, p = .03). The fourth difference was found in the area of classroom methodology. Black respondents perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this component (M = 2.82) than did white respondents (M = 2.52) (t= 2.15, df = 36, p = .04).

**Attendance in a Leadership Academy Differences**

In comparing the perceived extent of restructuring/reform by attendance in a leadership academy, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes/no) to indicate whether they had attended a leadership academy before becoming a respondent. A total of two significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring/reform was the area of classroom methodology. Those who attended a leadership academy perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this area (M = 2.71) than did those who had not attended a leadership academy (M = 2.42) (t=2.55, df = 132, p = .012). A second difference was found in the component teacher professional development. Respondents who had attended a leadership academy perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform (M = 2.48) than
did those who had not attended a leadership academy ($M = 2.23$) ($t = 2.26$, $df = 132$, $p = .025$). See Table 23 regarding leadership academy attendance.

Table 23.

### Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Respondents Attended a Leadership Academy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership academy</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=62) 2.42/.654</td>
<td>(n=76) 2.71/.677</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=63) 2.23/.653</td>
<td>(n=77) 2.48/.649</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=61) 2.29/.711</td>
<td>(n=76) 2.50/.721</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=61) 2.31/.788</td>
<td>(n=75) 2.46/.614</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=63) 2.60/.654</td>
<td>(n=77) 2.68/.719</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=63) 1.90/.583</td>
<td>(n=77) 1.89/.608</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=63) 2.30/.459</td>
<td>(n=77) 2.46/.459</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Two-tailed $p$ values.

### Advanced Placement Curricula Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of advanced placement curricula, the two groups were represented. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school offered advanced placement curricula and leaving it blank (no) if their school did not offer advanced placement. Only one significant difference was found among the seven comparisons. The greatest extent of
Restructuring/reform was indicated for the component community outreach.

Respondents from those schools where advanced placement curricula was offered perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this area ($M = 2.67$) than did schools that did not offer advanced placement ($M = 2.28$) ($t = 2.93$, $df = 77$, $p = .004$). See Table 24.

Table 24.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Advanced Placement Curricula was Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced placement curricula offerings</th>
<th>No ($n=95$)</th>
<th>Yes ($n=42$)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>2.28/.698</td>
<td>2.67/.716</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>2.30/.667</td>
<td>2.51/.627</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>1.92/.634</td>
<td>1.82/.498</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>2.60/.678</td>
<td>2.71/.742</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>2.54/.696</td>
<td>2.63/.648</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>2.37/.725</td>
<td>2.44/.624</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.33/.473</td>
<td>2.49/.430</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed $p$ values.
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**Honors Curricula Differences**

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of honors curricula, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school offered honors curricula and leaving it blank (no) if their school did not offer honors curricula. A total of two significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring/reform was the area of community outreach. Those respondents in schools where honors classes were offered perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform ($M = 2.58$) than did respondents in those schools that did not offer honors classes ($M = 2.13$) ($t = 3.79$, $df = 120$, $p < .001$). The second greatest difference was in the area of curriculum innovations Those respondents in schools which offered honors classes ($M = 2.55$) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did those respondents in schools which did not offer honors curricula ($M = 2.15$) ($t = 3.31$, $df = 105$, $p = .001$). See Table 25.

**Vocational Curricula Differences**

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of vocational curricula, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school offered vocational curricula and leaving it blank (no) if their school did not offer vocational curricula. Only one significant difference was
Table 25.

**Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Honors Curricula was Offered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honors curricula offerings</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=54)</td>
<td>(n=83)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.13/.657</td>
<td>2.58/.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=55)</td>
<td>(n=81)</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.15/.724</td>
<td>2.55/.629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional</td>
<td>(n=57)</td>
<td>(n=83)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>2.17/.691</td>
<td>2.49/.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=56)</td>
<td>(n=82)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.45/.763</td>
<td>2.65/.608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=57)</td>
<td>(n=82)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.80/.568</td>
<td>1.94/.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=57)</td>
<td>(n=83)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.54/.664</td>
<td>2.70/.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=57)</td>
<td>(n=83)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.22/.467</td>
<td>2.48/.434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Two-tailed p values.

found among the seven comparisons. In the area of curriculum innovations, respondents in those schools that offered vocational curricula (M = 2.45) perceived a greater extent of restructuring than did those respondents in schools that did not offer vocational curricula (M = 1.76) (t= 3.68, df = 14, p = .003). See Table 26.

**College Prep Curricula Differences**

In comparing the perceived extent of restructuring/reform by the presence of college curricula, the number of groups represented was two.
### Table 26.

**Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Vocational Curricula was Offered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational curricula offerings</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=12) 1.76/.613</td>
<td>(n=124) 2.45/.673</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=11) 2.17/.892</td>
<td>(n=127) 2.60/.652</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=12) 1.72/.431</td>
<td>(n=128) 1.90/.607</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=12) 2.10/.892</td>
<td>(n=128) 2.38/.633</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=10) 2.24/.756</td>
<td>(n=127) 2.41/.722</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=12) 2.61/.857</td>
<td>(n=128) 2.64/.684</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=12) 2.18/.541</td>
<td>(n=128) 2.40/.455</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Two-tailed p values.

The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school offered college prep curricula and leaving it blank (no) if their school did not offer college prep curricula. No significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. See Table 27.

**Tech Prep Curricula Differences**

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by presence of tech prep in the curricula, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) to
### Table 27.

**Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether College Prep Curricula was Offered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College prep curricula offerings</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=29) 2.17/.731</td>
<td>(n=107) 2.45/.675</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=30) 2.25/.759</td>
<td>(n=107) 2.44/.711</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=31) 2.74/.665</td>
<td>(n=109) 2.60/.706</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=31) 1.94/.558</td>
<td>(n=109) 1.87/.607</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=30) 2.51/.678</td>
<td>(n=108) 2.59/.684</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Professional development</td>
<td>(n=31) 2.30/.694</td>
<td>(n=109) 2.37/.653</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=31) 2.34/.463</td>
<td>(n=109) 2.39/.466</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Two-tailed p values.

indicate if their school offered a tech prep curricula or leaving it blank (no) if their school did not offer tech prep curricula. A total of five significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring reform was in the area of community outreach. Those respondents in schools that offered a tech prep curricula perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in these areas (M = 2.59) than did those respondents in schools that did not offer a tech prep curricula (M = 2.07) (t = -4.62, df = 124, p < .001). The second
The greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring reform was in the area of curriculum innovations. Respondents in schools which offered tech prep curricula ($M = 2.56$) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this area than did respondents in schools which did not offer tech prep curricula ($M = 2.13$) ($t = -3.74$, $df = 117$, $p < .001$). Classroom methodology also showed a difference. Respondents in schools which offered a tech prep curricula ($M = 2.71$) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did respondents in schools which did not offer tech prep curricula ($M = 2.34$) ($t = -3.29$, $df = 118$, $p = .001$). Teacher professional development was another area in which a difference was found. Respondents in schools which offered a tech prep curricula ($M = 2.48$) perceived a greater extent of restructuring reform than did respondents in schools which did not offer a tech prep curricula ($M = 2.15$) ($t = -2.86$, $df = 121$, $p = .005$). In addition, school structure was another area in which a difference was found. Respondents in schools which offer a tech prep curricula ($M = 1.98$) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did those respondents in schools which did not offer a tech prep curricula ($M = 1.74$) ($t = -2.54$, $df = 134$, $p = .012$). In addition, the overall mean for all components showed a difference ($M = 2.50$) ($t = -3.96$, $df = 109$, $p < .001$). See Table 28 for comparisons regarding Tech Prep.

**General Curricula Differences**

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of general curricula, the number of groups represented was two. The variable
Table 28.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Tech Prep Curricula was Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tech prep curricula offerings</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>2.07/.581</td>
<td>2.59/.731</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=51)</td>
<td>(n=86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>2.13/.631</td>
<td>2.56/.684</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=53)</td>
<td>(n=83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>2.34/.624</td>
<td>2.71/.679</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=53)</td>
<td>(n=85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Professional Development</td>
<td>2.15/.652</td>
<td>2.48/.638</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=54)</td>
<td>(n=86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Structure</td>
<td>1.74/.477</td>
<td>1.98/.644</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=54)</td>
<td>(n=86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2.55/.699</td>
<td>2.69/.695</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=54)</td>
<td>(n=86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.19/.452</td>
<td>2.50/.434</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=54)</td>
<td>(n=86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school offered general curricula and leaving it blank (no) if their school did not offer general curricula. No significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. Table 29 provides the data.

Special Education Curricula Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of special education curricula, the number of groups represented was two.
Table 29.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether General Curricula was Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General curricula offerings</th>
<th>No M/SD</th>
<th>Yes M/SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.39/.726</td>
<td>(n=118) 2.68/.685</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.10/.692</td>
<td>(n=118) 1.85/.570</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=21) 2.24/.673</td>
<td>(n=116) 2.43/.731</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.43/.652</td>
<td>(n=124) 2.38/.702</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.62/.735</td>
<td>(n=114) 2.56/.673</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.35/.777</td>
<td>(n=118) 2.36/.640</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.35/.522</td>
<td>(n=118) 2.39/.455</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school offered special education curricula and leaving it blank (no) if their school did not offer special education curricula. Two significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring/reform was the area of curriculum innovations. Respondents in those schools where special education classes were offered (M = 2.42) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this area than did respondents in those schools that...
did not offer special education curricula (M = 1.85) (t= 4.97, df = 14 p < .001). The second component in which differences were found was classroom methodology. Respondents in schools which offered special education curricula (M = 2.61) perceived a greater extent of restructuring reform than did respondents in schools which did not offer special education curricula (M = 1.99) (t= 2.58, df = 8, p = .033). See Table 30 regarding special education.

Table 30.

**Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Special Education Curricula was Offered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special education curricula offerings</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=8) 1.85/.274</td>
<td>(n=128) 2.42/.699</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=8) 1.99/.653</td>
<td>(n=130) 2.61/.668</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=7) 2.02/.549</td>
<td>(n=130) 2.41/.728</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=8) 1.96/.660</td>
<td>(n=132) 2.38/.655</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.30/.982</td>
<td>(n=132) 2.65/.676</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=8) 1.74/.552</td>
<td>(n=132) 1.90/.590</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.05/.466</td>
<td>(n=132) 2.40/.459</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.
In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of mainstreamed special education curricula, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) to indicate that their school offered mainstreamed special education curricula or leaving it blank (no) to indicate that their school did not offer mainstreamed special education curricula. A total of four significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring/reform was the area of classroom methodology. Respondents in schools which offered mainstreamed special education curricula (M = 2.66) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did respondents in schools which did not offer mainstreamed special education curricula (M = 2.12) (t=3.63, df = 32, p = .001). The second greatest difference was in the area of teacher professional development. Respondents in schools which offered mainstreamed special education curricula (M = 2.44) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did those respondents in schools which did not offer mainstreamed special education curricula (M = 1.97) (t= 3.63, df = 37, p = .001). The third greatest difference was in the area of curricula innovations. Respondents in schools which offered mainstreamed special education curricula (M = 2.45) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did those respondents in schools which did not offer
mainstreamed special education curricula ($M = 2.11$) ($t = 2.43$, $df = 38$, $p = .020$). See Table 31 regarding mainstreamed special education curricula.

Table 31.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Mainstreamed Special Education Curricula was Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstreamed (inclusion) curricula offerings</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology (n=23)</td>
<td>2.12/.643</td>
<td>2.66/.655</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development (n=24)</td>
<td>1.97/.565</td>
<td>2.44/.651</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations (n=24)</td>
<td>2.11/.603</td>
<td>2.45/.700</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach (n=23)</td>
<td>2.09/.759</td>
<td>2.46/.702</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure (n=24)</td>
<td>1.70/.695</td>
<td>1.92/.568</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology (n=24)</td>
<td>2.47/.812</td>
<td>2.66/.670</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.08/.521</td>
<td>2.44/.528</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed $p$ values.

