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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Educational reform has produced a national drive to hold schools accountable for their students' performance and increase parent involvement. One of this decade's major educational reforms to address accountability has been decentralization of school decisionmaking. This decentralization became known as site-based management (SBM) with the notion that participatory decisionmaking at the school site would increase student achievement. Ogawa and White (1994) concluded that one-third of all public school districts use some type of site-based management. This site-based management movement increased after researchers suggested that school autonomy was connected with school effectiveness (Purkey & Smith, 1985). Basically, site-based management is a group of people closest to the school site who are involved in decisionmaking.

Many schools are using forms of site-based management as an initiative to improve schools. Several researchers have investigated SBM in schools and parent involvement as indicators of current methods for school reform. Unfortunately, this review of the literature for this investigation found little evidence of increased student achievement associated with site-based management. In one particularly germane study that addressed student achievement, Jenkins (1994) related SBM to student achievement. Jenkins studied 23 schools with SBM in Washington state and found no significant differences in student scores as evaluated by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

Although the major purpose identified by most site-based councils was to improve student achievement, there remains wide variation in site-based management. The many variations of site-based management models used in public schools included different compositions, authority, accountability, and types of decisions. The site councils' compositions vary from an educator
majority to a community majority. Authority varies from shared responsibility with the principal to an advisory council. Some models have accountability for student achievement while other models have no accountability. The types of decisions also vary from decisions made with budget, personnel, and curriculum. Many councils have made decisions not related to student achievement but rather decisions related to extracurricular or noninstructional activities.

The many variations of site-based management have not led to significant differences in student achievement. However, other areas of school improvement have been documented from research on site-based management. School personnel often found success in SBM in other areas than student achievement. Researchers found that SBM had success in areas of school governance and teacher/parent empowerment. Hill, Boran, and Warner (1992) investigated five schools using SBM and found that the success of SBM required reform of an entire school system with SBM as the only focus for school reform. Wohlstetter (1997) studied 40 schools with SBM in three countries. She found that success of SBM depended on organizational conditions and a focus on instructional reform.

The organizational conditions must support the interactions of the different stakeholders. Kowalski (1994) surveyed 149 principals in Indiana and Minnesota. Eighty-eight percent felt that SBM was sound governance which increased teacher responsibility; however, only 61 percent stated SBM produced improvements in education. Success of SBM appears to be in areas other than student achievement.

Statement of Problem

The problems for this study are the need to identify the variety of SBM models, sharpen the definitions for the models, and locate exemplary models that impact student achievement. The research base demonstrates that variations for SBM exist, most of which result in only minimal
change in student achievement. David (1996), a proponent for the benefits of site-based management, states that the contributions of empowerment and decisionmaking outweigh the current, limited outcomes for student achievement from SBM. The importance of involving parents, educators, students, and community members in decisions about their local school was an intermediate goal which may be as important as the ultimate goal of improving student achievement (David, 1994).

SBM models need sharper definitions for school personnel to choose a model that best meets their schools' needs. The models with the most promise of effectiveness having the features described in the review of literature needs to be described, compared, and communicated to school personnel wishing to choose a model that best meets their needs for student achievement.

The following questions more specifically address the problem:

1. What are the different SBM models and their unique characteristics?
2. What types of SBM are most frequently used by public school districts of various sizes?
3. What is the content of SBM decisions utilized in public schools?
4. What opportunities for training are used by public schools to assist in SBM?
5. What relationship, if any, do the SBM models have to parent perceptions of involvement with decisionmaking?
6. What relationship, if any, do the SBM models have to student achievement?

Purpose of the Study

To address the problem and questions above, the specific purposes of the study were to:

1. Define the models of SBM in order to provide the knowledge base for schools to raise student achievement.
2. Document the perceptions of selected SBM council members toward the effectiveness of SBM.

3. Determine if SBM council members' perceptions differ significantly regarding the effectiveness of SBM.

4. Determine if there are statistically significant differences among parents' perceptions regarding student achievement associated with SBM.

5. Draw conclusions as to the potential impact of existing SBM models on student achievement.

Objectives

The overarching goal of this study was to determine the effectiveness of different SBM models and parents' perceptions of student achievement associated with SBM. The goal of Phase I of this study was to develop a survey to collect information on the initiation, type, authority, responsibility, composition, and level of student achievement used with SBM that exist in public schools.

Phase I

Specific objectives were to:

1. Collect and categorize data from national public school districts in order to identify SBM models.

2. Report the contents of the decisions made by site councils in their school governance.

3. Develop an array of SBM models with clear descriptions for each model.

4. Analyze returns and select SBM models associated with high student achievement.
Phase II

1. Follow up with one school district for each type of SBM model to draw conclusions associated with the impact on student achievement.

2. Determine if SBM council members' perceptions of council effectiveness differ significantly.

3. Determine whether there are differences among amount of parent involvement on site councils and parents' perceptions of student achievement and parents who were not members of site councils.

4. Examine the strength of parent representation on site councils.

5. Obtain parent perceptions of student achievement associated with SBM.

6. Describe the most promising SBM models.

**Research Questions**

This study attempted to first establish descriptions of different SBM models. Then second, this study attempted to determine the strength of parent involvement in SBM, analyze perceptions of student achievement in schools using different SBM models, and compare the different models of SBM. Parent perceptions of student achievement were analyzed to seek answers to the following questions:

1. What are the different SBM models and their unique characteristics?

2. What association, if any, does the SBM model have on parents' and other SBM council members' perceptions of involvement on decisions?

3. What relationship, if any, does the SBM model have on student achievement?
Hypotheses to be Tested

To provide comprehensive answers to the research questions, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences among SBM models and the content of decisions.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences among parent involvement on site councils and parents’ perceptions of student achievement and parents who were not members on site councils.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences among site-based models and perceptions of student achievement.

Assumptions

Research assumptions are as follows:

1. Characteristics of effective SBM school councils can be identified.
2. All respondents will provide accurate and complete information.
3. SBM is old enough to have allowed time for councils to determine effectiveness.

Delimitations

This study is delimited by the following parameters:

1. Only schools with two years or more in SBM were selected for the final questionnaire.
2. Parent opinion data were used for examining the strength of parent involvement on decisionmaking and the impact on student achievement.
3. This study was limited by the sampling technique: a stratified, nonproportional, random sample representing the national population.
4. Results of this investigation represent the 1998–99 school year, during which the data were collected.

5. This sample provided for separate questionnaire mailings made to 770 public school districts.

6. The initial questionnaire respondents for this study were superintendents or district leaders.

Definitions of Terms

One problem with examining SBM is that there are a variety of definitions for SBM. For this study, SBM was defined as the provision that creates school councils and delegates the authority to make decisions at the school building level to increase student achievement. School reform is defined as the act of changing the form, condition, and function of schools.

Human Subjects Release

In efforts to ensure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects participating in research are adequately protected, the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed this project and concluded that confidentiality was assured and the potential benefits through increased knowledge were appropriate. The study was conducted so that no emotional risk or risks to self-esteem were present. Modified informed consent to participate was assumed by those voluntarily completing and returning the questionnaire.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In successful schools, regardless of all past history, shared principles govern. We find most often in successful schools, a capacity to cherish individuality and inspire communality that is the hallmark of our loftiest institutions. (Rosenholtz, 1989)

Introduction

A national commission on the quality of education in the United States was established on August 26, 1981 by former President Ronald Reagan. This commission’s report entitled A Nation at Risk (1983) gave a challenge to schools for children born in 1981. These children would graduate from high school as the class of 2000, less than a year away from now. A Nation at Risk was one of the initial reports to focus public attention on the need for school reform. One of the tenets from this report included the call for "the voluntary efforts of individuals, businesses, and parent and civic groups to cooperate in strengthening educational programs" (A Nation at Risk, 1983, p. 20).

Among all the possibilities for school improvement, one of the ways was site-based management (SBM). A major portion of this literature review focused on summarizing the research on site-based management and parent involvement as decisionmakers on site councils. Other categories reviewed were those related to school reform, school restructuring, effective schools, school governance, and shared decisionmaking.

The review process initially began by conducting searches through the ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) system. This was followed by identifying articles contained in bibliographies of prior research studies by accessing the Dissertation Abstracts, Educational Administration Abstracts, and by using the Scholar System. Personal contacts were then made
with experts in the areas of parent involvement and site-based management. These experts were identified by research articles and Iowa State University faculty. Additional searches utilized the Internet. One limitation of the search procedure was minimal access to studies outside the United States. The process pointed to the fact that although there is limited research on the relationship of student achievement with SBM (Miller, 1995; Wohlstetter & McCurdy, 1991; Wohlstetter, 1997; Jenkins et al., 1994), increasing numbers of schools are viewing local school governance and increased parental involvement as important possibilities for school reform (Lindle, 1995; Shields & Knapp, 1997; Devos, Van den Broeck, & Vanderheyden, 1998; Kowalski, 1994; Epstein, 1995; David, 1994).

SBM as decentralization of decisionmaking changes the governing structures of schools. Wohlstetter and McCurdy (1991) concluded that there are two forms of decentralization. The first form is administrative decentralization where the authority for decisions is delegated to the level of the school building. The second form is community control with authority given to the community.

Another way to define SBM is by who initiates the restructuring process (Wissler & Ortiz, 1988). Some efforts for SBM have been external with the decision imposed on school districts such as state legislature mandating the reform. Another method is internal with members of the school such as the superintendent or school board members deciding to establish SBM.

The recent demands for accountability and improvement of student achievement have provided opportunities for those individuals and groups seeking restructuring of the public schools. As a result, SBM and increased parental involvement became two popular practices for improving education. Sewall (1999) identified stages of school reform, moving from traditional, top-down management to local school control. Several national reports have advocated decentralization as the current wave of educational reform. Decentralization has been promoted
by the Carnegie Commission on Teaching as a Profession (1986), the National Governors’ Association (1986), Education Secretary Richard Riley (1994), and the Clinton administration. Cawelti (1995) echoed the need for decentralization when he said:

Change is accomplished school-by-school, and policies from higher up in the district or state which seek improved achievement usually do little to help ensure the kind of leadership and school culture needed to provide focus and teamwork within a school.

(p. 8)

Across school districts, SBM is considerably diverse in its form, the impetus of SBM, the amount of authority decentralized, and the degree of focus on instruction. The key premise of SBM is that those closest to the students (teachers, parents, students, administrators, community members) should have the authority to make school level decisions and assume the responsibility for student performance (Hess. 1999; Kowalski. 1994; Pauley. 1988; Glatthorn. 1992; Dolan. 1994; Goodlad. 1983; Purkley & Smith. 1985).

Rosenholtz (1989) expanded on this.

The first problem for policymakers is not how to regulate schools but how to deregulate them so that they are still responsive to community needs; not how to put more power into bureaucratic hands but how to get more power into the hands of local teachers and principals. Schools can (and should) stand for public accountability and the common good without making a centralized bureaucracy its only instrument.

(p. 216)

Site-based Management Pros and Cons

The use of site-based management in the school governance process has both its advocates and critics. This review discovered several authors who argued that success of the SBM as an
approach to school improvement was rarely realized (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Wissler & Ortiz, 1986). Among one of the major disadvantages expressed was a reliance largely on participants' judgment of success. Other concerns were that schools haven't focused on improving student achievement but rather have focused on peripheral issues. David (1994) found that most schools focused on issues they felt they could solve such as discipline, facilities, and extracurricular activities. The areas of curriculum and instruction are more difficult to tackle, especially with district and state mandates for new assessments which require different teaching methods unfamiliar to parents and community members. Malen and colleagues (1990) strike at the core of criticism against SBM by saying that "student achievement does not appear to be either helped or hindered" (p. 59).

Teachers have reservations about SBM based on problems of time, complexity of problems, and conflict between their own leadership and teaching responsibilities (Guskey & Peterson, 1995). Other researchers have noted other drawbacks associated with SBM efforts. Glatthorn (1992) identified intensive time commitments from teachers, power struggles between members, scarcity of resources, and lack of coordination between initiatives within a district and the school building level. Lindle (1995) believes that the democratic processes for SBM and shared decisionmaking are time-consuming. Whylie (1995) claims that SBM is unlikely to bring in new resources to make up for inadequacies of government funding. Perhaps the person expressing the most universal reservations about SBM as an approach to school improvement is Malen (1990): "The promises are rarely realized. Although site-based management creates opportunities for site participants to be involved in school-wide decisionmaking, they rarely exert substantial influence on school policy decisions" (p. 32).
Advocates

In contrast to the beliefs of detractors, advocates of SBM for school improvement identify a growing body of evidence in its favor. Jenkins and colleagues (1994) claim: "To the extent that school improvement is broadly conceived to include such goals as establishing schools as centers for critical inquiry, shared decisionmaking, and perceived improvements in services, then SBM has enjoyed some success" (p. 370).

Schwan and Spady (1998) believe that schools can be successful when they align school improvement plans and staff development activities with site-based management decisionmaking. The organizational structures must match the policies, procedures, and practices. This view is consistent with literature on organizational changes which points to the need for congruency between system initiatives and directed supports for the changes (Glatthorn. 1992; Fullan, 1991; Rosenholtz. 1989; Sergiovanni. 1996; English & Larson, 1996).

A study conducted by Wohlstetter and Mohrmann (1996) addressed the issue of school-level factors as related to the capacity for school-level participants to impact the direction for school change. Some of these school factors were the role of the principal, participation structures, access to information, the amount of authority, rewards, and the amount of focus on instructional improvement. Their study demonstrated that information and power, the amount of authority assigned to SBM councils, were significantly different between struggling schools and actively restructuring schools. They also concluded that the role of the principal is essential for improvement. Miller (1995) concurred on the principal’s role as essential for school change. He conducted a five-year study of 12 public high schools and found that democracy in school governance helped teachers accept a reform, but the principal’s leadership determined the level of change.
David (1994) conducted a study of schools in Kentucky which has a SBM state mandate and found that councils effectively involved in decisions about curriculum and instruction shared several features:

- Leadership focused attention on student learning,
- Parents strongly represented on committees,
- Access to knowledge and professional development,
- Communication network exists inside and outside of the school,
- School board established roles of setting policy and approving recommendations. (p. 14)

To summarize the two viewpoints on SBM, the advocates of SBM see it as highly desirable and conducive to shared decisionmaking as part of a democratic process and productive for improving schools' governance. The opponents see it as unlikely to improve student performance and diverting attention to changes in school governance rather than bringing about redesigned educational reform.

Parental Involvement and Student Achievement

Parental involvement with schools continues to be a topic of interest among those concerned with educational outcomes for children. Different forms of parental involvement have been studied to determine those most beneficial to schools and student achievement. The two broad types of involvement are roles in which parents have direct involvement with their child and the other is an indirect role (Gettinger & Guetschow, 1988).

Direct parent involvement

Several studies provided a strong consensus that direct parental involvement in their children's education benefitted children's learning (Chavkin, 1993; Epstein, 1991; Fantini, 1980;
Keith, 1991; Walberg, 1984). The direct parental involvement takes several forms with basic obligations for home conditions, helping children with homework, and providing emotionally supportive home environments. At the most basic level, parent obligations are to establish home conditions that support children's healthy growth and development. Researchers have determined that parents who create emotionally supportive home environments help children perform better in school (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993; Moles, 1987; Taylor, 1996). The basic needs include assurances that children are prepared for school with basic nutrition and immunizations, sufficient sleep, school attendance, and completion of homework (Epstein, 1987).

Finn (1998) identified similar parental traits of involvement. These traits are active organization and monitoring of the children's time, discussion of school matters with their children, reading to their children, and helping with homework. However, many studies of parental involvement were conducted with low-income and minority families who had primary-aged children. These studies found success in raising student achievement (Henderson, 1987; Epstein, 1991). A few studies investigated the involvement of parents with their children's homework. They found that schools increased student achievement when the parents were given specific instructions about strategies with specific homework assignments (Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, & Brissie, 1992; Epstein, 1995). Other research also tended to focus on primary-aged children.

Little research exists regarding the effects of this direct type of parental involvement on learning for the middle and high school aged youth. The studies related to this age of students instead focused on home environments that value achievement and intellectual activities. In one particularly relevant study, Astone and McLanahan (1991) determined that parental involvement in monitoring homework and general supervision were related to school indicators such as grades, attendance, attitudes, expectations, school retention, and degree completion. Another study
examined the direct effects of parents monitoring homework and time spent in viewing television. These researchers determined that parental involvement did have a direct effect on time spent doing homework and grades, but only a minimal direct effect related to time spent in viewing television (Fehrmann, Keith, & Remers, 1987). Youth of this age performed better with parental encouragement and attention from parents monitoring daily activities and programs in schools. Other researchers showed that parents who actively helped their children organize their schedules led to higher achieving students (Taylor, 1996; Trusty & Perle, 1998; Walker, 1998; Gettinger & Guetschow, 1998).

**Indirect parental involvement**

Over the last decades, researchers have investigated parental involvement and programs that helped parents strengthen their direct role in the home learning environment. However, the indirect approaches of parental involvement such as serving on school advisory boards, school governance boards, and volunteering in schools has had limited study. The present review of literature found a few studies that linked parental involvement on school governance boards to increased satisfaction of parents as they influenced the decisions made in their schools (Davis, 1991; Chrispeels, 1991; Walberg, 1984). It appears that parent involvement as decisionmakers increased parents' feeling of empowerment which in turn showed their children the importance of school. Parents' perceptions of their influence on decisions made in the school were seen as the direct link to their satisfaction (Herman & Yeah, 1980). One study conducted by Public Agenda found that parents agreed with schools that monitoring homework and holding expectations for their children to learn were their most beneficial contributions to the school. There was minimal support by parents for the notion of parents helping to choose staff or develop curriculum.
Another indirect type of parent involvement is parent participation through volunteering in the schools. Reynolds (1992) conducted a longitudinal study over two years of parents volunteering in schools. He concluded that there was a moderate positive correlation between parent volunteering and student achievement. Other studies on parents as volunteers have received similar results (Stevenson & Baker, 1987; Fehrmann, Keith, & Reines, 1989; Watkins, 1997).

The appeal of parental involvement in schools has led to an increase in the number of education programs for parents (Chavkin, 1993). This appeal has been led by state and federal government. Several states, including California, Kentucky, Florida, and Illinois, have required parent involvement activities in efforts to increase student achievement. The California State Board of Education adopted policies on parent involvement as early as 1989. Renewed interest in parent involvement has also been noticed in federal requirements of parent involvement with federal programs such as Chapter I projects and Even Start.

Cawelti (1995) summarized his meta-analysis of various approaches to student achievement and verified that parent involvement with activities designed to reinforce the school’s curriculum resulted in large student achievement with effect sizes in .4-.6 range. His findings support the public agreement with direct approaches to children’s learning. However, the indirect approaches have less documentation of increasing student achievement.

Summary of the Literature

The literature provides no conclusive proof that SBM councils have positive effects on increasing student achievement. Several other studies suggested that school effectiveness was related to school autonomy and ownership. Some studies showed that students had increased student achievement when there was increased direct parental involvement. The indirect involvement of parents with schools has less documentation for linkage to student achievement.
However, there exists a large variance in issues addressed by SBM councils and often the
decisions are unrelated to direct student achievement. There is a need for documenting and
evaluating the effects of SBM and indirect parental involvement on the SBM councils. The
research showed that it is critical to include parents in the process of change in schools (Fisher,
1994). However, having parents serve on site-based councils to improve student achievement
remains unproved. The use of SBM has been used widely by many public schools in attempts to
reform education and improve student achievement. It is clear from the literature that there are
few studies using student achievement as a means to determine the effectiveness of SBM. See
Table 1.

Table 2 summarizes the research literature explaining parent involvement, both direct and
indirect types. The use of parent involvement has continued to rapidly become an integral
component of school improvement. According to the present review of literature, there is a
tremendous push from state governments to implement parent involvement programs for
improving schools and student achievement.