Self-Contained Special Education Curricula Offerings

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of self-contained special education curricula, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school offered self-contained
special education curricula or leaving it blank (no) to indicate that their school
did not offer self-contained special education curricula. A total of four
significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. The
component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of
restructuring/reform was the area of community outreach. Respondents in
those schools where self-contained special education curricula was offered
(M = 2.49) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this
component than did respondents in those schools that did not offer main-
streamed special education classes (M = 2.11) (t = 2.79, df = 55, p = .007) The
second greatest difference was in the area of curricula innovations.
Respondents in schools which offered self-contained special education
curricula (M = 2.48) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this
area than did respondents in schools which did not offer self-contained
special education curricula (M = 2.12) (t = 2.67, df = 54, p = .010). An overall
difference existed for all components (M = 2.44) (t = 3.12, df = 33, p = .004).
Differences also existed in the component teacher professional development
and classroom methodology. Respondents in schools which offered self-
contained special education curricula (M = 2.43) perceived a greater extent of
restructuring/reform than did respondents in schools which did not offer self-
contained special education curricula (M = 2.14) (t = 2.01, df = 56, p = .049).
See Table 32 regarding extent of restructuring/reform implementation by
whether self-contained special education curricula was offered.
Table 32.

**Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Self-Contained Special Education Curricula was Offered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-contained curricula offerings</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach</td>
<td>(n=33) 2.11/.689</td>
<td>(n=104) 2.49/.712</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Innovations</td>
<td>(n=33) 2.12/.679</td>
<td>(n=103) 2.48/.679</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Professional Development</td>
<td>(n=35) 2.14/.678</td>
<td>(n=105) 2.43/.641</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Methodology</td>
<td>(n=35) 2.64/.698</td>
<td>(n=110) 2.37/.664</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Structure</td>
<td>(n=35) 1.78/.517</td>
<td>(n=105) 1.91/.618</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>(n=35) 2.59/.625</td>
<td>(n=105) 2.65/.724</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=35) 2.20/.477</td>
<td>(n=105) 2.44/.448</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Two-tailed p values.

**Gifted and Talented Curricula Differences**

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of gifted and talented curricula, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school offered gifted and talented curricula and leaving it blank.
if their school did not offer gifted and talented curricula. No significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. See Table 33.

Table 33.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Gifted and Talented Curricula was Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gifted and talented curricula offerings</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=44) 2.26/.708</td>
<td>(n=93) 2.47/.724</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=45) 2.46/.789</td>
<td>(n=101) 2.62/.620</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=45) 2.54/.809</td>
<td>(n=95) 2.69/.637</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=43) 2.44/.803</td>
<td>(n=93) 2.37/.641</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=45) 1.86/.675</td>
<td>(n=95) 1.90/.557</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=45) 2.37/.802</td>
<td>(n=95) 2.35/.586</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=45) 2.32/.564</td>
<td>(n=95) 2.40/410</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Mandate Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of mandates from either the local or state level, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school were under mandates to restructure/reform and placing a check (no) if their school were not under
mandates to restructure/reform. No significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. See Table 34.

Table 34.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Restructuring/Reforms were Mandated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restructuring mandate</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=52) 2.30/.746</td>
<td>(n=52) 2.54/.676</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=52) 2.56/.706</td>
<td>(n=53) 2.74/.725</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=52) 1.90/.606</td>
<td>(n=53) 2.04/.618</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=52) 2.33/.648</td>
<td>(n=53) 2.47/.661</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=52) 2.56/.594</td>
<td>(n=51) 2.46/.707</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=52) 2.68/.733</td>
<td>(n=52) 2.70/.568</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=52) 2.38/.505</td>
<td>(n=53) 2.50/.431</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Parish Mandate Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by mandates from the parish the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their parish had mandated the restructuring in their school and placing a check (no) if the parish had not mandated restructuring/reform occurring in their school. No
significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. See Table 35 regarding parish mandated reforms.

Table 35.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether the Parish Mandated Restructuring/Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Community Support Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by support from the community the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents circling (yes) if their school received support from the community when restructuring/reform was attempted and circling (no) if they did not receive support from the community when
restructuring/reform was attempted. No significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. See Table 36.

Table 36.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by the Presence of Perceived Community Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community support</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.25/.669</td>
<td>(n=70) 2.47/.600</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=22) 1.85/.682</td>
<td>(n=70) 2.05/.574</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.30/.724</td>
<td>(n=69) 2.47/.718</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.66/.657</td>
<td>(n=68) 2.51/.640</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=20) 2.59/.773</td>
<td>(n=70) 2.70/.718</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.71/.795</td>
<td>(n=69) 2.75/.563</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=22) 2.36/.539</td>
<td>(n=70) 2.50/.408</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

School Board Support Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the perceived presence of school board support, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents circling (yes) if their school received support from the parish school board when restructuring/reform was attempted and circling (no) if
they did not receive support from the parish school board when restructuring/reform was attempted. Only one significant difference was found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring/reform was the area of information technology. Respondents in those schools where school board support was perceived ($M = 2.69$) indicated a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did respondents in schools where school board support was not perceived ($mean = 2.13$) ($t = 2.34$, $df = 9$, $p = .046$). See Table 37.

Table 37.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by the Presence of Perceived School Board Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School board support</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean/SD</td>
<td>Mean/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.13/.654</td>
<td>(n=93) 2.69/.720</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.11/.596</td>
<td>(n=93) 2.43/.632</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.40/.776</td>
<td>(n=92) 2.73/.643</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.45/.469</td>
<td>(n=91) 2.52/.664</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=8) 1.90/.591</td>
<td>(n=93) 1.95/.605</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.42/.955</td>
<td>(n=93) 2.43/.712</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.20/.586</td>
<td>(n=93) 2.45/.465</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed $p$ values.
Parish School Superintendent Support Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by support from the parish school superintendent, two groups were represented. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents circling (yes) if their school received support from the parish school superintendent when restructuring/reform was attempted and circling (no) if they did not receive support from the parish school superintendent when restructuring/reform was attempted. No significant differences were found among the comparisons. See Table 38.

Table 38.
Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by the Presence of Perceived Parish School Superintendent Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School superintendent support</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.16/.672</td>
<td>(n=95) 2.69/.708</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.33/.756</td>
<td>(n=94) 2.72/.641</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.19/.589</td>
<td>(n=95) 2.39/.637</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.60/.811</td>
<td>(n=94) 2.41/.720</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=8) 1.85/633</td>
<td>(n=95) 1.97/611</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.54/.502</td>
<td>(n=93) 2.49.653</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=8) 2.25/.578</td>
<td>(n=95) 2.44/.457</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.
Parental Support Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of parental support, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents circling yes if their school was supported by the parents and no if they were not supported by parents. Two significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring/reform was the area of teacher professional development. Respondents in those school where parents were felt to support restructuring/reform ($M = 2.49$) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did those respondents in those schools that did not feel they were supported by the parents ($M = 2.17$) ($t = 2.48, df = 29, p = .019$). The second greatest difference was in the area of school structure. Respondents in schools where parents were felt to support restructuring/reform ($M = 2.04$) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did those respondents in schools where parental support was not felt ($M = 1.75$) ($t = 2.13, df = 27, p = .042$). See Table 39.

Business and Industry Support Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by perceived presence support from the business and industry the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents circling (yes) if their school received support from business and industry when restructuring/reform was attempted and circling (no) if they did
not receive support from the business and industry when restructuring/reform was attempted. No significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. See Table 40.

Table 39.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by the Presence of Perceived Parental Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental support</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>2.17/.430</td>
<td>2.49/.615</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>1.75/.469</td>
<td>2.04/.619</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>2.48/.758</td>
<td>2.71/.711</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>2.45/.611</td>
<td>2.56/.639</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>2.37/.544</td>
<td>2.47/.746</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>2.67/.716</td>
<td>2.76/.600</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>2.29/.384</td>
<td>2.50/.447</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Civic Organization Support Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform by the presence of support from civic organizations, the number of groups was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents circling yes or no to indicate if their school received support for restructuring/reform efforts from civic
organizations. Only one significant difference was found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring/reform was the area of teacher professional development. Respondents in those schools where there was support from civic organizations (M = 2.60) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform than did respondents in those schools that did not receive support from civic organizations (m=2.21) (t= 2.69, df = 55, p = .010). See Table 41.

Table 40.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by the Presence of Perceived Business and Industry Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business and industry support</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean/SD</td>
<td>Mean/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=21) 2.27/.577</td>
<td>(n=62) 2.45/.632</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=21) 2.55/.807</td>
<td>(n=62) 2.61/.661</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=21) 1.93/.651</td>
<td>(n=62) 1.98/.540</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=21) 2.50/.683</td>
<td>(n=61) 2.54/.634</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=21) 2.36/.724</td>
<td>(n=61) 2.37/.689</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=21) 2.73/.675</td>
<td>(n=62) 2.72/.638</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=21) 2.37/.498</td>
<td>(n=62) 2.45/.432</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.
Table 41.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by the Presence of Perceived Civic Organization Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic organization support</th>
<th>No (n=26)</th>
<th>Mean/SD</th>
<th>Yes (n=43)</th>
<th>Mean/SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>2.21/.572</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>2.60/.591</td>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>2.25/.716</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>2.48/.684</td>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>2.67/.654</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>2.84/.649</td>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>1.85/.632</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>2.01/.554</td>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>2.44/.634</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>2.56/.687</td>
<td>(n=42)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>2.55/.760</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>2.63/.721</td>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.31/.479</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>2.54/.435</td>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Religious Group Support Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the presence of support from religious groups, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents circling yes or no to indicate if their school received support from religious organizations. One significant difference was found among the seven comparisons. The component that had the greatest difference in perceived extent of restructuring/reform was the area of teacher professional development.
Respondents in those schools that had the support of religious organizations (M = 2.62) perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in this component than did those respondents who did not receive support from religious organizations (M = 2.31) (t= 2.04, df = 55, p = .046). See Table 42.

Table 42.

Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by the Presence of Perceived Religious Group Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious group support</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=36) 2.31/.548</td>
<td>(n=29) 2.62/.643</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=36) 1.84/.545</td>
<td>(n=29) 2.11/.739</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=36) 2.49/.596</td>
<td>(n=27) 2.62/.755</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=36) 2.65/.707</td>
<td>(n=29) 2.58/.684</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=36) 2.74/.623</td>
<td>(n=29) 2.79/.652</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=36) 2.31/.658</td>
<td>(n=29) 2.34/.732</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=36) 2.38/.434</td>
<td>(n=29) 2.52/.483</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed p values.

Grant Money Differences

In comparing the perceived restructuring/reform extent by the grants received, the number of groups represented was two. The variable was dichotomous in nature with respondents placing a check (yes) if their school
had received grants to help with the restructuring/reform efforts and placing a check (no) if their school had not received grants to help with the restructuring/reform efforts. No significant differences were found among the seven comparisons. See Table 43.

Table 43.

**Differences between Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Whether Grant Money Was Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt of grant money</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td>M/SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
<td>(n=54) 2.43/.606</td>
<td>(n=49) 2.61/.693</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom methodology</td>
<td>(n=54) 2.62/.634</td>
<td>(n=50) 2.76/.667</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher professional development</td>
<td>(n=55) 2.34/.646</td>
<td>(n=50) 2.44/.669</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach</td>
<td>(n=55) 2.38/.735</td>
<td>(n=49) 2.44/.713</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>(n=55) 2.64/.742</td>
<td>(n=50) 2.67/.705</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School structure</td>
<td>(n=55) 1.96/.570</td>
<td>(n=50) 1.98/.660</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>(n=55) 2.39/.471</td>
<td>(n=50) 2.47/.470</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Two-tailed p values.*

Objective 7: Relationships between Selected Variables

Determine if relationships existed between the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation by component (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure...
Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology) as perceived by public high school principals, and selected demographic characteristics of principals (years in current position, years of classroom teaching experience, highest degree and year earned, number of professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended per year) and selected school characteristics (current enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, racial make-up of the student body and size of city/town in which the school is located).