The preceding review of the literature and this study will provide needed information on the
nationwide status of SBM and parents’ perceptions of student achievement because of SBM.
Through the delineation of SBM models into categories of who initiated SBM, this study serves to
provide information about a critical linkage to student achievement and SBM. Furthermore, this
investigation describes different SBM models and parents’ perceptions of the functioning of SBM
councils to determine their satisfaction with the indirect parental involvement to student
achievement.
Table 1. A summary of the research literature for site-based management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Purkey &amp; Smith</td>
<td>School autonomy connects with school effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Clune &amp; White</td>
<td>School-based budgeting is part of comprehensive reform with curriculum and personnel issues for decisionmaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hentschkle</td>
<td>Effective restructuring requires a change in authority relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Harrington-Lueker</td>
<td>All schools in Kentucky have SBM with powers to set policy for curriculum, budget, and personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Rist</td>
<td>School reform in Chicago dilutes the power of the central administration and school board. Site councils have authority for curriculum, budget, and personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Wohlstetter &amp; McCurdy</td>
<td>Large variances exist to school-based budgeting reforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Wohlstetter &amp; Buffet</td>
<td>Seven of the eight largest urban school districts in the United States have SBM. New patterns of decisionmaking exist that empower educators and community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>The issues of school reform should be determined by those who have the most immediate connection to the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Lindle</td>
<td>SBM functions in 66 percent of Kentucky’s schools. Effective councils must represent their constituencies, focus on instruction, and develop democratic processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Wylie</td>
<td>New Zealand’s SBM works best when part of other strategies to improve schools. SBM can be mandated and those making the decisions enjoy autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Shields &amp; Knapp</td>
<td>SBM is widespread and extremely varied. The SBM schools with most improvement had goals, focus on curriculum, and encouragement of collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Wohlstetter &amp; Buffet</td>
<td>New patterns of decision making exist that effectively empower educators and community members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Setting goals and assessing students' progress improves student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Latham</td>
<td>SBM has support among educators and the public. SBM must be connected to instruction to have an impact on student achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. A summary of the research literature for parental involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Williams, Jr. &amp; Chavkin</td>
<td>Successful parent involvement programs must have written policies, administrative support, training, partnerships, communication, networking, and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Parent involvement increases efforts to reform schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Epstein</td>
<td>Shared visions and collaborative efforts lead to a variety of effective programs to connect schools and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, &amp; Brissie</td>
<td>Relationships exist between perceptions of parent efficacy and parent involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Healey</td>
<td>The keys to successful programs are communication and involvement of parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Rutherford &amp; Billig</td>
<td>Parent involvement depends on active advocacy by school leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Increased parental involvement requires the leadership of the principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>Parental involvement and empowerment accounted for substantial variance in student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Hoover-Dempsey &amp; Sandler</td>
<td>Successful school involvement programs must address parents' roles and parental sense of efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Successful parental involvement requires a wide variety of involvement options. Schools with stronger ties to their families increased attendance rates and student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Mapp</td>
<td>Strong links exist between parent involvement and children's success in school. The personal connections with school staff make the difference in increasing parental involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td>The main predictors of parent involvement are child achievement, teacher communication, and parent efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Bauch &amp; Goldering</td>
<td>Parents and teachers must work together collaboratively to take responsibility for the quality of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Ogawa</td>
<td>Effective organizations build connections to parents for providing resources and buffer uncertainties for families and schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

A review of the literature in site-based management (SBM) and a study conducted by Jim DeGracie for the Mesa, Arizona, School District served to establish the basis for the major components of the survey instruments. Questions also were listed on the survey to establish pertinent characteristics of site councils.

Overview

This study is both quantitative and cross-sectional. The study is cross-sectional because it used a single survey to compare the different types of SBM models. The project is divided into two parts. Part I sampled school districts, nationwide, to identify the type, configuration, and authority given to site councils. In this part, superintendents or district leaders were sampled.

Part II had three objectives: 1) to determine if there were statistically significant differences among site-based models and the content of their decisions, 2) to determine if there were significant differences among amount of parent involvement on site councils and parents’ perceptions of student achievement and parents who were not members on site councils, and 3) to determine if there were statistically significant differences in parent involvement on different types of site councils and their perceptions of student achievement.

Sample Design

It was anticipated this study would contribute to the development of descriptive profiles of various SBM models. The population for this project included public school districts in the United States.
The Part I sample consisted of 770 public school districts in the United States. The Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory developed the initial sampling methodology used by James Scott in his dissertation study and this project. The population was defined in two documents: The Common Core of Data Public School Universe computer tape (1988) and the Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies (1988). Both documents were published by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education. These data sources contain names and addresses of 15,579 public school districts in the United States.

The states and districts were grouped into eight geographic regions: Far West, New England, Mideast, Southeast, Great Lakes, Great Plains, Southwest, and Rocky Mountains. The Part II sample consisted of three public school districts in the United States chosen for longest time involvement with SBM for the three different categories of who initiated SBM within the school district. The three categories were "initiated by the superintendent, initiated by the school board, and mandated by the state."

**Instrumentation**

The survey instrument on the first sample (Appendix A) was used to determine the prevalence of SBM and the different types of SBM. In addition, the instrument was used to identify three school districts with long-term involvement in SBM who had high perceptions of effectiveness in function and impact of SBM on student achievement. The initial question served to establish whether or not a district used SBM. The second question established the size of the school district. This constituted the demographic portion of the survey instrument. The next questions established who initiated SBM in the district, the configuration of the membership on the SBM council, and the authority given to the SBM council. The final section established the
perceptions of SBM council members' impact on student achievement. This section also established how well the SBM councils functioned as a decisionmaking committee.

The survey instrument on the second sample (Appendix B) duplicated selected items from a questionnaire developed by the Research and Evaluation Department of the Mesa, Arizona, Public School District in its study of the effectiveness for the functioning of their SBM councils. Mesa's items were taken from a number of sources with the main source from work done by Nancy Fiandach for her doctoral dissertation. The instrumentation was provided by Jim DeGracie and used with his permission (Appendix C).

Prior to the initial mailing, the survey instrument and accompanying letters of instruction were field tested. A panel of graduate students at Iowa State University, consisting of working administrators, teachers, research associates, and university professors of educational administration, were asked to review the items. They made recommendations to improve the clarity of the questions. The initial instrument was mailed in January, 1999. The second instrument for Part II of this study was mailed in March, 1999.

Collection of the Data

The initial survey instruments were sent to the superintendents or district leaders of schools in the 770 school districts in the sample. Each survey mailing package included a letter, the survey instrument, and a prepaid return envelope. The letter was countersigned by Professor Richard P. Manatt and was printed on Iowa State University School Improvement Model stationery. The letter explained the purpose of the study and described the sample. The superintendent or designated official was given until the end of January to return the completed survey. A total of 187 surveys were received as a result of the first mailing. A second mailing was not done due to the cost of the mailing.
The second survey instruments were sent to the superintendents of three school districts identified by the results of the initial survey. The superintendents agreed to the second more in-depth survey of their SBM council members and parents not represented on the councils. A survey mailing package was mailed to each district superintendent in the second sample (Appendix D). Each package contained a letter of explanation to the superintendent and requested that the superintendent route the survey instruments and envelopes to the SBM councils. The surveys were assigned a code number to identify the school district and preserve the confidentiality of the respondents. The code was also used to tally responses.

A total of 334 surveys were mailed to three districts. A total of 138 individuals from three districts responded to this mailing. Telephone calls to the superintendent suggested that a personal appeal increased the amount of returns. The response rate was 41 percent for the second phase of the study. At this point, data collections were terminated.

Treatment of Subjects

The proposal for this study was reviewed and approved by the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research. Committee approval is in Appendix E.

Data Analysis

Initial data analysis involved several separate procedures. First, the Phase I completed surveys received were tabulated and separated by the schools using SBM and the schools not using SBM. Then the number of years the school districts had used SBM was tabulated. Only districts with two or more years' involvement with SBM were included for consideration in the second phase of the study. The school districts with the longest involvement with SBM were chosen for the second phase of this study. The frequency was tabulated for who initiated the SBM
in the school district. Next, the mean responses for the perceived relationship to student achievement were calculated. The desktop version of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 8.0, 1997 version) program was used to do all the mathematical calculations and the statistical analyses. The descriptive statistics provided frequencies, means, and standard deviations to study the value of the variables.

The analysis of the second phase of the study involved several procedures. The first calculations were for the council functioning characteristics of the three school districts. The characteristics were reported with means and standard deviations for the sample schools. Actual frequencies of raw counts and percentages were produced on the SPSS computer package. These raw counts and percentages were useful in completing tables to depict and categorize the data. ANOVA tables were then constructed with the SPSS computer package.

The ANOVA models were used to compare the means for the different responses from each model of SBM. An alpha level of .05 statistical significance was established for each statistical test. The .05 level is commonly used in educational research. A one-way ANOVA was used to compare the content of decisions between the three school districts. A chi-squared test was done on the site council members' responses on authority granted the site councils for the different types of SBM. The chi-squared test compares the observed frequencies with values expected from the null hypothesis of independence. It was used to determine whether the sample differences could be due to sampling variation. The formula for the chi-squared statistic is as follows (Agresti & Finlay, 1997, p. 255):

\[ X^2 = \frac{(fo-fe)^2}{fe} \]

A two-way ANOVA was used to compare the respondents' perception for the SBM's impact on student achievement. The dependent variable was the level of impact the site council
had on student achievement. Post hoc tests were used for multiple comparisons between the school districts and the perception of impact on student achievement. Two different post hoc tests were used for comparing the content of decisions between school districts' SBM councils. The first method was the Scheffé test, which has intervals slightly narrower than the Bonferroni test, which was the second method selected for comparison. The Scheffé method is used for multiple comparisons of means. This method is used for sophisticated comparisons between an average of one set of means and an average of another set. The Bonferroni approach also uses a stringent confidence level for each interval to guarantee that the entire confidence level is adequately high (Agresti & Finlay, 1997, pp. 446–449). Open-ended responses were tabulated using the MS Word program (Microsoft, 5.1 version). These open-ended responses were then categorized by similarities. After completion of all the analyses, conclusions were drawn and reported in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

The purposes of this study were to identify and describe the different models of site-based management (SBM) currently being utilized in the public schools in the United States. The different categories of SBM were established and compared to determine the perceptions of SBM council members toward the effectiveness of SBM and, specifically, parents' perceptions regarding certain SBM decisions and their association with improved student achievement.

The sample in Phase I of this study consisted of 770 school districts. Initial contact with school districts was made through a mailing of survey instruments and a letter of instructions to superintendents or district leaders. One hundred and ninety-six school districts responded to this phase of the study.

The average size of the school districts was 18,169. Return rates are shown in Table 3 and are disaggregated by region and return rate. The Great Lakes and the Southwest regions had the highest return rate—29 percent. Regions with lowest return rates were Northeast (19 percent) and Far West (16 percent). The return rate was low, in part, because 59 surveys were returned as undeliverable. This may have been due to the older documents (1988) used for the addresses of school districts. Other reasons for the low return rate may have been that the questionnaire was long and the interest in SBM may have crested.

Findings

The findings are organized to address the three hypotheses of this study: 1) There are no significant differences among SBM models regarding the content of decisions. 2) There are no significant differences among SBM models regarding respondents’ perceptions of SBM’s
Table 3. Frequencies and percentages of respondents by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total districts</th>
<th>Districts in sample</th>
<th>Districts returning questionnaires</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Plains</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,437</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

influence on student achievement, and 3) there are no significant differences in perceptions of
student achievement impact between parents on site councils and parents not on site councils.

The first part of Phase I for this study used an initial question to determine the degree of
SBM in school districts. School district leaders were asked if they were using the formal school
governance of site-based management. If they were not using SBM, they needed to answer only
the student enrollment of their school district.

A second question was used to determine the number of years the school district had used
SBM. The mean duration for school districts using SBM was 6.99 years. All districts with less
than two years' involvement with SBM were then removed from consideration for the second
phase of the study. Four school districts had less than two years' involvement with SBM and were therefore removed from the second phase of the study.

Questions 4 through 7 of the survey reflect different compositions and models of SBM. Respondents were first asked to identify who initiated SBM in their school districts. Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations of responses for different choices of initiation: state mandated, school board, or superintendent. The total number of responses was 122 responses for this question.

The highest frequency for the question of who initiated SBM was "the superintendent." followed by the "state mandating SBM" and the "school board initiating SBM." SBM initiated by the community, parents, or teachers was less than 10 percent.

Table 4. School district leaders' identification of who initiated SBM in their school district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiation of SBM</th>
<th>Number responding positive</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State mandated</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The responses were positive identification of the three choices by the superintendents; therefore, more than one choice was possible (N=122).
Respondents were asked to identify the selection process used to establish site councils. The choices were elected by a represented group; volunteered, recruited and appointed by administrators; and applied and interviewed. The total number of responses was 126 responses to this question. Table 5 illustrates the frequencies for the different selection processes of site council members.

Table 5. Site council selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection process</th>
<th>Number responding affirmative</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected by represented group</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited and appointed by administrators</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than one selection process could be affirmed by superintendents (N = 126).

The most typical selection processes for site council members were election by representative groups and recruitment with appointment by administrators. Both of these types of selection processes were identified as 46 percent affirmative by the superintendents. The next type of selection process was volunteering for membership and this type was at 37 percent. Another type of selection for site council membership was application, but this type was identified by only 5 percent of the superintendents.

Respondents were then asked to identify the composition of their site councils and the number of each type of membership. The choices included parents, students, community
members, support staff, administrators, and teachers. The total responses for this question were 126 responses. Table 6 portrays the composition of site councils.

The majority of respondents portrayed their site councils as composed of parents, administrators, and teachers. Due to the different markings on the number of each type of membership, no data were analyzed for the number of each type of membership.

Respondents identified the authority given to the site councils in decisionmaking. Table 7 shows that superintendents identified curriculum authority as the most frequently granted authority for the site councils.

The most common authority granted the SBM councils was decisions on curriculum, such as curriculum renewal, alignment, textbooks, with 69 percent of the responses. The next highest was decisions on budget at 62 percent. The lowest response for authority granted to SBM was personnel, with a response of 37 percent.

### Table 6. Composition of site councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number responding yes</th>
<th>Number responding no</th>
<th>Percent positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The responses were determined by superintendents indicating the composition as positive; therefore, more than one item could be identified for this question (N=126).*
Table 7. Authority given to site councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Frequency marked positive</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean was based on positive response to each item for authority; therefore, more than one choice could be selected for this question (N=126).

Question 8 of the survey reflected the prioritization of decisions made by site councils. Five types of statements were listed: student learning, student discipline, extracurricular activities, facilities, and instruction. The respondents rated the statements from 1 to 5, with 1 for the lowest priority and 5 for the highest priority. Table 8 displays the prioritization of the highest and lowest priority.

Table 8. Priority of site council decisions—Highest priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision areas</th>
<th>Highest priority</th>
<th>Lowest priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discipline</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=126.
Superintendents most frequently identified student learning as the highest priority with facilities as the lowest priority.

Question 9 of the survey requested the superintendents' perception of the impact the site councils had on student achievement. The response was 0 to 4, with 0 as no impact and 4 as a large impact. Table 9 illustrates the school district leaders' perception of SBM's impact on student achievement.

Table 9. Level of impact site councils had on student achievement at the present time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of impact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (No impact)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Little impact)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Some impact)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Moderate impact)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Large impact)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of district leaders perceived site councils to have a "moderate" to "some impact" on student achievement. Only three school districts identified the site councils having a large impact on student achievement. The three school districts were contacted, but declined to participate in Phase II of this study.

The last question on the survey reflected the functioning of the site councils, the use of student data for decisionmaking by the councils, and the perception of parent strength on the site
councils. Superintendents were asked to indicate if any of nine positive statements regarding site councils described their councils. Table 10 displays the superintendents' responses to their site councils' functioning. There were 125 responses to this item.

The respondents most frequently indicated that their site councils had access to professional development with 71 percent of the superintendents marking this item as true of their councils. The item least frequently marked true of the site councils was the statement that the councils' role was to set policy, coordinate, and approve recommendations, with 41 percent of the district leaders marking this item as true of their councils.

Table 10. Site councils' functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site councils have access to professional development</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site councils have access to student data</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership focuses the council on student learning</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site councils have an organized protocol for decisionmaking</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site councils are connected to other school committees</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site councils have an established communication network</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong parent representation is seen on site councils</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site councils base decisions on student data</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site councils' role is to set policy, coordinate, and approve recommendations</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase II Detailed Examination of Selected SBM Councils

The second phase of this study was a study of three school districts. The school districts were differentiated by who initiated SBM in their district. Data from Phase I of the study were used to determine the number of years a school district had used SBM. The schools with the highest numbers of years' involvement with SBM were determined, and the three school districts with the longest involvement with SBM were contacted for Phase II of this study. One hundred surveys were sent to a school district in California (School District A); 100 surveys were sent to a school district in Oklahoma (School District B); 134 surveys were sent to a school district in Wisconsin (School District C). A larger number was sent to the school district in Wisconsin because the superintendent requested that all site councils in her district be included in the survey. School District A had SBM mandated by the state. School District B had SBM initiated by the school board. School District C had SBM initiated by the superintendent.

The surveys were sent to all members of 10 site councils in each of the three school districts, and a request was made for the principals to give surveys to parents not on the councils. The return rate is shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Return rate from Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Number sent</th>
<th>Percent returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School District A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District C</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The highest return rate was from School District C in Wisconsin, with a return of 60 percent. School District A in California had a return rate of 34 percent. School District B in Oklahoma had the lowest return rate of 23 percent. After querying the superintendent of the school district in Oklahoma, it was learned that his/her school district had just completed a study of their SBM with another university, and this may explain the low return rate.

Site Council Membership

The respondents were asked to identify the type of membership they represented on the council. Table 12 depicts the representation of the combined respondents from all three school districts.

Table 12. Type of site council members for three school districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff member</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses were calculated by combining the data from the three school districts (N=132).

The staff members represented the largest group of respondents, and the second highest respondent group was parents on the council. Community members, school board members, and parents not on the council responded less than 6 percent. The parents not on the council were given the questionnaire by the building administrator.
The first question on the survey had the respondents indicate the number of years they had been a member of the site council. Table 13 shows the comparison for the three schools of the number of years members had been on the site councils.

The three school districts had been identified for longest length of involvement with SBM; however, the mean of the individual members' involvement with SBM was considerably lower than the school district's involvement with SBM. School District A with SBM mandated by the state had the largest mean of 2.7 years for site members' involvement on the site council. School District B with the school board-initiated SBM had the lowest mean of 2.32 years for site members' involvement on the site council.

Data were disaggregated for the three school districts to examine the different models of SBM in regard to authority granted the councils, differences in content decisions, perception of student achievement, and council functioning.

**Types of Authority Granted to Site Councils**

The respondents were asked to identify the authority given to their site councils. There were three choices of budget, personnel, and curriculum for this item. The respondents could check
any combination that applied to their councils. A chi-squared test was used for each of the seven combinations of responses. The combinations were budget, personnel, curriculum, budget and personnel, budget and curriculum, personnel and curriculum, and a response of all three: budget, personnel, and curriculum. Table 14 illustrates the descriptive data for the authority granted to site councils.

Table 14. Authority granted to site councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses were calculated by combining the data from the three school districts. More than one choice could be selected (N = 127).

The site council members identified budget as the most frequently granted authority, followed by curriculum and then personnel authority.

The data were then analyzed to compare the responses from the three school districts. A chi-squared test was used because the survey used a non-ordered scale and the investigation sought to determine whether responses differed by school district type of SBM. Table 15 depicts the response of authority sorted by school districts.
Table 15. Chi-squared test for authority granted to site councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>School District A</th>
<th>School District B</th>
<th>School District C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected count</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget, personnel, and curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected count</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected count</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected count</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N=132.*
The highest percentage of response for authority granted to site councils was 25 percent, which was for budget and curriculum authority. This was identified by School District C, which was the superintendent-initiated SBM in Wisconsin. The next highest response was 19.7 percent, which was for budget and personnel authority. This was also identified by School District C.

School District A (state-mandated SBM in California) reported their highest response to authority granted as budget and curriculum. School District B (superintendent-initiated SBM in Oklahoma) reported their highest response to authority granted as budget and curriculum.

The data were further analyzed using the Pearson chi-square test for the significance level. Table 16 portrays the significance levels between the three school districts for the different authorities granted to the different types of SBM.