In assessing the extent of relationships that existed between the dependent variables (extent of restructuring/reform by component) and selected respondent and school demographics, two statistical procedures were utilized by the researcher. For independent variables that were measured on an interval scale the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used to assess the existence of relationships between the independent and dependent variables. For variables that were measured on an ordinal scale (highest degree held), the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was used. The correlations for the variables are presented in Tables 44-45.

**Relationship between Number of Teachers and Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component**

Respondents were asked to write in the number of full time classroom teachers (grades 9-12) in their school. The relationship between the number
Table 44.

Relationship between Selected School Demographic Variables and Perceived Extent of Restructuring/reform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Restructuring/reform components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>d .25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricula offerings</td>
<td>c .31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent minority</td>
<td>d .23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of city/town</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Practical significance interpretation according to Davis’ set of descriptors: a. .7 or higher – very strong relationship; b. .50 - .69 – substantial relationship; c. .30 - .49 – moderate relationship; d. .10 - .29 – low relationship; and .09 or lower – negligible relationship.

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Table 45.

Relationship between Selected Respondent Demographic Variables and Perceived Extent of Restructuring/Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Restructuring/reform components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in position</td>
<td>.05 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching experience</td>
<td>.02 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.09 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree earned</td>
<td>.01 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year highest degree earned</td>
<td>-.20* 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of professional memberships</td>
<td>.10 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of state professional meetings attended/year</td>
<td>.20* 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of national professional meetings attended/year</td>
<td>-.02 133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Practical significance interpretation according to Davis' set of descriptors: a.7 or higher - very strong relationship; b.50 - .69 - substantial relationship; c.30 - .49 - moderate relationship; d.10 - .29 - low relationship; and .09 or lower - negligible relationship. Two-tailed p values.

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
of full time classroom teachers (grades 9-12) in the respondent’s school and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of the data (Table 44) revealed that there was a low relationship (Davis, 1971) between number of full time classroom teachers and the restructuring/reform components community outreach ($r = .28$, $p = .001$), curriculum innovations ($r = .25$, $p = .003$), and teacher professional development ($r = .19$, $p = .028$).

Therefore, respondents in schools that had a larger number of teachers seemed to have higher levels of perceived restructuring/reform implementation in those components than did those respondents in schools with a smaller number of teachers.

**Relationship between Number of Curricula Offerings and Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component**

Respondents were asked to place a check beside all of the curricula that was offered in their school. Choices were: advanced placement; honors; vocational; college prep; tech prep; general; special education; mainstreamed; self-contained; and gifted and talented. The relationship between the number of curricula offered at the respondent’s school and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of these data (Table 44) reveal that number of curricula offerings in the school was significantly related to four of the six components of restructuring/reform. Number of curricula offerings had a moderate relationship (Davis, 1971) to the restructuring/
reform components curriculum innovations ($r = .31, p < .001$) and community outreach ($r = .40, p < .001$). In addition, number of curricula offerings had a low relationship (Davis, 1971) to teacher professional development ($r = .27, p = .001$) and classroom methodology ($r = .26, p = .002$). This meant that respondents in schools with a larger number of curricula offerings seemed to have higher levels of perceived restructuring/reform implementation in these areas than did respondents in schools with fewer curricula offerings.

**Relationship between Racial Makeup of the School and the Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component**

The researcher ascertained information about the racial makeup of the school from the Louisiana Department of Education Annual School Report. The relationship between the racial makeup of the respondent’s school defined as percentage minority students and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of the data reveal (Table 44) that there was a low relationship (Davis, 1971) for the reform components curriculum innovations ($r = .23, p = .007$), classroom methodology ($r = .19, p = .024$) and teacher professional development ($r = .24, p = .004$). This meant that respondents in schools where there was a higher percentage of minority students seemed to have higher levels of perceived restructuring/reform implementation in these components than respondents in schools with fewer minority students.
Relationship between the Size of the City/town and Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component

The researcher ascertained information about the size of the city/town from the U.S. Census Bureau. The relationship between the size of the city/town in which the respondent's school was located and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of these data reveal (Table 44) that there was a low relationship (Davis, 1971) between the size of the city/town and community outreach ($r = .20, p = .020$). This meant that respondents in schools located in larger towns seemed to have higher levels of perceived restructuring/reform implementation in this area than did respondents located in smaller towns.

Relationship between the Number of Years the Respondent Has Held His Current Position and Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component

Respondents were asked to write in the number of years they had held their current position in their current school. The relationship between the number of years the respondent had held their current position and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of these data (Table 45) reveal that there is no relationship between number of years the respondent had been in their current position and the extent of restructuring/reform implementation.
Relationship between Number of Years of Teaching Experience and Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component

Respondents were asked to write in the number of years of teaching experience they had before becoming a principal. The relationship between the number of years of teaching experience and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of these data (Table 45) reveal that there is no relationship between respondent's number of years of teaching experience and the extent of restructuring/reform implementation.

Relationship between the Age of the Respondent and the Extent of Restructuring/ Reform Implementation by Component

Respondents were asked to write in their current age. The relationship between the age of the respondent and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of these data (Table 45) reveal that there is no relationship between respondent's age and the extent of restructuring/reform implementation.

Relationship between the Highest Degree Held by the Respondent and the Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component

Respondents were asked to indicate their highest level of education by placing a check in the correct blank. The choices were Bachelor's, Master's, Master's plus 30, Educational Specialist and Doctorate. The relationship between highest degree held by the respondent and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using Spearman rank order correlation coefficient.
coefficient. Examination of these data revealed that the highest degree held 
showed a low relationship (Davis, 1971) to the component information 
technology \((r = .17 \ p = .042)\). This shows that respondents who had higher 
degrees seemed to have higher levels of perceived restructuring/reform in 
this component than did respondents who held a lower degree. See Table 
45.

**Relationship between the Year in Which the Highest Degree Was Earned and 
Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component**

Each respondent was asked to write in the year in which their highest 
degree was earned. The relationship between the year the highest degree 
held by the respondent was earned and extent of restructuring/reform 
implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation 
coefficient. Examination of these data (Table 45) reveal that there is low 
inverse relationship \((r = -.21, \ p = .04)\) relationship between the year the 
respondent earned their highest degree and the extent of restructuring/reform 
implementation for the component curriculum innovations. This means that 
respondents who held higher degrees seemed to have lower levels of 
perceived restructuring/reform implementation in this area than did 
respondents who held lower degrees.

**Relationship between the Number of Professional Memberships and the 
Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component**

Respondents were asked to check the professional organizations to 
which they belonged. The relationship between the number of professional 
memberships held by the respondent was measured using the Pearson
Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of these data (Table 45) reveal that there is no relationship the number of professional organization memberships and the extent of restructuring/reform implementation.

**Relationship between the Number of State Professional Meetings Attended per Year and the Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component**

Respondents were asked to list the number of state professional meetings they attended per year. The relationship between the number of state professional meetings attended per year and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of these data showed a low relationship (Davis, 1971) existed between the number of state professional meetings attended per year and the restructuring/reform components school structure ($r = .19, p = .028$) and curriculum innovations ($r = .20, p = .023$). This shows that respondents who attend more state meetings seem to have a higher level of perceived restructuring/reform in this component than did those respondents who attend fewer state meetings. Table 45 provides the data.

**Relationship between the Number of National Professional Meetings Attended per Year and the Extent of Restructuring/Reform Implementation by Component**

Respondents were asked to list the number of national professional meetings they attended per year. The relationship between the number of national professional meetings attended per year and extent of restructuring/reform implementation was measured using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. Examination of these data (Table 45) reveal that there
is no relationship between the number of national professional organization
meetings a respondent attends per year and the extent of restructuring/reform
implementation.

Objective 8: Barriers to Restructuring/Reform

The eighth objective for this study was to identify any barriers that exist
in the school restructuring/reform process as identified by Louisiana public
high school principals. The open-ended responses to these items were
summarized using frequencies and percentages.

Lack of money, resistance to change, and lack of time were identified
by Louisiana public high school principals as the three biggest barriers to
restructuring/reform. Additional barriers listed were: lack of staff; too many
uncertified teachers; too many new teachers; lack of resources like
technology, proper wiring and textbooks; deteriorating schools; and schools
too small to provide electives. Table 46 provides more details.

One respondents has said, "As a new principal, I find myself
overwhelmed with requirements of too many departments (local, district &
state). Also, I tend to want to make changes too quickly, i.e., prior to giving
my aging faculty time to accept these changes. It appears to me that these
reform efforts need a full-time, administrative level person to coordinate,
pursue and provide training in these efforts."

"There is never enough time." "Finances are always a barrier in any
educational endeavor."
To quote three respondents, “Restructuring is a painful process. Many people still believe that traditional structure and methodology are good enough.” “Parent apathy is a big problem.”

Another respondent said “The most striking barrier to restructuring in our school is the resistance of experienced teachers to utilize modern technology – even though they recognize the need for and the benefits of technology integration into the classroom”.

“The school was basically destroyed by fire... As a result, we were housed in trailers and the school became very disconnected. Programs could not be fully implemented because of limited classroom space and facilities.”

“Too many programs to write and still have time in the day to run the school and try to meet with teachers and students – not enough time to do everything needed.”

Yet another respondent complains, “Our school is in a rural poverty-stricken area and is very small. Teacher pay is at the bottom of the systems in the state and recruiting new teachers is almost an impossible situation. Five of our 15 faculty members are uncertified. The school is in deplorable physical condition with the main school building being condemned by the state fire marshal in 1997. Portable buildings are being used.”

“The faculty and administrators are now working an 4x4 block scheduling for next year. At first vote, the school board disapproved. The teachers visited various schools in Louisiana and spoke with board members
to allow our school to go 4x4 next year even though the two other schools are not ready next year."

Objective 9: Successful Reform Interventions

The ninth objective for this study was to identify any successful interventions that existed in the school restructuring/reform process as identified by Louisiana public high school principals. The open-ended responses to these items were summarized using frequencies and percentages.

Though many barriers existed, respondents had solutions for most of them. Grant writing was tops on the list of solutions for lack of money. However, they could not find a solution to lack of staff and too many uncertified teachers in their schools. See table 46 for details.

The same respondent who found teachers resistant to utilizing modern technology said this, "This year I was allowed to select ten teachers for ongoing, intensive training in the use of computers. I selected teachers who would otherwise not have attended such training sessions. They were given the latest in computer equipment and software with the stipulation that they would plan, implement, and document the experiences afforded their students as a result of the training. These teachers are raving about what they have learned and are proud of the lessons they have supplied their students."

One respondent has said, "Without more administrative help, lower pupil-teacher ratio, more staff and financial help; improvement, restructuring and/or change is unlikely to be successful. We need help!"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 46.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barriers to Restructuring/Reform Implementation and Successful Interventions Used by Louisiana High School Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier</strong></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of money</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Staff</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of restructuring effort from district/state</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Community/Parent Support</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of space</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small school unable to provide electives</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table con’d)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Successful Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of school board support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Portable buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bond issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote location/low socioeconomic area/ no business and industry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student absences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>Academic Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low student self-esteem/motivation and apathy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>Counselor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher morale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>In-service/Retraining of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students performing below grade level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>Teacher Advisee System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of business/industry involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>In-service/Retraining of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Schools That Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tech Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"We need release time for schools interested in the block or school-to-work academies to do a school visit to a site where these things are being done successfully. In addition, we need more time for teachers to shadow or work in a mentoring situation with a business professional."
"Our restructuring has been centered around 'Block Scheduling'. Staff development has been very cooperative in providing needed workshops and in-services to assist in the transition needed to make the changes that will be necessary."

"We have used some Title 1 money for staff development in 4MAT."

Objective 10: Establishing a Model

The tenth objective for this study was to determine if a model existed which explained a significant portion of the variance in the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation. The predictor variables used in these analyses included those reported by the high school principal (awareness of restructuring/reform, selected demographic variables of the school and respondent, internal forces, external forces). School demographic variables included: curricula offerings: advanced placement curricula, general curricula, special education, self-contained curricula, mainstreamed special education curricula, honors curricula, tech prep curricula; and number of full time high school classroom teachers. Respondent demographic variables included: years in position; gender; race; highest degree; number of professional memberships and number of state professional meetings attended per year. Internal or external forces included: support for restructuring/reform by the community, school board, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, religious groups; and mandates.

"In multiple regression analysis, the regression coefficients often become less reliable as the degree of correlation between the independent
variables increases. If the level of correlation between them is high, the reliability of the correlation coefficients is reduced" (Levin, 1987, p. 592). To remove those independent variables with multicollinearity problems, each variable was regressed. In addition, variables were eliminated from the model if they failed the following conditions: If they did not enter the model, if the correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable was low and if the beta weight was less than .10.

This objective was analyzed using restructuring as the dependent variable. The other variables were treated as independent variables and step-wise entry of the variables was used because of the exploratory nature of this study. A variable was included in the model if it contributed one percent or more to the explained variance.

In analyzing the data, one variable was constructed from the data collected. This variable was race. Only two groups contained sufficient data for analysis. These two groups were African American and Caucasian. If the respondent indicated that they were African American, they were coded as "0". If they indicated that they were Caucasian, they were coded "1".

Table 47 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis. A variable was included in the model if it contributed one percent or more to the explained variance. The variable that entered the regression model first was mainstreamed special education. Mainstreamed special education was the best predictor of school restructuring/reform implementation. Considered
alone, this variable explained 9% of the variance in perceived amount of restructuring/reform occurring in Louisiana public schools.

Seven other variables explained an additional 21% of the variance in the score. These variables were honors curricula, respondent's level of education, tech prep, civic organization support, years respondent had held his/her position, school board support, the race of the school principal, and business and industry support.

Schools that indicated that they offered mainstreamed special education, honors curricula, and tech prep curricula were more likely to have higher levels of restructuring/reform implementation. Moreover schools whose respondent had a higher level of education, had been in his position longer, or was African American were more likely to have higher levels of restructuring/reform implementation.

Respondents who perceived that business and industry supported their efforts to restructure were more likely to have higher levels of restructuring/reform implementation. However, if the respondents perceived that the school board or civic organizations supported their efforts to restructure, they had lower levels of restructuring/reform implementation.

Even though all variables included in the step-wise multiple regression analysis were chosen based on prior research or a theoretical/conceptual framework, only 8 variables accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in this study. These 8 variables accounted for a total of 33% of the variance in school restructuring/reform implementation.
Table 47

**Multiple Regression Analysis of Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6.902</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>4.770</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15.435</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22.337</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables in the Equation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Ch</th>
<th>F Ch</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreamed special education</td>
<td>.2995</td>
<td>.0897</td>
<td>.0897</td>
<td>10.249</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors curricula</td>
<td>.3789</td>
<td>.1436</td>
<td>.0539</td>
<td>6.477</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>.4212</td>
<td>.1774</td>
<td>.0339</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech prep</td>
<td>.4588</td>
<td>.2105</td>
<td>.0331</td>
<td>4.232</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.2308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic organization support</td>
<td>.4918</td>
<td>.2418</td>
<td>.0313</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.3420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in position</td>
<td>.5229</td>
<td>.2734</td>
<td>.0316</td>
<td>4.306</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.1446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board support</td>
<td>.5332</td>
<td>.2843</td>
<td>.0109</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>-.1368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.5432</td>
<td>.2951</td>
<td>.0107</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; industry support</td>
<td>.5559</td>
<td>.3090</td>
<td>.0139</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables Not in the Equation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.005</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of professional memberships</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of state meetings attended</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced placement curricula</td>
<td>-.556</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General curricula</td>
<td>-0.834</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Contained special education</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>-0.506</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious group support</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purposes and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to investigate restructuring/reform in Louisiana public schools. To accomplish the purpose of this exploratory study, specific objectives were formulated.

The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Describe Louisiana public high schools (which contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools) on selected characteristics. These characteristics included: current enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, racial makeup of the student body, and size of city/town in which the school was located.

2. Describe Louisiana public high school principals (in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but were not classified as alternative schools) on selected demographic characteristics. These characteristics included: current position in school, years in this position, years of classroom teaching experience, age, gender, race, highest degree and year earned, number of professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended per year, and attendance in a leadership academy.

3. Determine if Louisiana public high school principals perceived that each of the following supported school restructuring/reform: mandates,
grant funds, school board, superintendent, community, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, and religious groups.


5. Assess the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation as perceived by public high school principals regarding components of school restructuring/reform (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology).

6. Determine if differences exist between groups for selected variables. Principal characteristics included: gender, race, and attendance in a leadership academy. School characteristics included: curricula offerings; advanced placement, honors, vocational, college prep, tech prep, general, special education, mainstreamed, self-contained, and gifted and talented. Internal and external characteristics included: mandates for school restructuring; parish mandates; community, school board, superintendent, parent, business and industry, civic organizations, religious group support and receipt of grant money.

7. Determine if relationships existed between the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation by component (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology).
Development, School Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology) as perceived by public high school principals, and the selected demographic characteristics of principals (years in current position, years of classroom teaching experience, highest degree and year earned, number of professional memberships, number of state and national professional meetings attended per year) and selected school characteristics (current enrollment, number of full time high school classroom teachers, curricula offerings, racial make-up of the student body, size of city/town in which the school is located).

8. Identify any barriers that existed in the school restructuring/reform process as identified by Louisiana public high school principals.

9. Identify any successful interventions that existed in the school restructuring/reform process as identified by Louisiana public high school principals.

10. Determine if a model existed which explains a significant portion of the variance in the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation. The predictor variables used in these analyses included those reported by the high school principal (awareness of restructuring reform, selected demographic variables of the school and principal, internal forces, external forces). School demographic variables included: curricula offerings: advanced placement curricula, general curricula, special education, self-contained curricula, mainstreamed special education curricula, honors curricula, tech prep curricula; number of
full time high school classroom teachers, and percentage minority. Principal demographic variables included: years in position; gender; race; highest degree; number of professional memberships; and number of state professional meetings attended per year. Internal or external forces included: support for restructuring/reform by the community, school board, parents, business and industry, civic organizations, religious groups; and mandates.

Procedures

The target population for this study was defined as all Louisiana public school principals in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools. The accessible population was defined as the 318 Louisiana public school principals who were employed for the year 1997-1998 in schools that contain at least grades 10, 11, and 12, but are not classified as alternative schools. A simple random sample, with replacement, was drawn from the accessible population. The drawn sample was 222.

A researcher-developed instrument, validated by a panel of principals and field tested by principals not included in the drawn sample was used for data collection. The final instrument was revised based upon the literature review and the opinion of those who reviewed the instrument.

The instrument included selected demographic data plus six educational restructuring/reform component scales (Curriculum Innovations, Classroom Methodology, Teacher Professional Development, School
Structure, Community Outreach and Information Technology). Each component was divided into two scales: awareness of elements of restructuring/reform (yes/no) and extent of school restructuring/reform implementation (not implemented, being planned, in progress, fully implemented). A write in section asked principals to identify the barriers to successful restructuring/reform and the successful interventions tried in their respective schools.

The completed instrument was mailed to 222 public secondary school principals. Non-response follow-up included reminder postcard, a second questionnaire, a telephone survey, and third questionnaire. The total number of useable responses from principals was 151 (68%).

Data Analysis

The alpha extent was set at .05 a’ priori. Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients were used to analyze the data.

Summary of Findings

The summary of the findings is presented in order by objective below. Following the summary of findings, the conclusions and recommendations will be presented.

Objective One: School Demographics

1. Over 50% of the schools reported that they had less than 500 students.
   Almost 90% of the schools reported that they had less than 75 teachers. The average number of teachers per school was 40.
mean proportional minority enrollment was less than 40%. There were only six one race schools in the sample.

2. Over 90% of the schools reported that they offered vocational curricula (n=128, 91.4%) and special education curricula (n=132, 94.3%). Less than 35% of the schools reported that they offered advanced placement curricula (n=43, 30.7%).

3. The size of the city/town ranged from a low of 100 to a high of 496,938.

**Objective Two: Respondent’ Demographic Data**

1. Respondents had four years of experience in their current position and approximately 17 years of teaching experience prior to their appointment as principal. The majority of the respondents were between the ages of 46 and 55 (n=91, 64.6%), were male (n=108, 76.6%) and Caucasian (n=113, 80.1%), hold a Masters' plus 30 degree (n=88, 62.4%) earned between 1969 and 1986 (n=78, 71.6%).

2. About 72% of the respondents reported membership in at least one professional organization. Almost 9% of the responding principals do not attend state professional meetings; however, slightly more than 91% attend at least one professional meeting per year. About 62% attend at least one national professional meetings during the year. Over 55% of the respondents reported that they had attended a leadership academy prior to their appointment as principal.
Objective Three: Internal and External Forces

1. Almost half of the respondents reported that the restructuring/reform efforts at their school were the result of mandates. The majority (n=55, 51.9%) reported that no grant money had been received to assist with their efforts to restructure/reform.

2. Religious organizations (45.3%) were reported as less likely to support efforts to restructure.

Objective Four: Respondents’ Awareness

1. Awareness for the component curriculum innovations ranged from 100% to 79.3%; for the component classroom methodology the range was 99.3% to 61.9%; for the component teacher professional development ranged from 95.7% to 73.9%; for the component school structure the range was 97.9% to 70.9%; for the component community outreach the range was 93.5% to 82% and for the component information technology the range was 98.6% to 79.7%.

2. The highest level of awareness was for School-to-Work (100%) and the lowest level of awareness was for brain-based learning (61.9%).

Objective Five: Extent of Restructuring/Reform

1. The mean for the six restructuring/reform components ranged from 2.64 for the component information technology to a low of 1.89 for the component school structure. The grand mean for all components was 2.38.
2. Two components were classified as moderate level restructuring. They were: information technology ($M = 2.64$) and classroom methodology ($M = 2.60$). This was out of a possible 4.0.

**Objective Six: Differences in Responses by Selected Variables**

1. For the variable race, African American respondents perceived a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform in the components curriculum innovations ($M = 2.86$) ($t = 3.81$, $df = 34$, $p = .001$) and teacher professional development ($M = 2.77$) ($t = 3.19$, $df = 32$, $p = .003$) than did white respondents.

2. For the variable attendance in a leadership academy, respondents who attended a leadership academy perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the areas of classroom methodology ($M = 2.71$) than did those respondents who had not attended a leadership academy ($M = 2.42$) ($t = 2.55$, $df = 132$, $p = .012$) and teacher professional development ($M = 2.48$).

3. For the variable advanced placement, respondents in schools that offered advanced placement curricula perceived a greater extent of restructuring reform in the area of community outreach ($M = 2.67$) than did those respondents in schools that did not offer advanced placement ($M = 2.28$) ($t = 2.93$, $df = 77$, $p = .004$).

4. For the variable honors curricula, respondents in schools that offered honors curricula perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the area of community outreach ($M = 2.58$) than did those respondents...
in schools that did not offer honors curricula ($M = 2.13$) ($t = 3.79$, $df = 120$, $p < .001$).

5. For the variable vocational curricula, respondents in schools that offered vocational curricula perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the area of curriculum innovations ($M = 2.45$) than did those respondents in schools that did not offer vocational curricula ($M = 1.76$) ($t = 3.68$, $df = 14$, $p = .003$).

6. For the component tech prep curricula, respondents in schools that offered tech prep curricula perceived a higher extent of restructuring/reform ($M = 2.59$) in the area of community outreach than did those respondents in schools that did not offer tech prep curricula ($M = 2.07$) ($t = 4.62$, $p < .001$); curriculum innovations ($M = 2.55$) ($t = 3.74$, $df = 117$, $p < .001$).

7. For the variable special education curricula, respondents in schools that offered special education curricula perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the area of curriculum innovations ($M = 2.42$) than did those respondents in schools that did not offer special education curricula ($M = 1.85$) ($t = 4.97$, $df = 14$, $p < .001$).