Table 16. Chi-square test for significance of the granted authority between the three school districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget and personnel</td>
<td>9.056</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and curriculum</td>
<td>7.302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and curriculum</td>
<td>3.166</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget, personnel, and curriculum</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>12.973</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>12.413</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 132.

*p < .05.
The Pearson chi-squared test showed a significance of 0.011 for budget and personnel authority. Superintendent-initiated SBM was significantly different than state-mandated SBM, with the superintendent-initiated SBM having more authority for budget and personnel.

The chi-squared test also showed a significance of 0.026 for budget and curriculum authority between the school districts. Superintendent-initiated SBM was significantly different than school board-initiated SBM, with the superintendent-initiated SBM having more authority in budget and curriculum.

Another area of granted authority that showed a significant level of differences between school districts was budget authority. This was significant at the 0.002 level. The authority of budget was significantly different for the three types of SBM. State-mandated SBM councils reported slightly higher percentages for authority granted on budget decisions than superintendent-initiated SBM. School board-initiated SBM councils reported no authority for budget decisions. The largest differences were noted in the responses to not having only budget authority.

The chi-squared test showed a significance of 0.002 for curriculum. The authority of curriculum was significantly different for the three types of SBM. School board-initiated SBM councils reported slightly higher percentages for authority granted on curriculum decisions.

The chi-squared test for personnel showed a significance of 0.528, which did not meet the criterion of .05. The authority of personnel was not significantly differentiated between the different school districts and types of SBM. Essentially none had only personnel authority.

**Functions of Site Councils**

The next 13 statements on the survey reflect the respondents' perception of the functioning of the site council. A Likert scale was used for the 14 statements with four rankings: 1 = Strongly
disagree. 2 = Disagree. 3 = Agree. and 4 = Strongly agree. Table 17 illustrates the elements or activities of the site councils in the three different school districts.

Most of the respondents rated their site councils' functioning as positive by stating agree or strongly agree. The majority of responses were in agreement with statements about the functioning activities for their council. The lowest response mean was between disagree and agree (2.48). This response was from School District C in Wisconsin (superintendent-initiated SBM) and related to members provided professional development. Other response means between disagree and agree were found for the site council members seek community opinions. Again, School District C in Wisconsin had a mean response to this item of 2.78. Three other items from the Wisconsin respondents displayed a response mean between 2 and 3. The items were statements for the site council publishes agendas, the site council is connected with other school committees, and the site council has established communication network.

School District A in California (state-mandated SBM) provided all responses to the functioning of the site councils between 3 (agree) and 4 (strongly agree). All of the means reflected positive agreement with the site councils' functioning.

School District B in Oklahoma (superintendent-initiated SBM) had 12 of the 13 means for responses fall between 3 (agree) and 4 (strongly agree). The responses demonstrated a positive agreement with the site councils' functioning. One item from School District B had a mean of 2.71. The item of site council members were provided professional development received the lowest mean response for School District B.

**Time Site Councils Spent on Issues**

The respondents from the site councils were asked to prioritize the amount of time their councils spent on different issues (Table 18). The issues were curriculum, student discipline,
Table 17. Elements of site councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site council:</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operates according to bylaws</td>
<td>3.67  0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has organized protocol</td>
<td>3.60  0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publishes agendas</td>
<td>3.67  0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follows orderly procedures</td>
<td>3.73  0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds meetings at convenient times</td>
<td>3.70  0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides members professional development</td>
<td>3.21  0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members exhibit respect and trust</td>
<td>3.73  0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sets goals and plans</td>
<td>3.50  0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is connected with other school committees</td>
<td>3.17  0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members seek community opinions</td>
<td>3.27  0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members represent entire school community</td>
<td>3.53  0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has established communication network</td>
<td>3.20  0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses student data to make decisions</td>
<td>3.24  0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Legend: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly agree.*
student attendance, homework, extracurricular activities, facilities, and instructional strategies and methods. The priorities ranged from 1 to 7, with 1 for no time and 7 for a major amount of time.

Site councils with state-mandated SBM (California) responded that their councils spent more time on curriculum, homework, extracurricular activities, and instructional strategies than the other types of SBM councils. The site councils with state-mandated SBM also rated the most time spent on issues of curriculum and instructional strategies/methods.

Table 19 summarizes the analysis of variance (ANOVA) tables for the priority of time spent on issues by the site councils between the three school districts. The ANOVA was chosen to examine the portion of the total explained by the differences among the group means.

Table 18. Means for priority of time councils spend on issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A California</td>
<td>B Oklahoma</td>
<td>C Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discipline</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student attendance</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction strategies/methods</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Legend: 1=No time, 3=Little time, 5=Enough time, 7=A major amount of time.
Table 19. Between group ANOVA for the priority of time councils spend on issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent on:</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>31.067</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.534</td>
<td>3.849</td>
<td>0.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discipline</td>
<td>8.830</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.415</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student attendance</td>
<td>21.338</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.669</td>
<td>3.361</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>25.146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.573</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>33.900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.950</td>
<td>3.779</td>
<td>0.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies and methods</td>
<td>10.553</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.276</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

Three of seven issues for time spent by site councils were significantly different between the three school districts and types of SBM. The issues of facilities, student attendance, and curriculum were significant at the .05 level between the three school districts. Four of the issues for priority of time given to them by site councils were not significantly different across the school districts. The issues that were not significantly different between the school districts were student discipline, extracurricular activities, instructional strategies and methods, and student homework.

Post hoc tests for each of the issues prioritized for time spent by the site councils were used for multiple comparisons between the school districts. The tests used the Scheffé and Bonferroni methods to examine the mean differences between the school districts' site councils. The Scheffé
is useful when complex comparisons are made such as between one set of means and another set of means. Its intervals are slightly narrower than the Bonferroni.

The next seven tables display the multiple comparisons for each issue prioritized by the site council members. Table 20 portrays the dependent variable of the priority for the amount of time the site council spent on student curriculum.

The mean difference is significant at the 0.028 level between the site councils in School District C (Wisconsin—superintendent-initiated SBM) and School District A (California—state-mandated SBM) for the amount of time the site councils spent on student curriculum. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>School district</th>
<th>School district</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonferroni</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheffé</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
reported priority of time spent on curriculum of School District A (5.42) was significantly higher than that reported by School District C (Table 18). California with state-mandated SBM spent more time on curriculum than the Wisconsin school district with superintendent-initiated SBM.

Table 21 illustrates the multiple comparison between school districts for the amount of time the site councils spent on student attendance. The Scheffé method displayed no significant differences between the school districts' site councils; however, the Bonferroni method supported a significant difference between School District C in Wisconsin (superintendent-initiated SBM) and School District B in Oklahoma (school board-initiated SBM) for time spent on student

Table 21. Tests of significance for multiple comparisons between school districts for the amount of time spent on student attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>School district</th>
<th>School district</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonferroni</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheffé</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
attendance. Since the Bonferroni is an acceptable test for educational research, the significant level was accepted. The significant level was 0.046.

The mean difference between the multiple comparison was significantly different at the 0.046 level between School District C and School District B for time spent on student attendance. This was important since it showed that there was a difference between SBM models and the amount of time the councils spent concerning student attendance.

There was no significant difference for the means for the differences of the multiple comparisons between schools for time spent on homework, extracurricular activities, or instructional strategies and methods. The multiple comparison between the school districts for time spent on homework showed a significant level of 0.051. The multiple comparison between the school districts for time spent on extracurricular activities showed a significant level of 0.708. This level was not significant between the different types of SBM for the time the councils spent on extracurricular activities. The multiple comparison across the school districts for time spent on instructional strategies and methods showed a significant level of 0.290. The significant level sought was .05. This level was not significant for the different SBM types and the amount of time the SBM councils spent on instructional strategies and methods.

Another issue prioritized by the SBM council members was time spent on facilities. This issue did have significance of 0.026 between the school districts’ SBM councils. Table 22 provides the multiple comparisons between the school districts’ SBM councils and the amount of time the council spent on facilities.

The SBM councils had significant differences at the 0.026 level between the Oklahoma school with school board-initiated SBM (School District B) and the Wisconsin school with superintendent-initiated SBM (School District C). The site council members from school board-
Table 22. Tests of significance for multiple comparison between school districts for the amount of time the councils spent on facilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>School district</th>
<th>School district Mean difference</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonferroni</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheffé</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Legend: A = California school; B = Oklahoma school; C = Wisconsin school.

\*p < .05.

initiated SBM indicated that their councils spent more time on facilities than the councils with superintendent-initiated SBM.

The multiple comparisons between the school districts with the different types of SBM showed significant differences in the time spent on issues of curriculum, student attendance, and facilities. The multiple comparisons between the school districts show no significant differences at the .05 level for time spent on student discipline, homework, extracurricular activities, and instructional methods. The differences between school districts and types of SBM for time spent
on curriculum were between the Wisconsin school district with superintendent-initiated SBM and the California school district with state-mandated SBM. The SBM councils with superintendent-initiated SBM responded that their councils spent more time on curriculum than did councils from state-mandated SBM. Generally speaking, time spent on curriculum would have more impact on student achievement than other issues such as facilities or attendance. The differences between school districts and types of SBM for time spent on student attendance and facilities were between the Wisconsin school with superintendent-initiated SBM and the Oklahoma school with school board-initiated SBM. SBM councils with superintendent-initiated SBM indicated their councils spent more time on student attendance than did SBM councils with school board-initiated SBM. Student attendance may have been seen as indicative of time for learning. SBM councils with school board-initiated SBM indicated their councils spent more time on facilities than did SBM councils with superintendent-initiated SBM. Time spent on facilities probably would have lesser impact on student achievement.

Impact on Student Achievement

One of the last questions on the survey asked for the council members' perceptions of student achievement based on the SBM council. The respondents rated the impact on the SBM council on student achievement from 0 to 4. Zero was negative impact, 1 was little impact, 2 was some impact, 3 was moderate impact, and 4 was large impact.

Site councils' impact on student achievement between school districts

Table 23 summarizes the different school district site councils' perception of their impact on student achievement.
Table 23. Site councils’ perception of impact on student achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School district</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A—California</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B—Oklahoma</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C—Wisconsin</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Legend: 0 = Negative impact, 1 = Little impact, 2 = Some impact, 3 = Moderate impact, 4 = Large impact.