8. For the variable mainstreamed special education curricula, respondents in schools that offered mainstreamed special education curricula perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the area of classroom methodology ($M = 2.66$) than did those respondents in
schools that did not offer main-streamed special education curricula ($M = 2.12$) ($t = 3.63$, $df = 32$, $p = .001$).

9. For the variable self-contained special education curricula, respondents in schools that offered self-contained special education curricula perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the area of community outreach ($M = 2.49$) than did those respondents in schools that did not offer self-contained special education curricula ($M = 2.11$) ($t = 2.79$, $df = 55$, $p = .007$).

10. For the variable school board support, respondents in schools where the school board supported restructuring/reform perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the component information technology ($M = 2.69$) than did those respondents in schools that did not receive school board support ($M = 2.13$) ($t = 2.34$, $df = 9$, $p = .046$).

11. For the variable parental support, respondents in schools in which received parental support perceived a higher extent of restructuring/reform in the component teacher professional development ($M = 2.49$) than did those respondents in schools that did not receive parental support ($M = 2.17$) ($t = 2.48$, $df = 29$, $p = .019$).

12. For the variable civic organization support, respondents in schools in which the school received support from civic organizations perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the component teacher professional development ($M = 2.60$) than did those respondents in
schools that did not receive business and industry support (M = 2.21) 
(t= 2.69, df = 54, p = .010).

13. For the variable religious group support, respondents in schools in which religious group support was received perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform in the component teacher professional development (M = 2.62) than did those respondents in schools that did not receive religious group support (M = 2.31) (t= 2.04, df, 55, p = .046).

Objective Seven: Relationships between Selected Variables

1. For the variable number of teachers, a low relationship existed for the components curriculum innovations (r= .25, p = .003), teacher professional development (r = .19, p = .028), and community outreach (r = .28, p = .001).

2. For the variable number of curricula offerings, a moderate relationship existed for the components curriculum innovations (r= .31, p < .001) and community outreach (r = .39, p < .001). A low relationship existed for the components classroom methodology (r = .26, p = .002), and teacher professional development (r = .27, p = .001).

3. For the variable racial makeup of the school, a low relationship existed for the components curriculum innovations (r= .23, p = .007), classroom methodology (r = .19, p = .024) and teacher professional development (r = .24, p = .004).
4. For the variable highest degree held, a low relationship existed for the components information technology ($r = .17, p = .042$).

5. For the component number of state professional meetings attended per year, a low relationship existed for the component school structure ($r = .19, p = .030$).

**Objective Eight: Barriers to Restructuring/Reform**

1. Lack of money, resistance to change, and lack of time were identified by Louisiana public high school principals as being the greatest barriers to restructuring/reform in Louisiana public high schools.

**Objective Nine: Successful Reform Interventions**

1. Grants, bond money, donations and fund-raises were identified as the interventions used to overcome the barrier of lack of money.

2. In-service, High-Schools-That-Work, Tech Prep, School-to-Work, stipends and release time for conferences were identified as the interventions used to overcome the barrier of resistance to change.

3. Creative scheduling and early release one day per month for inservice were identified as the interventions used to overcome the barrier of lack of time.

**Objective Ten: Establishing a Model**

1. A significant model was found explaining a significant portion of the variance in extent of school restructuring/reform implementation ($F = 4.770, p < .001$).
2. Nine variables met the criteria for entry into the significant model. These variables were: mainstreamed special education, honors curricula, level of education, tech prep, civic organization support, years in position, school board support, race, and business and industry support.

3. The total amount of variance explained by the eight variables was 31% in extent of school restructuring/reform implementation in Louisiana public high schools.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn and recommendations were made by the researcher.

Conclusions for Objective One

1. Schools vary in size, pupil teacher ratio, number of curricula offered, have a mixed ethnic population, and are located in communities of under 50,000 people.

   The conclusion is based upon the finding that the mean number of students was 564 and the range was from 16 to 2,048 students. This does not agree with Raywid (1996) who found that most schools today are designed to accommodate 2,000 to 3,000 students. However, it does agree with Breaking Ranks: Changing and American Institution (1996) which states that schools should break into units of no more than 600 students so they are more personalized. Further, the mean number of teachers was 39.9 and the range was from six to
127 teachers. This agrees with the finding by Wulf (1997) who found that no ideal class size had been identified. The majority of the respondents reported that honors (n = 83, 59.3%), vocational (n = 128, 91.4%), college prep (n = 109, 77.9%), tech prep (n = 86, 61.0%), general (n = 118, 83.7%) special education (n = 132, 94.3%), mainstreamed special education (n = 116, 82.9%), self-contained special education (n = 105, 75.0%) and gifted and talented (n = 95, 67.9%) curricula were offered in their school. Minority population ranged from zero to 1279 students with a mean of 243 students. The size of city/town in which the school was located ranged from 100 to 496,938 people with a mean of 34,348.

Conclusions for Objective Two

1. The typical Louisiana public high school respondent is a middle aged, male Caucasian, with more than a masters' degree which was earned over ten years ago, with approximately 20 years of school experience, who has been active in professional organizations and has generally attended a leadership academy prior to becoming a principal.

The conclusion is based on the findings that the majority of the respondents (n = 91, 64.9%) were between the ages of 46 and 55; the majority of the respondents were male (n = 108, 76.6%); the majority of the respondents were Caucasian (n = 113, 80.1%); the majority of the respondents held a Masters’ plus thirty degree (n = 88, 62.4%); and that degree was earned by a majority of the respondents prior to 1986.
(n = 105, 74.5%). In addition, they had almost 17 years of teaching experience (M = 16.9, SD = 7.2) prior to becoming a respondent; the median number of years served in their present position was four; Over 60% of the principals belonged to at least one professional organizations with the largest number belong to the Louisiana Association of Secondary School Principals (LASE) (n = 102, 72.3%). The majority of principals (n = 125, 82%) attended at least one state meetings per year. About 38% (n = 52) of the principals attended about one national professional meeting per year.

2. Respondents in Louisiana public schools lack gender diversity. This is based on the finding that the majority of the respondents were male (n = 108, 76.6%).

Recommendations for Objective Two

Based on the conclusions for Objective 2, the researcher recommends future research to:

1. Determine why there is a lack of gender equity among respondents in Louisiana public schools included in this study.

Conclusions for Objective Three

1. Restructuring is occurring yet it is not a widespread movement. The conclusion is based on the finding that 80% (n = 106) of the respondents reported that restructuring was occurring in their schools. Forty-nine percent of the principals (n = 52) reported that there was state and/or parish mandates for them to restructure the schools.
2. Public high schools in Louisiana need to increase efforts in grantsmanship for restructuring of schools.

The conclusion is based on the finding that 51.9% (n = 55) of those principals who reported that they were restructuring, did not receive any grant money. From the data obtained it cannot be ascertained whether the schools simply do not apply for grants or if they apply and do not receive those grants. There seems to be some pockets of very strong support, yet there are too many other pockets where there is no support. It may be that the responding schools are in locations where there are no businesses for them to partner with.

3. Fully functioning partnerships are currently limited.

This is based on the finding that respondents perceived that less than half of business and industry (n = 62, 75.6%), civic organizations (n = 43, 63.2%) and religious organizations (n = 29, 45.3%) supported their efforts to restructure. This agrees with Cawelti (1994) who found that less than half of the high schools in his study reported they had the support of business and industry.

Recommendations for Objective Three

1. Schools need to build stronger alliances with business and industry, civic organizations, and religious organizations. Involvement of business and industry could be strengthened by setting up mentoring and shadowing programs for both students and teachers. Tech Prep
and School-to-Work programs are a vehicle through which this is or could be accomplished.

2. Build partnerships with civic and religious organizations.

3. Colleges and universities need to prepare students to write and implement successful grants.

Conclusions for Objective Four

1. Respondents in Louisiana public schools are aware of the six components and the elements included in the components curriculum innovations, classroom methodology, teacher professional development, school structure, community outreach, and information technology.

   This is based upon the finding that the range of awareness is from a low of 61.9% to a high of 100%.

2. Even though the 90's has been designated as the decade of the brain only a limited number of respondents were aware of the element brain-based learning.

   This conclusion is based on the finding that only 61.9% of the respondents indicated an awareness for this element. This seems to reflect that respondents are still operating under a traditionalist view of how schools should operate.

Conclusions for Objective Five

1. Louisiana public high schools restructuring/reforming efforts are limited in scope.
This is based upon the finding that only two of the restructuring/reform component scores (information technology and classroom methodology) were classified in the moderate level of restructuring category (2.64 - 2.60 respectively out of a possible 4.0).

Recommendations for Objective Five

1. Make fuller use of Tech Prep programs, High Schools That Work and School-To-Work programs. Because these programs are already in place, the impact would be immediate. These programs would help to establish or extend linkages to the six components of restructuring/reform.

Conclusions for Objective Six

1. The race of the school principal in Louisiana public schools supports the extent of restructuring/reform implementation.

   This conclusion is based on the finding that overall African American respondents perceived a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform (Grand mean = 2.33) than did white respondents (Grand mean = 2.61) (t= 2.81, p = .008).

2. Respondents attendance in a leadership academy supports the extent of restructuring/reform implementation.

   This conclusion is based on the finding that for the component classroom methodology, those respondents who had attended a leadership academy perceived a greater extent of restructuring/reform (M = 2.71) than did respondents who had not attended a leadership academy.
academy ($M = 2.42$) ($t = 2.55, p = .012$). In the component teacher professional development, respondents who had attended had a mean of 2.48 and respondents who had not attended a leadership academy had a mean of 2.23 ($t = 2.26, p = .025$).

3. Advanced placement curricula supports restructuring/reform implementation for the component community outreach.

   This conclusion is based on the finding that overall respondents in schools that offer advanced placement perceived a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform for the component community outreach ($M = 2.67$) than did respondents in schools that did not offer advanced placement ($M = 2.28$) ($t = 2.93, p = .004$).

4. Honors curricula supports restructuring/reform implementation.

   This conclusion is based on the finding that overall respondents in schools that offer honors curricula perceived a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform (Grand mean = 2.48) than did respondents in schools that did not offer honors curricula (Grand mean = 2.22) ($t = 3.36, p = .001$).

5. Vocational curricula supports restructuring/reform implementation in the component curriculum innovations.

   This conclusion is based on the finding that in the component curriculum innovations respondents in Louisiana public high schools that offer vocational curricula perceived a significantly greater extent of
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restructuring/reform \((M = 2.45)\) than did respondents in schools that did not offer vocational curricula \((M = 1.77)\) \((t = 3.68, p = .003)\).

6. Tech prep curricula supports restructuring/reform implementation.

This conclusion is based on the finding that overall respondents in Louisiana public high schools that offer tech prep curricula perceived a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform (Grand mean = 2.50) than did respondents in schools that did not offer tech prep curricula (Grand mean = 2.19) \((t = 3.96, p < .001)\). In all cases where statistical significance was found, respondents in schools that offered tech prep curricula perceived a greater extent of restructuring reform than did respondents in schools that did not offer tech prep. This agrees with Cawelti (1994) who found that principals felt that tech prep had the greatest impact on student achievement.

7. Special education curricula, mainstreamed special education and self-contained special education support restructuring/reform implementation in the component curriculum innovations.

This conclusion is based on the finding that in the component curriculum innovations respondents in schools that offer special education curricula perceived a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform \((M = 2.42)\) than did respondents in schools that did not offer special education curricula \((M = 1.85)\) \((t = 4.97, p < .001)\).

This also holds true for the finding that overall respondents in schools that offer mainstreamed special education curricula perceived
a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform (Grand mean = 2.44) than did respondents in schools that did not offer mainstreamed special education curricula (Grand mean = 2.08) (t = 3.21, p = .003).

In addition, respondents in schools that offer self-contained special education curricula had a higher overall mean (Grand mean = 2.44) than did respondents in schools that did not offer self-contained special education curricula (Grand mean = 2.20) (t = 2.50, p = .016).