The California school district with state-mandated SBM had the highest mean for the site council’s perception of its impact on student achievement. This was followed by the Oklahoma school district with school board-initiated SBM, and last, the Wisconsin school district with superintendent-initiated SBM. The state-mandated SBM council perceived their councils to have more impact on student achievement than the other councils with types of SBM.

A two-way ANOVA was used to examine the multiple comparison between the school districts with different types of SBM. Table 24 illustrates the post hoc test using both the Scheffé and Bonferroni methods to examine the councils’ perceptions of impact on student achievement.

The multiple comparison between schools portrays a significant difference at the .01 level between the Wisconsin school district (School C) with superintendent-initiated SBM and the California school district (School A) with state-mandated SBM for their councils’ perceptions of their impact on student achievement. There was no significant difference between the school districts and the Oklahoma school district with school board-initiated SBM. The type of SBM with the highest response for council members’ perception of their impact on student achievement was state-mandated SBM (Table 23).
Table 24. Tests of significance for multiple comparison of council members' perception of their impact on student achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>School district</th>
<th>School district</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonferroni</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheffé</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05.

Parents' and other site council members' impact on student achievement

Another analysis was made to determine if there were differences of the site council members' perception for their impact on student achievement. The two-way ANOVA method was used to compare means across categories of one qualitative variable, while controlling for another variable. This was used to examine the differences of perceptions of the site councils' impact on student achievement between the parents on site councils and the other members.

Table 25 displays the perception of site council members' impact on student achievement for the three school districts.
Table 25. Descriptive data for the site council members' perception of their level of impact on student achievement between school districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>A California</th>
<th>B Oklahoma</th>
<th>C Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Legend: 0 = Negative impact, 1 = Little impact, 2 = Some impact, 3 = Moderate impact, 4 = Large impact.*

Parents on site councils with state-mandated SBM reported the highest level of impact that they perceived was made by their site councils (3.58). This was followed by parents on site councils with superintendent-initiated SBM (2.83). The parents on site councils with school board-initiated SBM reported the lowest impact of their site councils on student achievement (2.33).

Table 26 displays the significance test for the differences of their perceptions of impact on improving student achievement between the parents on the site councils and the other members of the site council between school districts.

Table 26. Perception of parents and other site council members: perception of the impact of the site council on student achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The perception of parents on the site councils was significant at the 0.067 level from the other members of the council on their perceptions of the site council’s impact on student achievement. This did not meet the criterion of significance at the .05 level. Therefore, there was not a difference between perceptions of their site councils’ impact on student achievement between parents on the site councils and the other members on the site council.

Parents’ perceptions of their impact on student achievement between the three schools

Another comparison was made for the parents’ perception of their impact on student achievement between the three schools.

An analysis was conducted to determine if there was significant differences between the parents’ perceptions of their site councils’ impact on student achievement. Table 27 illustrates the test of significance for determining the parents’ perceptions of their impact on student achievement between the three school districts.

The differences of parents’ perceptions of their site councils’ impact on student achievement varied by the different type of SBM ($p<0.038$). The difference was identified between the Wisconsin school district and the California school district (Table 25). The parents on state-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.358</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.463</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
mandated SBM councils identified their councils' impact on student achievement as greater than did parents on SBM councils with superintendent-initiated SBM.

An analysis was not conducted between parents on site councils and parents not on site councils because of the small number of returns from the parents not on site councils.

**Open-ended Questions**

Two of the questions on the survey were open-ended to allow the respondents to identify the greatest success of their council and the least successful aspect of their council (Appendix F). The responses were categorized by similarities. Table 28 displays the greatest successes of the councils as identified by the respondents. The most common responses by site council members for the greatest success was the involvement of many in goals and plans, improvement for students, and curriculum decisions.

There was more variation in the responses to aspects the site council members found least successful. Table 29 displays the least successful aspects of the councils as identified by the respondents.

The most common response for least successful aspects of site councils was "not enough communication between parents and faculty." The second most frequent response was "not enough time." A third response was the "lack of authority for the site councils to make decisions."
Table 28. Greatest successes of site councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified success</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of many in goals and plans</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement for students</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum decisions</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of goals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions on personnel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions on budget</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions on facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/direction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29. Least successful aspect of site councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified least success</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough communication between parents and faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of authority</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The movement toward experimentation with the principle of decentralization shows every sign of continuing to accelerate. Yet the results so far are not encouraging. There is little evidence of better student achievement, and few schools calling themselves "de-centralized" have made major changes in established educational practice. (Bimber, 1994. p. vii)

Summary

Over the last decades, accountability for students' performance became increasingly popular with school staff, state legislators, and community members. Site-based management (SBM) as a form of decentralized decisionmaking often was used as a means to hold public schools accountable for their own decisions.

Problem

A wide variety of authority was granted to site councils at the local school building level. The variety included decisionmaking authority with budgets, curriculum, and personnel. Site councils also had a large variety in their membership composition. The variety in composition included parent majority, community majority, and school staff majority. SBM councils included parents as decisionmakers because of political reasons and because parent involvement was documented as increasing student achievement (Cawelti, 1994). Few studies have found student achievement improvement related to SBM. Some of the studies have provided features of SBM models that have created effective councils related to governance and relationships. The models
with the most promise of effectiveness having the features described in the review of literature need to be described, compared, and communicated for other school districts wishing to choose a SBM model that best meets their needs. Ogawa and White (David, 1994) concluded that one-third of all public school districts have some type of SBM. With the increased use of SBM as a reform, well-described models are needed for schools to have increased student achievement with SBM. Also, the impact of parent involvement and student achievement needs to be studied in order to understand the relationship with SBM. Therefore, the purposes of this study had two parts. This study was undertaken to document the level of SBM used as decentralized decisionmaking in the public school districts in the United States. A second purpose for this study was to provide a detailed examination of selected SBM councils, the content of their decisions, and the site council members' perceptions of their impact on student achievement. Parent members of site councils were examined to determine if their perceptions differed from other council members.

Methodology

The first part of this study consisted of the population of public school districts in the United States. A sample of 770 school districts was randomly drawn, following stratification of the population by geographical region. A total of 770 questionnaires with 11 items were mailed to the superintendents or district leaders of public school districts. The response rate was 26 percent. The 11 items on this first questionnaire were divided into three parts. The first section asked for information about the size of the school district and whether the school district used SBM as a form of decentralized decisionmaking. This section was used to provide descriptive information about SBM in public school districts. The second section of the questionnaire consisted of questions to determine who initiated the SBM, the composition of the SBM site councils, type of authority given to the site councils, and the content of the site councils' decisions. The responses
in this section were examined to identify different models of SBM. The last section measured the
district leaders’ perception of the impact from SBM on student achievement. The data from this
section were analyzed using inferential statistics.

The second part of this study examined different models of SBM in three public school
districts. The school districts were chosen for their length of involvement with SBM and the
district leaders’ perception of moderate to large impact from SBM on student achievement. A
second questionnaire was used in Part II of this study. This instrument was sent to site council
members and parents not on the site councils. This questionnaire was divided into five parts. The
first part provided descriptive information about the site council members. The analysis of this
part showed the length of membership on the site council and identified their role as either parent,
community member, school board member, administrator, or staff member. The second part of
the questionnaire provided information on authority granted the site councils and a prioritization
of the amount of time the councils spent on different issues such as curriculum, discipline, student
attendance, homework, extracurricular activities, facilities, and instructional methods. This was
examined to compare issues that affect student achievement with peripheral issues. The third part
of the questionnaire had 13 items to determine the site council members’ perceptions of how well
the council functioned as a decisionmaking committee. The responses to this part were analyzed
to determine characteristics of effective councils. The fourth part of the questionnaire was open-
ended questions on greatest success of councils and least successful aspects of the council. The
responses were categorized and reported as a portion of the council function. The last part of the
questionnaire was an indication of the level of impact SBM had on student achievement. This part
was analyzed and comparisons were made between the different SBM models.
Findings

1. SBM as a form of decentralized decisionmaking was used in 54 percent of the public school districts responding.

2. Superintendents initiated SBM most frequently, followed by states mandating SBM and lastly school boards initiating SBM.

3. The process for selection of site council members was divided into three types of selection. The major selection processes were election by representative groups and recruitment with appointment by administrators. A third selection process used, less frequently, was volunteering to be site council members.

4. The site councils were composed of parents, administrators, and teachers. This was reported by 94 percent of the superintendents. Less frequently, a composition of students, community members, and support staff was reported.

5. Regarding powers granted site councils, curriculum decisions were the most frequently granted, followed by budget, and then personnel decisions.

6. The superintendents’ rating on the SBM’s impact on student achievement revealed that the majority (77 percent) of superintendents thought that SBM had some or moderate impact on student achievement. Only 3 percent of the superintendents perceived SBM to have a large impact on student achievement.

7. Site council members from state-mandated SBM reported that SBM had the largest impact on student achievement. They were significantly more certain than those with superintendent-initiated SBM.

8. The data portrayed significant differences between superintendent-initiated SBM and state-mandated SBM regarding the time the councils spent on curriculum, student attendance, and facilities. The state-mandated SBM was better at spending time on
Curriculum decisions which would have more impact on student achievement than time spent on student attendance and facilities, in this study.

9. Council members from state-mandated SBM indicated that they spent more time on curriculum decisions than the councils with superintendent-initiated SBM.

10. Council members from superintendent-initiated SBM indicated that they spent more time on student attendance than the councils with school board-initiated SBM.

11. Council members with school board-initiated SBM indicated that they spent more time on facilities than councils with superintendent-initiated SBM.

12. There were no significant differences between the three models of SBM regarding the time the councils spent on extracurricular activities, student discipline, student homework, and instructional methods.

Conclusions

Considering the results of this investigation, the following conclusions seem warranted. The results of this study indicate that SBM as a form of decentralized decisionmaking continues to be prevalent in public schools. The superintendents perceive SBM had some impact on student achievement. Six problem questions were formulated to determine the status of SBM, to describe the different models of SBM, and to identify the relationship of SBM and parent involvement to student achievement.

What are the different SBM models and their unique characteristics?