8. Principals who receive support from the parish school board, parents, civic organizations and religious groups have a greater extent of restructuring/reform implementation.

This conclusion is based on the finding that, in the component information technology, respondents in schools that receive support from the parish school board have a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform (M = 2.69) than did respondents in schools that did not receive support from the parish school board (M = 2.13) (t = 2.34, p = .046). In the component, teacher professional development, respondents in schools that receive support from the parents perceived a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform (M = 2.49) than did respondents in schools that did not receive support from the parents (mean = 2.17) (t = 2.48, p = .019). In the component, school structure, respondents in schools that receive support from the parents perceived a significantly greater extent of restructuring/reform (M = 2.58).
2.04) than did respondents in schools that did not receive support from the parents (mean = 1.75) (t= 2.13, p =.042).

Recommendations for Objective Six

1. Put Tech Prep programs into all Louisiana public high schools.
2. Respondent leadership academies need to include a focus on awareness of change and the components and elements of restructuring/reform.

Conclusions for Objective Seven

1. Principals in schools that have a larger number of curricula offerings perceive a greater extent of restructuring/reform implementation.

   This conclusion is based on the finding that a low relationship existed between number of curricula offerings and the restructuring/reform components classroom methodology (r= .26, p =.002) and teacher professional development (r= .27, p =.001). In addition, a moderate relationship existed between number of curricula offerings and the restructuring reform components curriculum innovations (r= .31, p <.001) and community outreach (r= .40, p <.001).

2. Respondents in schools with a greater percentage of minority students perceive a greater extent of restructuring/reform implementation.

   This conclusion is based on the finding that a low relationship existed between number of minority students and the restructuring/reform components curriculum innovations (r= .23, p = .007),
classroom methodology (r = .19, p = .02) and teacher professional
development (r = .24, p = .004).

3. The higher the degree held by the respondent, the greater the
perception of the extent of restructuring/reform in the component
information technology.

This conclusion is based on the finding that a low relationship
existed between respondents with a higher level of education and a
greater extent of restructuring/reform implementation by the component
information technology (r = .17, p = .042).

4. The more state professional meetings a respondent attends, the
greater the perceived extent of restructuring/reform implementation in
the component curriculum innovations and school structure.

This conclusion is based on the finding that a low relationship
existed between the restructuring/reform component school structure
(r = .19, p = .03) and curriculum innovations (r = .20, p = .02) by the
number of state professional meetings attended per year.

**Recommendations for Objective Seven**

1. Further research should be conducted to extend information beyond
the baseline data collected in this study.

**Conclusions for Objective Eight**

1. Lack of money, resistance to change, and lack of time are major
barriers to restructuring/reforming Louisiana public high schools.
This conclusion is based on the finding that lack of money, resistance to change, and lack of time were the most frequently identified barriers listed by Louisiana public high school respondents.

**Conclusions for Objective Nine**

1. Writing grants, contracts, donations and fund-raisers are interventions to overcome lack of money for restructuring. To overcome resistance to change, in-service training, High-Schools-That-Work programs, Tech Prep programs, School-To-Work programs and release time for teachers will be needed to observe other schools who are advanced in the restructuring/reform process. Lack of time could be overcome through creative scheduling and early release of students once a month for teacher inservice.

**Conclusions for Objective Ten**

1. A significant explanatory model can explain the extent of school restructuring/reform implementation.

   This was based upon the finding that a model exists that explains a significant portion of the variance (31%) in extent of school restructuring/reform implementation ($F = 4.77, p < .001$).

2. Expect tech prep, race, civic organization support, business and industry support, mainstreamed special education, school board support to enter an explanatory model for restructuring with mainstreamed education curricula, and honors curricula as the leading variables.
This was based on the finding that the nine variables which entered the model added one percent or more of explanatory power to the model with the model remaining significant. Mainstreamed special education curricula and honors curricula were the first two variables that entered the equation.

**Recommendations for Objective Ten**

Based on the conclusion drawn from the findings, the researcher recommends the following:

1. Test the elements of the model for further refinement and use.
2. Use mainstreamed special education, honors curricula, tech prep or vocational education programs to lead the implementation process.
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APPENDIX A: TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Adult Volunteer Programs - The school has an ongoing program to recruit and coordinate efforts of adults who volunteer to tutor or assist with other school functions, i.e. parent patrols (Cawelti, 1994).

Alternative Assessment - A method of grading or measuring what students know or are able to do using something other than a pencil and paper test. With this method a teacher would interact with students to gather information. The teacher would record and synthesize that information using established criteria. Performance assessment is an example and might include such things as portfolios, performance based assessments, essays, experiments, demonstrations, case studies, role plays, games, exhibitions, projects, and video tapes (Education Week on the Web Glossary, 1997; Gilman & McDermott, 1994; Polen, 1992). These alternative methods provide a valid assessment of student progress, guide student learning, and motivate students, including those who might not otherwise be encouraged by results of standardized tests. (Bartz, Anderson-Robinson, & Hillman, 1994).

Block Scheduling - Uninterrupted blocks of time are designated for both instruction and planning purposes (Wiebe, 1992 & Watts & Castle, 1993).

Brain-Based Learning/Multiple Intelligences - Teaching in a manner that bases learning activities on the way in which an individual perceives and processes information. The teacher is aware of the student's learning style and spends a portion of each class period teaching to their learning style (Kolb, 1984 as cited in Harvill, 1992).

Business/Industry Alliances - A cooperative and collaborative sharing of resources between schools and businesses i.e. Adopt-a school (Wiebe, 1992). One or more businesses in the community routinely provides resources, consultation, or learning experiences for the students (Cawelti, 1994).

CD-ROM Technology - Compact disks are used in conjunction with computers to access various reference material or databases (Opitz, 1994). "They contain roughly 600 times as much data—including text, graphics, sound, and video— as a standard computer floppy disk" (Education Week on the Web Glossary, 1997, p. 1).

Charter Schools - "Schools run independently of the traditional public school system but receiving public funding, run by groups such as teachers, parents, or foundations. Charter schools are free of many district regulations and are often tailored to community needs" (p. 1).
Collaboration - The extent to which teachers engage in help-related exchanges. Collaboration is a voluntary effort among educators and is used to improve schools and the skill of teachers through teamwork (Smith, 1987).

Collaborative Schools - A school in which teachers observe one another, communicate, share what they know, share leadership, and talk openly about education. The climate and structure encourage teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth (Cohen, 1994; Smith & Scott, 1990; Smith 1987).

Collegial Planning Time - A period of time for groups of teachers to be free of students and duty in order to plan jointly. It provides time to examine, reflect on, amend, and redesign programs (Raywid, 1993; Wiebe, 1992; Hunter, 1989).

Community Service Programs - Students are or will be required to perform a specific number of hours of community service in order to graduate (Cawelti, 1994).

Community Use of Schools - School is open before and after the regular school day to allow for agencies, service groups or other educational entities to be offered to the students and/or citizenry. Activities are offered to benefit families and other community members i.e. Child care, adult education, recreation, counseling, health screening, mentoring, tutoring, parent education, or drop-in centers for teenagers (Education Week on the Web, 1997).

Cooperative Learning - “A method of instruction that encourages students to work in small groups, learning material then presenting what they have learned to the other small groups. In doing so, they take responsibility for their own learning as well as their classmates (Education Week on the Web, 1997, p. 1). They work together as a team as opposed to competitively or independently. It is designed to teach collaborative social skills, foster independence, and force individuals accountability (Cooperative Learning: Today’s Teen, 1994).

Distance Learning - Learning that involves a live telecast from an originating classroom to other classrooms in distant locations, also allows for interactive discussions across the distance, simultaneously with the live telecast (Opitz, 1994). This may also involve interactive video conferencing (Education Week on the Web, 1997).
Extended School Day - An extended school day is one in which the school day is longer than 7 hours (Canady, 1993).

Extended School Year - A year is considered extended when it is longer than 180 days (Canady, 1993).

Flexibly Organized Learning Time - The learning style of each individual is assessed and time is allowed for each student to master the material according to his/her needs (Sternbert, 1994).

Heterogeneous Grouping - Students are assigned to classes and/or groups of students with mixed ability (Tewel, 1995).

Homogeneous Grouping - Students are grouped on the basis of measured or perceived ability (Tewel, 1995).

Integrated Disciplines/Curriculum - "Teachers of several different subjects are assigned one group of students and encouraged to correlate their teaching. Teachers may deal with different aspects of one topic or theme, or they may choose to combine the content of the separate subject areas" (Wiebe, 1992, 38). Subjects are connected and related to one another to ensure mastery and understanding (Poulon, 1992).

Interactive Video - "Interactive video involves online video computing systems capable of rapid, accept-and-reject communications with human beings" (Houston as cited in Blair, 1993, 29).

Internet - "A widely-used worldwide public computer network, initially developed by the U.S. military, that links smaller computer networks and allows users on different computer systems to communicate with one another on a global scale (Education Week on the Web, 1997, p. 1). It provides a wealth of reference materials and databases (LaQuey, & Stout, 1993).

Mentoring/Shadowing - A person in business and industry works closely with a teacher so that the teacher can return to the school setting and give his/her students a taste of the real world in place of "book learning" only. Ex. a teacher would intern with a scientist during the summer.

Multi-Media Systems - The school has one or more systems that allow teachers and/or students to combine text, data, audio, graphic, animation, and/or still or moving video into a computer-controlled interactive product. An example of multimedia would be an electronic encyclopedia in CD-ROM format (Education Week on the Web, 1997: Cawelti, 1994).
Networked Computers - Computers within a school are linked to allow student and teacher On-Line interaction and the capability to access information in and out of the classroom.

Outcome-Based-Education (OBE) - OBE is an "education theory that guides curriculum by setting goals for students to accomplish. Outcomes-based education focuses more on these goals, or outcomes, than on 'inputs,' or subject units (Education Week on the Web, 1997, p. 3). Each school district has a clear set of general learner outcomes on which students are or will be expected to demonstrate proficiency prior to graduation (Cawelti, 1994; Mamary, 1994).

Peer Observation/Coaching - This method provides support by peers and is focused on encouraging and assisting efforts to achieve goals (Wiebe, 1992). A supervisory method that pairs two teachers who periodically observe each other in class. The observing teacher is looking for the use of a particular strategy or technique that was identified in a pre-observation conference. The observation teacher provides feedback on the results (Sousa, 1995).

Professional Leave Support - Teachers are provided release time for participation in quality professional growth activities such as sharing effective teaching strategies, reflecting on issues of curriculum and instruction, analyzing student achievement results, developing innovative instructional programs, or conducting action research. In addition, attendance at professional conferences is encouraged (Patterson, 1995).

School/College Partnerships - This set up can be seen as a system of cooperative and collaborative sharing of resources between schools and colleges. School is regularly involved with one or more nearby colleges or universities to improve teacher training, staff development, or preparing students for the school to college transition. The network allows for sharing of ideas, solving problems and building improvement in the school (Cawelti, 1994; Riley, 1993).

School/Technical College Partnerships - Schools and technical college are involved in a cooperative and collaborative sharing of resources. Each is involved with the other as they seek to prepare students for school/technical college transition.

School-To-Work - This approach can be described as an apprenticeship program that effectively connects school to work and requires two years or more of job-tailored curriculum (Education Week on the Web, 1997; Dunlap, 1993). A school collaborates with the local community college/technical college and/or businesses to provide training in the skills needed for positions...
that are likely to be available for them on graduation; such efforts include apprenticeships and “Tech Prep” programs (Cawelti, 1994).

**School-Within-A-School** - Polen (1992) has defined the school-within-a-school as one in which a non-traditional educational setting was offered to students who were not successful in their traditional school, however, this program remains within the regular high school building. Tewel (1995) states that a school-within-a-school preserves the conventional school for most students, but creates alternative programs for students to elect with the idea being to organize high schools into smaller units.