This study found different models of SBM based on who initiated SBM. Three different SBM models were identified as state-mandated SBM, superintendent-initiated SBM, and school
board-initiated SBM. The different models had consistent composition in site council membership with the majority consisting of administrators, parents, and school staff.

There was a variety of authority granted to SBM councils. Power to determine curriculum decisions was the most frequent authority granted to SBM councils. SBM councils with state-mandated SBM identified that significantly more time was spent on curriculum issues than superintendent-initiated SBM councils. Budget authority was granted more often with state-mandated SBM and superintendent-initiated SBM than school board-initiated SBM which had no authority on budget decisions. Essentially none of the SBM models were granted personnel authority.

What types of SBM are most frequently used by public school districts?

The type of SBM most frequently used by public schools is superintendent-initiated SBM, followed by state-mandated SBM and school board-initiated SBM.

What are the content of SBM decisions utilized by public school districts?

According to the superintendents, the most frequently granted authority for SBM councils is curriculum decisions, followed by budget and then personnel decisions. Thirty-eight percent of the superintendents indicated that their site councils had student learning as the highest priority for the site councils. However, the site council members indicated that more time was spent on other issues than issues related to student learning. Differences were also noted between the different SBM models and the amount of time their site councils spent on issues. The SBM councils for state-mandated SBM indicated that a majority of their time was spent on curriculum which was significantly higher than SBM councils with superintendent-initiated SBM. The superintendent-initiated SBM councils also spent significantly more time on student attendance than the school
board-initiated SBM councils. This study found that the school board-initiated SBM councils spent significantly more time on facilities than superintendent-initiated SBM councils.

What opportunities for training are used by public schools to assist in SBM?

Seventy-one percent of the superintendents indicated that site councils had access to professional development. However, site council members reported that they did not agree that they were provided professional development. This may be differing by who got the training. Site council members were asked their perception for the provision of professional development and training. Forty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they "agreed" they were provided professional development and training. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents stated they "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with the statement that they were provided professional development and training.

A few site-based council members responded that not enough training opportunities were provided to the councils in the open-ended question for the least successful aspects of their site councils.

What relationship, if any, do the SBM models have to parent perceptions on involvement with decisionmaking?

Parents on site councils were more positive than other members on the site council regarding the impact to student achievement. Parents on site councils with state-mandated SBM were significantly more positive about their impact on student achievement than parents on site councils with superintendent-initiated SBM.
What relationship, if any, do the SBM models have to student achievement?

The superintendents reported their SBM councils had "some" to "moderate impact" on student achievement with only 3 percent indicating a "large impact" from SBM on student achievement. The site council members were more positive regarding their impact on student achievement. Seventy-one percent of site council members indicated that SBM councils had "some" to "moderate impact" on student achievement with 17 percent indicating a "large impact."

The site council members from the different types of SBM also reported their site councils had "some" to "moderate impact" on student achievement. The state-mandated SBM councils indicated the highest report of impact of student achievement, followed by the superintendent-initiated SBM and the school board-initiated SBM.

State-mandated SBM was the best type of SBM because it showed the highest impact on student achievement and focused on curriculum decisions. The state-mandated SBM also had elements of their site councils rated higher for effective councils: operated according to bylaws, organized protocol, followed orderly procedures, held meetings at convenient times, set goals and plans, members represented the entire school community, and used student data to make decisions.

Limitations

The conclusions drawn from this study are restricted by the following limitations:

1. The sample of respondents was small. The response rate from Phase I of this study was 26 percent. The database used for sampling was established in 1988. The initial study in 1990 with the same database conducted by Joseph Petrone had a return rate of 76 percent. A study with the same database conducted by Jim Scott in 1995 had a 47
percent return rate. Perhaps his return rate dropped because of his sensitive and controversial topic.

2. No local district student achievement data were used.

3. This study was limited to surveys of perceptions of the respondents.

4. No examination of meeting minutes or archival data were used to confirm perceptions.

5. This extensive study was limited to three public K–12 school districts: one in California, one in Oklahoma, and one in Wisconsin.

6. Participation in this study was voluntary on the part of the superintendents and council members. The responses used for this study may not be representative of all site councils.

7. No attempt was made to survey the quality of decisions made by the site councils.

8. This investigation relied on self-reporting of content of decisions. No attempt was made to confirm whether these responses were consistent with actual decisions or time spent on issues.

Discussion

The results of this study were expected. SBM as a form of decentralized decisionmaking is still being used in many public schools. This study found a higher prevalence of SBM than Ogawa and White (David, 1994). The superintendents responding to this study indicated that 54 percent of the school districts had SBM. Ogawa and White determined that only one-third of the public school districts used SBM.

This study did not find a prevalence of community control of decisions such as SBM in the Chicago public school district. The types of SBM found in this study were all related to decisions delegated to the school building level. This delegation of decisions was differentiated by three
types of SBM models determined by who initiated the SBM in the school district. SBM was initiated by superintendents, school boards, or state mandates. The types of SBM found in this study were different than the forms identified by Wohlstetter and McCurdy (1991). They identified SBM as two forms: community control of decisions and decisions delegated to the school building level.

This study showed that curriculum decisions were the most decentralized, followed by budget decisions, and then personnel decisions. This was different from another study on the most readily decentralized types of decisions. Clune and White (1988) concluded from their survey of over 100 school districts, decisions on budget were the most readily decentralized followed by decisions on personnel and then curriculum decisions.

Perhaps with the current nationwide emphasis on standards and state-mandated testing, the emphasis has switched to curriculum. Another reason may be that public school districts are realizing tighter budgets which may lead to more centralized decisionmaking for budgets. Personnel decisions are more difficult to decentralize as teacher associations have more control on issues of transfer and hiring of staff.

This study found that 44 percent of the superintendents perceived SBM’s impact on student achievement as a moderate impact. Only three percent of the leaders perceived SBM to have a large impact on student achievement. Perhaps they perceived the national current standard driven reform as having more impact on student achievement. The site council members perceived SBM to have more impact on student achievement than the superintendents. This may be due to different levels of understanding for student achievement indicators. It would be assumed that superintendents would have a deeper understanding of student achievement indicators than site council members. This may be similar to Kowalski’s (1994) findings, although he used principals, where a majority of principals in his study agreed that SBM had produced meaningful
improvement in education. If meaningful improvement relates to increased student achievement, few studies have documented the impact of SBM on student achievement.

This study found that superintendents did rank student learning as the highest priority for site councils; however, the site council members often ranked the peripheral issues as higher priority based on time spent on issues. The site council members did indicate that curriculum was given a high priority of time and this should translate to a variable that would increase student achievement. However, the site council members also ranked facilities and student attendance as high priorities based on the time spent on these issues. Cawelti (1994) found that SBM has not shown to be effective in improving student achievement. He hypothesized that school councils don’t focus on student achievement but rather on peripheral issues. David (1994) also indicated that most schools didn’t focus on curriculum and instruction but rather on peripheral issues such as student discipline, facilities, and extracurricular activities.

This study was not longitudinal, but only schools with longer duration than two years of involvement with SBM were chosen for closer examination. It would be expected that the site councils would have a high perception that student achievement was being influenced by SBM. Therefore, the results of this study showing a large percentage of site council members’ perceptions that SBM had "some" to "moderate impact" on student achievement may relate to the longer time the school districts had been involved with SBM. Hess (1991) focused on student achievement in the Chicago schools since SBM was initiated in 1988. He found that during the first few years of SBM, student achievement actually declined, the so-called "implementation dip." Then after a five-year period, student achievement levels recovered to the initial level. After a 10-year period, elementary reading and math scores had increased. High school math scores had increased, but high school reading scores had decreased. It may take up to 10 years for SBM to be an effective reform strategy to show gains in student achievement.
One of the aspects identified by council members as least successful was use of time in SBM meetings. Other researchers also found that SBM was time consuming (Lindle, 1995; Guskey & Peterson, 1995; Glatthorn, 1992).

One of the most successful aspects of SBM identified by this study was information sharing and communication. This is consistent with the research by Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1996) who also found two areas of success for SBM. They identified the strategies for success of SBM councils as a focus on continuous improvement with school-wide training and a well-developed system for sharing information.

School-wide training related to the number of years members had been on the site councils. The members who had been on the councils longer rated the school-wide training higher than those with less years of membership. This may be due to initial training for site council members in the beginning years of SBM with a school district. This training may be less in subsequent years of the school districts' involvement with SBM.

The public is demanding more accountability for raising student achievement in the public schools. Although there has been much research done about the implementation of SBM, there has been less effort to make judgments about the quality of SBM decisions and their impact on student achievement. The impact of this study must be cautiously interpreted because of the low return rate. However, this study has created a baseline for variables of SBM as indicators to student achievement for SBM councils that have been in existence for longer than two years. SBM as a reform may take longer than a few years to establish an effect on student achievement. This research will help school district personnel and others to identify the criteria for successful SBM councils and thus create a focus on variables that have an impact on student achievement.
Recommendations for Practice

One of the purposes for examining the different models of SBM was to identify successful characteristics of SBM models. The following recommendations are offered to assist school districts, state departments of education, and state legislators in establishing effective SBM.

1. The state-mandated SBM may provide more guidance to help councils match the district’s vision with their decisions. SBM councils need a clear focus of change and training to improve student achievement.

2. The criteria for successful SBM councils are well-established functioning of the councils, which include the following: meetings follow orderly procedures and are held at convenient times for the members, the council members exhibit respect and trust, the councils operate according to bylaws and have an organized protocol, the councils represent the entire school community, and the councils set goals and plans to improve student achievement.

3. School districts with SBM should provide opportunities for council members to have training to learn about the process and content of decisionmaking.

4. School districts with SBM should provide time for council members to work collaboratively in developing action plans with a focus on student achievement.

5. It is suggested that site councils communicate with other constituents and committees within the school and the community. This would provide a broader perspective for decisions.

6. Site councils should focus on issues related to student achievement such as curriculum and instructional methods.
7. It is suggested that school districts without SBM facilitate careful examination of different models for SBM and successful strategies to increase the focus on student achievement, if contemplating the use of SBM as a governance model.

8. SBM as reform strategy to increase student achievement is not a quick remedy, and therefore, school districts should consider reform strategies that have the greatest potential for impacting student achievement such as parent involvement. This kind of parent involvement may be more effective in areas such as homework and support of schools other than in governance.