**Site-Based Management (SBM)** - This is the key component of the restructuring/reform effort (Tewel, 1995). SBM is an approach that shifts decision-making authority from school districts to individual schools. Each school establishes a school council composed of parents, teachers, and local administrators who share the responsibility of making decisions (Education Week on the Web, 1997; Smith, 1994). Bureaucracy is replaced with processional responsibility; the school board has less control and the school staff assumes responsibility for decisions that are made at the school site (Cohen, 1988 as cited in David, 1989).

**Targeted In-Service/Professional Development/Staff Development** - “The workshops and lectures designed to keep teachers abreast of the latest developments in their field (Education Week on the Web, 1997, p. 1). The majority of teachers are provided six or more days of school or district staff development in areas that will increase their repertoire of teaching strategies or decrease problems related to students and school (Cawelti, 1994).

**Teacher-Advisee System** - This is a system in which each individual student is paired with an adult or teacher who will provide support and encouragement in their educational endeavors (Wiebe, 1992). Each teacher provides their selected students with counseling/ or personal assistance. The teachers meet with each student and make home contact at times designated by the school principal (Cawelt, 1994).

**Teacher Support Teams** - Novice teachers are paired with a group of veteran teachers who provide support and assistance with problems encountered during their first three years of teaching.

**Team Teaching** - Teachers who have disciplines that cross into other fields of curriculum voluntarily pair to work together on curriculum that will correlate all subjects. The object is for students to see the relevance of one subject to another and to make connections that will make it easier for them to learn all subject matter (Sousa, 1995). Responsibilities for curriculum development
and teaching, evaluating student performance, and staff development are assigned to each team (Cawelti, 1994).

**Video Instructional Programs** - Delivery of concepts or units of subject matter are delivered to individuals or groups via video tape.

**Word Processing Programs** - Computer word processing programs like Word Perfect are used in the place of typewriters to help students improve their composition skills.
APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER

10238 Carmel Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70818
January 15, 1998

Dear

As you know, there are many critics of public school education. Many parents, legislators, and other in the public sector see public school education as a failure. However, both you and I know that this is not a fact, but it is extremely hard to convince those who control the money otherwise.

I know that restructuring/reforms have been instituted which have had a positive impact on children, teachers and administrators in our schools. However, there is currently no baseline data which supports this. Data gathered from this study will help determine the status of restructuring/reform in Louisiana schools containing grades 10, 11, and 12. In addition, it will identify the interventions which principals feel would enhance the chances of more successful restructuring/reform. As there is an increased emphasis on restructuring/reforms, I know that you will want to share your successes and barriers so that others involved in restructuring/reform will have those resources available to them.

You are one special principal who has been selected to participate in this study. Your participation is crucial to the success of this study! Will you please assist me in this endeavor?

Be assured that your responses will be held in strictest confidentiality. At no time will your answers be identified with your name. Identification numbers on questionnaires will only be used for follow-up purposes. I will look for your response in the next week. A return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Should you have questions or comments, you may contact Diane at (504) 261-4144 or Dr. Betty C. Harrison at (504) 388-2454. Thank your for your cooperation and prompt response.

Sincerely yours,

Diane S. Cook

Betty C. Harrison, Ph.D.
APPENDIX C: INSTRUMENT

General Information

1. Number of full time high school classroom teachers employed in your school? _____ Teachers

2. Curricula offerings (Mark all that apply)
   _____ Advanced Placement (AP)
   _____ Special Education
   _____ Mainstreamed
   _____ Honors
   _____ Self-Contained
   _____ Vocational
   _____ Gifted and Talented
   _____ College Prep
   _____ Tech Prep
   _____ General

3. Current position in the school? (of person answering this survey) ____________________________

4. Years you have held this position in this school? _____ Years

5. Years of classroom teaching experience? _____ Years

6. Your age? ______

7. Gender? _____ Male _____ Female

8. Race?
   _____ African American
   _____ Asian
   _____ Caucasian
   _____ Hispanic
   _____ Native American
   _____ Other (please specify):

9. Highest degree you have earned? Year earned?
   _____ Bachelor's
   _____ Master's
   _____ Master's plus 30
   _____ Educational Specialist
   _____ Doctorate
   _____ Other (please specify):
10. Memberships you hold in professional organizations (✓ all that apply).
   ✓ National Association of Secondary School Principals
   ✓ Louisiana Association of Secondary School Principals
   ✓ Parish Association of Secondary School Principals
   ✓ Louisiana Association of School Executives
   ✓ National Association of School Executives
   Other (Please Specify):

10. Number of national professional meetings you attend per year. _____ meetings

11. Number of state professional meetings you attend per year. _____ meetings

12. Prior to your appointment to an administrative position, did you attend a leadership academy?
   Yes   No   If so, on what extent? Parish State

13. Are restructuring/reform efforts being conducted at your school?
   Yes   No   (If no, skip to page 4)

14. Are the restructuring/reform efforts being conducted at your school the result of mandates?
   Yes   No   If so, from what extent? Parish State

15. Are you receiving support for your restructuring/reform efforts from the following sources? (Circle Appropriate Answer)
   Community Yes No   Business & Industry Yes No
   School Board Yes No   Civic Organizations Yes No
   Superintendent Yes No   Religious Groups Yes No
   Parents Yes No   Other Yes No

17. Has your school received grant money to assist with the restructuring efforts being conducted in your school?
   Yes   No
   If Yes, what amount of money has been received? $_________
   Source______________________________________________
DEFINITION OF TERMS:

ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT - A method to determine individual progress which does not involve a pencil and paper test. Examples: portfolios, observation, behavior, experiments, demonstrations, projects, video tapes, group interaction, etc.

BRAIN BASED LEARNING/MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES/LEARNING STYLES - Teachers use various instruments to determine the way in which each student learns best and then uses that information to plan lessons which will meet the needs of each student.

COOPERATIVE LEARNING - A method of teaching by which the teacher organizes the students into teams for group work as opposed to allowing them to work independently or competitively. Ex., consensus building

CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS - Teaching strategies that develop students ability to think critically and solve problems.

FLEXIBLY ORGANIZED LEARNING TIME - Teachers provide ample time for each student to reach their individual potential.

HETEROGENEOUS GROUPING - Students are grouped into classes without regard to measured or perceived ability.

INTEGRATED DISCIPLINES - Teachers from various disciplines work together to correlate their teaching so that students can see the relevance of one subject to another.

OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION - O.B.E. - What the learner is expected to know is determined by the school system, and students demonstrate individual proficiency of those required expectancies prior to graduation.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK - Preparation of students to move from school to work. Ex., apprenticeships, tech-prep or other delivery systems that connect school to work.
Instructions: In the left column, indicate whether you are aware of the restructuring or reform element listed by checking "yes" or "no". In the right column, indicate the extent to which this restructuring/reform element has been implemented in your school by checking (✓) the appropriate column. Operational definitions are provided on the facing page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Reform Element</th>
<th>Are you aware of this element?</th>
<th>If you are aware, to what extent has the restructuring element been implemented?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum Innovations**
- Integrated Disciplines
- Outcomes-Based Education
- School-To-Work

**Classroom Methodology**
- Alternative Assessment
- Brain Based Learning
- Cooperative Learning
- Critical Thinking Skills
- Flexibly Organized Learning Time
- Heterogeneous Grouping

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE
DEFINITION OF TERMS

BLOCK SCHEDULING - Uninterrupted blocks of time are used for instruction. Ex., Four-by-four block, modified block, etc.

COLLEGIAL PLANNING TIME - Teachers in departments are provided a joint planning and discussion time to examine, reflect on, amend, and redesign programs (Raywid, 1993).

EXTENDED SCHOOL DAY - A school day which is longer than 6.5 hours.

EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR - A school year that is longer than 180 days.

MENTORING - A person in business and industry works closely with a teacher so that the teacher can return to the school setting and give students a taste of the real world in place of "book learning" only. Ex. A science teacher would intern with a scientist during the summer.

PEER COACHING - Teachers designated as model teachers are paired with a beginning teacher. The beginning teacher observes and learns from the master teacher. The master teacher observes and critiques the beginning teacher to help them identify strengths and weaknesses.

PEER OBSERVATION - A teacher observes and critiques another teacher in action. The intent of peer observation is to help each other increase desired teacher behaviors.

PROFESSIONAL LEAVE SUPPORT - Teachers are provided leave time for participation in quality professional growth activities that will upgrade their teaching skills or increase their knowledge of subject matter. Ex., conferences, workshops.

RECOGNITION AND REWARD SYSTEM - A school system provides intrinsic or extrinsic rewards or recognition to those teachers who show excellence in and out of the classroom.

SCHOOL-WITHIN-A-SCHOOL - A program that breaks a large school into smaller units. A non-traditional educational setting might be offered to students who were not successful in a traditional school setting. This program remains within the regular high school building.

SHADOWING - A teacher observes a business or industry professional to better understand the knowledge/skills that students will need to succeed in the business world.

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT - Refers to a program or philosophy adopted by schools or school districts to improve education by increasing the autonomy of the school staff to make school-site decisions (Odden, 1995). Teams of teachers, parents, and administrators jointly decide on school policy and practice (Newmann, 1993).

TARGETED IN-SERVICE/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - School or district in-services are provided to increase teacher competencies in a specific area or to upgrade specific teaching skills.

TEACHER SUPPORT TEAMS - Novice teachers are paired with a group of teachers who provide support and assistance to the novice during their first three years of teaching.

TEAM TEACHING - Teacher teams from different disciplines and/or grade work together as a "core group" responsible for teaching a specific group of students.

TEACHER-ADVISEE SYSTEM - Individual students are paired with a teacher who will provide support and encouragement in their educational endeavors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Reform Element</th>
<th>Are you aware of this element?</th>
<th>If you are aware, to what extent has the restructuring element been implemented?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted In-Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended School Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended School Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Within-A-School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-Based Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Advisee System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE
DEFINITION OF TERMS

ADULT VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS - The school has an ongoing program to recruit parents or other adults in the community to tutor or assist with other school functions, i.e. parent patrols (Cawelti, 1994).

BUSINESS/INDUSTRY ALLIANCES - One or more businesses in the community routinely unite with the school to provide special resources, expertise, consultation, or learning experiences for the students.

CD-ROM TECHNOLOGY - Using CD's with the computer to access various references and databases (Opitz, 1994).

COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS - Students are required to perform a specific number of hours of community service in order to graduate (Cawelti, 1994).

COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS - School is open before and after the regular school day to allow for agencies, service groups or other educational entities to be offered to the students and/or the citizenry.

DISTANCE LEARNING - Learning that involves a live telecast from an originating classroom to other classrooms in distant locations and allows for simultaneous interactive discussions across the distance (Opitz, 1994).

INTERACTIVE VIDEO - "Interactive video involves on-line video computing systems to communicate with human beings" (Houston, as cited in Blair 1993, 29).

INTERNET - A public network that connects people throughout the world and provides a wealth of reference material and databases (Quey & Stout, 1993)

MULTIMEDIA SYSTEMS - Allows teachers/students to combine text, data, audio, graphic, animation, or still/moving video into a computer-controlled interactive product (Cawelti, 1994).

NETWORKED COMPUTERS - Computers within the school are linked to allow student and teacher on-line interaction and the capability to access information in and out of the classroom.

SCHOOL/COLLEGE PARTNERSHIPS - The school networks with a college/university to share ideas, solve problems and improve the transition of students from secondary school to higher education.

SCHOOL/TECHNICAL COLLEGE PARTNERSHIPS - The school networks with the local technical college to provide opportunities for students to articulate credits from high school to a core curriculum at the local technical college or to make the transition from secondary school to technical college more successful for students.

VIDEO INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS - Concepts or units of subject matter delivered by way of video tape to individuals or to groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Reform Element</th>
<th>Are you aware of this element?</th>
<th>If you are aware, to what extent has the restructuring element been implemented?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Volunteer Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry Alliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Use of Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/College Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Technical College Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/World Wide Web</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networked Computers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Instructional Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE
Instructions: In the left column of the table below, write in the main barriers you have faced in the restructuring/reforming of your curriculum, program, teaching methods, and other educational quality aspects of your school. In the right column, write in any interventions (if any) that you have successfully used to address the barriers listed in the left column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS TO RESTRUCTURING</th>
<th>SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER COMMENTS:
Dear Principal,

Approximately two weeks ago you should have received a questionnaire designed to identify the types of restructuring/reform occurring in Louisiana public schools. If you have already returned the questionnaire, I sincerely appreciate your response. If you have not yet responded, please do so by (date). If you did not receive a questionnaire or have misplaced your copy, please call me at (504) 261-4144 (H) or (504) 775-0012 (W) and I will send you a replacement. Thank you for your participation!

Sincerely,

Diane S. Cook  
Betty C. Harrison, Ph.D.  
Professor, Louisiana State University
APPENDIX E: SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER

10238 Carmel Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70818

Date

Dear

About a month ago a study was begun which is attempting to identify the status of public school restructuring/reform occurring in Louisiana public schools. Many questionnaires have been returned and I am encouraged by that fact. However, we have not yet received your completed questionnaire. To accurately access the status of restructuring/reform occurring in Louisiana and to identify exactly what restructuring/reform is occurring depends on you and other principals who have not yet responded. I am positive that you have many great ideas to share with other schools throughout the state and I know that you truly want to be a part of making Louisiana public schools better.

If you have recently returned your questionnaire, please accept this not as our thanks. In case you did not receive the previous copy or your copy has been misplaced, another questionnaire is enclosed for your convenience. I will look forward to your response by (date).

Be assured that your response will be kept in the strictest confidentiality. At no time will your answers be identified with your name. Identification numbers on the questionnaire will only be used for follow-up.

Should you have any questions or comments, you may contact Diane at (504) 261-4144 or Dr. Betty C. Harrison at (504) 388-2454. Thank you for your cooperation and your prompt response!

Sincerely yours,

Diane S. Cook
Louisiana State University

Betty C. Harrison, Ph.D.
Professor
APPENDIX F: BARRIERS TO RESTRUCTURING AND SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTIONS – COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM RESPONDENTS

Note: Each respondent's comments are separated by a horizontal line.

• The faculty and administrators are now working on 4 X 4 block scheduling techniques for next year.
  • At first vote, the school board disapproved.
  • $  
  • $$  
  • $$$  
  • Time = $  
  • Time  
  • Money  
  • Number of teachers  
  • Hesitation to change  
  • Time  
  • Cost of technology  
  • Too few computers for # of students  
  • Parent concern/cooperation  
  • Release time for teachers  
  • Certified teachers  
  • Money - cannot keep up with technology  
  • Control by Board members - micro management  
  • Finances  
  • “Change” by the more experienced teachers  
  • $ for professional growth  
  • Parental accountability  
  • Time  
  • Money  
  • Parental support  
  • Student apathy  
  • Special education rules  
  • Wiring for Internet usage  
  • $ for software needed for instructional use  
  • Traditional ways  
  • Too many different projects/grants  
  • Faculty resistance  
  • Money
• Small school/not enough staff
• Funding
• Governmental mandates
• Lack of in-service time (teachers are tired after school and in-service is not too effective
• Money
• Lack of parental support
• Funding for needed additional staff
• Indifference to change
• Lack of leadership from SDE
• Lack of financial resources
• Time constraints
• Time
• Money
• Resources
• Community involvement
• Existing rules and regulations that are out dated and hinder progress
• Lack of knowledge from above our school
• Unwillingness of some to change
• Financial
• Staffing
• In service (workshops and time involved)
• Money to finance programs
• Money
• Time
• Organized support and direction
• Time & demands of Central Office, State Department, parents, students, etc.
• Teachers unwilling to change
• Money
• "New" teacher corps
• Teacher attrition
• Lack of staff development people
• Lack of resources & equipment
• Union contract constraints or use of teachers' time
• Pear teacher training programs
• Affordable instructional materials to assist teachers in change
• Lack of business & community involvement
• Older defiant faculty
• Money
• Change
• Inability to hire certified teachers
• Finances
  • Money to fully implement the change
  • Faculty, community, etc., to accept “change”
• Teacher attitudes
• Community attitudes
• Curriculum standards for all academic disciplines
• Computer/technology training for staff
• Teachers unwilling to change
• Money
• “New teacher corps”
• Teacher attitudes
• Technology in instruction
• Teacher allotment
• Money for technology
• The barrier to restructuring in everything listed above is the fear of change by community, teachers, and school board
• Our Parish school administration and school board do not allow each school the autonomy to structure its programs. They want all high schools parish-wide to do the same things.
• Time
• Money
• Resistance to change
• Shortage of teachers
• Shortage of classroom space
• Student absences
• Low student motivation
• Lack of parental involvement
• Poor self esteem (students)
• Students coming from elementary school functioning below level
• Lack of involvement by central office
• Lack of money
• Lack of certified teachers
• Lack of money and computers
• Changing attitudes
• Money - increased budget concerns for implementing reform
• Staffing - not enough staff to accomplish all that is desired
• The most striking barrier to restructuring in our school is the resistance of experienced teachers to utilizing modern technology—even though they
recognize the need for and the benefits of technology integration into the classroom

- Time for in-service
- Technological resources
- Limited course offerings due to small staff
- State/Parish Boards not willing to extend the school year
- Teachers struggle to trim mile-wide, inch-deep curriculum down

- Parents of Algebra students
- Funds
- Space in classrooms
- Number of teachers

- Staff size
- Certification
- Class offerings
- Financial restraint
- Low socio-economic area
- Apathy towards education

- Financing
  - Not enough text book money
  - Can't find teachers
  - Can't find coaches

- Central Office not allowing release time for teachers

- Funding
- Staffing

- Teaching staff resistant to change
- Lack of funding
- Too many demands on time to be able to carry out these initiatives

- Lack of money
- Inferior facilities
- Low teacher morale
- Inferior teachers
- Lack of parental involvement

- Money
- Money
- Time
- Time

- Money for training
- Faculty willingness to change
- Community pressure to remain same

- Interruption of instructional time for teacher in-services, workshops
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- Tradition
- Time
- Money
- Time
- New ideas/old teachers
- Alternative styles
- Teacher isolation
- Culture of teaching
- Financial
- Central Office - some personnel
- Lack of staff
- Some present staff do not wish to change
- Inadequate space
- Resistance of teachers
- Teachers
- New laws
- Finances
- Teacher attitudes
- Time
- Budget
- Building space
- Over crowding classes
- Certified teachers
- Teachers afraid to try new concepts
- Parents not wanting children to leave school early
- Money
- Time for in-service
- Released time from students for schools to provide in-service for faculty.
  The Parish uses allotted time for parish-wide in-service
- Conservative leadership
- Money
- Parent apathy is a big problem
- Money
- Staffing - especially physics/chemistry, etc.
- Space - additional rooms for programs
- Time - especially for testing LEAP, IOWA, etc.
- Logistics of 4-12 school - cross over of faculty
- Finances
- Teacher morale
• Apathy to change (success for all)
• Parental support
• Money, resources
  • Funding
  • Time restraints
  • In-service, instruction, & planning
• Resistance to change
  • Money
  • Personnel
  • Time
• Adult volunteer program
• District restrictions on use of time
• Money & time to make changes
• Remote location of school in relation to business/industry
• Coordination of restructuring efforts from district/state levels
• Willingness of faculty to make changes
  • Factual information
  • School Board members
  • Teachers’ extra hours
  • Teacher attitudes to change
  • Many older faculty
  • Members are afraid of change
  • Having enough computers in classrooms to utilize technology. The school is in a rural community with little resources. Makes it more difficult to get community support and business support
  • Mature teachers who have grown accustomed to the one-hour lesson plan, much of it lecture
• Lack of staffing and time
  • Money
  • Lack of resources
  • Uncertified teachers
  • Deteriorating school
  • Small rural school
• Financial
  • Community support
• Restructuring at the university level
  • Time limiting factor
• Funding
  • Resistance to change
  • Physical plant
• Electrical update, wiring
• Financial support
• Staffing (Poor teachers)
• Funding
• Textbooks
• Poor parental involvement
• Low teacher morale
• Low student morale

SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTIONS

• The teachers visited various schools in La. And spoke with board members to allow our school to go 4 X 4 next year, even though the 2 other parish high schools are not ready next school year
• Parents
• Business partner
• Reorganization of school day
• Using retraining/staff development opportunities
• Grants
• Business partnerships
• In-service teachers
• Title I
• Internet
• Staff development
• Tech Prep
• Networking
• Try for grants
• Schedule the best I can with the staff provided
• Provide In-service
• Effective In-service
• Grant writing
• New ideas/innovations
• Integrated planning teams
• Integrated courses & academies
• High schools that work initiatives
• Delegate tech prep
• New courses to provide higher standards
• In-service
• Grant writing
• Preaching the need
• Help from superintendent
• Few grants - low amount
• Some funding from local school board
• In-services on new programs - Articles in local paper
• In-Service with appropriate information
• sent bulk mailings with appropriate information
• Effective In-service
• Grants
• New ideas/innovation
• Staff development
• Peer influence
• Bond Issue with some money for technology
• Research
• Getting information out to parents and community
• Presentation to Board
• Working on professional growth with teachers
• None successful as yet
• Staff support
• Innovative teachers
• Careful planning
• Addressed to personnel
• Improvised teachers
• Improvised classrooms
• Restructured curriculum offerings, etc.
• Meeting with students and parents
• Academic incentives programs
• Parent meetings, etc
• Conferences with counselors, etc.
• Remediation
• Ask, Ask, Ask
• Ask, look for Grants
• ???
• Integration within the school (class activities)
• Involving parents
• School wide committees
• Information dissemination
• Collaborative efforts with other administrators in the Parish
• Redistributing assignments
• Designated certain days strictly for in-service
- Itinerant teachers
- Newsletters
- Parent/teacher conferences
- Grant writing
- Business Donations
- Encourage additional certification
- Bussed to other campuses
- Partner-in-Education
- Fundraising
- Encourage Education
- Encourage degree attainments
- Title I
- Grants
- Used money from our general fund
- 665 teachers
- Continued persistence
- Workshops through High Schools that Work & RRPW
- Grants
- Donations
- Creative Assignments
- Effective School-to Work program
- Grant requests
- Creative uses of available money
- Directing teachers to worthwhile workshops
- Redirecting teachers with poor performance
- Grant money
- School team is planning for restructuring of school day
- Lengthening each day to allow for early dismissal of students one day per week, ½ day per week for professional development
- Begin getting grants
- In-services
- Interdisciplinary projects
- Triggering effects
- Staff development, STW, H-STW, etc.
- Grants
- Work with those who assist
- In-service - workshops
- Transfer staff who will not change
- Include need for space in future bond issue to be brought to voters
- None yet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-service training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandate policies &amp; documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of teachers to work to convince other teachers the advantages of block - A/B scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote grants that provided funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired substitutes for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None found for release time from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School that Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-to-Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tele learning (LA Schools - NAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALERO INC sends a representative to help with physics instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Wong In-service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus observation of other schools with success for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort to open communication network with teachers, parents, students, community, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore grant opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time restraints - meet before or after school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open discussions at committee meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meetings to address key concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many teachers are becoming aware of the many uses of the classroom computer to enhance student education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are being trained to use classroom computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving school adapters as much as possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Had to change mature teachers' methodology to create about 3 mini-lessons including some cooperative group learning
- Staff development
- Staff development
- Staff development
- Use of High Schools that Work network and materials
- Grants
- Request assistance
- None for uncertified teachers
- Portable classrooms
- None for small rural school
- Partners in education
- Research at local level
- Make small moves
- System/community bond passed
- Positive teachers working to change
- HSTW
- Tech prep
- Grants
- Fund-raisers
- Business support
- Encourage retirements
- Transfers
- Personal finances
- Community and school-based support
- Still need help with textbooks
- Teacher/advisee system
- Recognition, rewards to all staff members
- Recognition, rewards, encouragement continuously
- Lots of unconditional love
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