9. The SBM should focus on student achievement and curriculum decisions. The SBM should have effective councils which include the following: operate according to bylaws, establish organized protocol, follow orderly procedures, hold meetings at convenient times, set goals and plans, have members represent the entire school community, and use student data to make decisions. The state-mandated SBM did focus on student achievement and had the elements of effective councils.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following are recommendations for future research:

1. A new national sample of school districts should be developed to provide a more accurate data base for addresses of school districts.

2. It is suggested that another investigation be conducted to verify the three different models used in other school districts and the elements for effective councils and student achievement. This investigation should include on-site visits to confirm actual student achievement data, time spent on issues, quality of decisions, and elements of
effective councils. The hypothesis would be that there is no significant difference
between the three different models and their impact on student achievement.

3. Test criteria by which administrators could evaluate the overall success of SBM
councils in schools.

4. Research should be undertaken to conduct a longitudinal study of the different models
of SBM to examine changes in student achievement. This would assist researchers to
determine if there were significant differences among the models of SBM at different
points in time. The hypothesis would be that there is no significant differences among
different SBM models and their effect on student achievement at different points in
time.

5. Future research should examine other variables associated with SBM for school
improvement. This could be accomplished by investigating other variables such as
principal leadership, percentage of eligible students enrolled in non-public schools, and
school climate. The hypothesis would be that there are no significant differences
among principal leadership and school climate relating to school improvement with
SBM.
APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR PHASE I
1. Does your school district currently utilize a formal school governance of site-based management?
   _____ A. Yes
   _____ B. No

2. How many years have you used site-based management in your school district? ________

3. What is the student enrollment of your school district? ________

4. Who initiated site-based management in your district?
   _____ A. State mandated
   _____ B. School Board
   _____ C. Superintendent
   _____ D. Community
   _____ E. Parents
   _____ F. Teachers

5. What selection process is used to establish your site councils?
   _____ A. Elected by a represented group
   _____ B. Volunteered
   _____ C. Recruited and appointed by administrators
   _____ D. Applied and interviewed

6. What is the composition of your site councils? Identify the number of each type of membership.
   _____ Parents
   _____ Students
   _____ Community Members
   _____ Support Staff
   _____ Administrators
   _____ Teachers

(Please complete back)
7. Please check the authority given to site councils in decision-making:
   _____ A. Budget
   _____ B. Personnel
   _____ C. Curriculum

8. Prioritize decisions made by your site councils. (#1 is the lowest priority and #5 is the highest priority)
   _____ A. Student learning
   _____ B. Student discipline
   _____ C. Extracurricular activities
   _____ D. Facilities
   _____ E. Instruction

9. Indicate the level of impact your site councils has had on student achievement.

   0 1 2 3 4
   no impact little impact some impact moderate impact large impact

10. In answering the following, please check any that are true about your site councils.
   _____ A. Role is to set policy, coordinate, and approve recommendations.
   _____ B. Other school committees are connected to site councils.
   _____ C. Leadership focuses the council on student learning.
   _____ D. A communication network is established inside and outside the school about the site councils and the decisions made.
   _____ E. The site councils have access to professional development.
   _____ F. The site councils have an organized protocol for making decisions.
   _____ G. The site councils have access to student data.
   _____ H. Decisions made by the site councils are based on student data.
   _____ I. Strong parent representation is seen on site councils.

11. Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up questionnaire?
   _____ A. Yes
   _____ B. No

Thank you for your assistance with this important research.
APPENDIX B. SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR PHASE II
1. Please check one: I am a
   _____ staff member
   _____ parent on the site council
   _____ parent not on the site council
   _____ community member
   _____ administrator
   _____ school board member

(If a parent not on the site council, please complete questions 22 - 25.)

2. How many years have you been a member of the site council? ________

3. How many meetings were held during this school year? ________

4. How many meetings were you able to attend this school year? ________

5. Estimate the average number in attendance at the council meetings, exclusive of council members. ________

6. Please check if your council has advisory authority only ________

7. If your council had authority for any of the following, please check the areas given to your site council in decision-making:
   _____ A. Budget
   _____ B. Personnel
   _____ C. Curriculum

8. Prioritize the amount of time your council spends on the following issues. (#1 is the least amount of time and #7 is the most amount of time). Only use a number one time.
   _____ A. Student curriculum
   _____ B. Student discipline
   _____ C. Student attendance
   _____ D. Student homework
   _____ E. Extracurricular activities
   _____ F. Facilities
   _____ G. Instructional strategies/methods
The following statements concern site councils' functions. Please indicate if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

9. The council operates according to bylaws/policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The council has an organized protocol for establishing agreement and making decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The council meeting agendas are published in advance of council meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The council meetings follow orderly procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The council meetings are held at convenient times for all members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The council members are provided professional development and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The council members exhibit mutual respect and trust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The council sets goals and plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. The council is connected with other school committees.

1 strongly disagree  2 disagree  3 agree  4 strongly agree

18. The council seeks community reactions and opinions before making decisions/recommendations.

1 strongly disagree  2 disagree  3 agree  4 strongly agree

19. The council members represent the entire school community and not just special interest groups.

1 strongly disagree  2 disagree  3 agree  4 strongly agree

20. The council has an established communication network inside and outside the school.

1 strongly disagree  2 disagree  3 agree  4 strongly agree

21. The council uses student data to make decisions.

1 strongly disagree  2 disagree  3 agree  4 strongly agree

22. What was the greatest success of your council?

23. What was the least successful aspect of your council?
24. Please indicate your overall level of satisfaction with your council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>most satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Please indicate the level of impact your site council has had on student achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negative impact</td>
<td>little impact</td>
<td>some impact</td>
<td>moderate impact</td>
<td>large impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Do you have state mandated tests? _______

27. Please check the form(s) of measurements used to assess student achievement.

- _____ A. Criterion-referenced tests
- _____ B. Norm-referenced tests
- _____ C. District developed tests
- _____ D. Other

28. Please list the names of assessments used to determine student achievement in your district. (e.g. Iowa Test of Basic Skills)

Thank you for your assistance with these important questions.
APPENDIX C. PERMISSION LETTER TO USE PORTIONS OF JIM DEGRACIE'S SURVEY
February 10, 1999

Jim DeGracie
Mesa Public Schools
549 N. Stapley Drive
Mesa, Arizona  85203

Dear Mr. DeGracie;

I hereby request permission to use modified questions from your 1998 Self-Appraisal Survey of School Improvement Advisory Councils in the Mesa Public Schools.

I am a graduate student conducting research which parallels your work. In my dissertation, I would like to compare my findings with yours. This would include extending and modifying the questions in your survey. Also, I would make references to the descriptions and explanations of findings discussed in your June, 1998 Tech Memo.

If you require additional information, please call me at 515-239-3737.

Thank you for considering this request.

Yours truly,

[signature]

Pauline Sampson
Research Associate
March 1, 1999

Pauline Sampson, Research Associate
SIM Projects
College of Education
Iowa State University
N225 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear Ms. Sampson:

Please feel free to use or modify any or all of the items on our 1998 Self-Appraisal Survey of School Improvement Advisory Councils. As noted in our June, 1998 Tech Memo, a number of the items were taken from Nancy Fiandach’s dissertation. Nancy is also with the Mesa District. She gives permission to use her material. If you have trouble obtaining her dissertation let me know.

Respectfully,

James DeGracie
APPENDIX D. LETTERS OF INSTRUCTION TO DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS AND INTENDED SURVEY RESPONDENTS
Dear Superintendent

Over one-third of our public schools are using some form of site-based management as a means to improve the quality of education and improve student achievement. We are currently conducting a national study of site-based management in public schools.

The School Improvement Model Projects Office at Iowa State University is conducting this study to collect and report the opinions of those who lead, operate, and support schools. Your district has been selected, by random procedures, to participate in this study. The researchers anticipate that data collected will provide other schools with guidance for critical decisions regarding the future of site-based management.

Your school is among 900 school districts sampled nation-wide. With your help, the results of our research will assist others educators to select site-based management models with the most potential for affecting student achievement. The enclosed questionnaire has been coded in order to assure geographic representation and to permit follow-up mailings. For the purpose of this study, site-based management is defined as the provision that creates school councils and delegates the authority to make educational decisions at the school building level to increase student achievement. Confidentiality of all respondents will be preserved. Responses will not be identified with specific individuals, schools, or districts.

A pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope is enclosed for the questionnaire. Please return the response questionnaire as soon as possible, but no later than January 29, 1999.

Approval from the Iowa State University Human Subjects Release Committee was obtained on December 21, 1998.

Thank you for your time and assistance. Please contact us if you have questions or concerns during school hours at (515)-294-5521 or call after hours at (515) 233-2531. Thank you.

Richard P. Manatt
Director, School Improvement
Model Projects and
Program Coordinator, Education Administration

Pauline M. Sampson
Research Associate

Dick Manatt
Director
Shirley Stow
Co-Director
February 22, 1999

Dear Superintendent:

We are currently conducting a follow-up survey of site-based management in public schools. The School Improvement Model Projects Office at Iowa State University is conducting this follow-up study to collect and report the opinions of those who lead, operate, and support schools. Your district has been selected, by initial survey, to participate in this follow-up study. The researchers anticipate that data collected will provide other schools with guidance for critical decisions regarding site-based management.

Your school is among nine school districts sampled nation-wide. We are enclosing materials necessary to participate in our poll on site-based management and student achievement. We ask that you route the enclosed questionnaire to your site councils for all members to complete. Confidentially of all respondents will be preserved. Responses will not be identified with specific individuals, schools, or districts. Pre-addressed, postage-paid envelopes are enclosed with the questionnaire. Please ask that the responses be returned as soon as possible, but no later than March 31, 1999.

Approval from the Iowa State University Human Subjects Release Committee was obtained on December 21, 1998.

In addition, any information you can share on your district student data, policies or protocols on site-based management, or information related to your site-based model would be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed, prepaid postage large envelope is enclosed.

Realizing the many demands on your time, we sincerely appreciate your assistance with this vital education issue. Results of this study will be provided after completion of the analysis. Please contact us if you have questions or concerns during school hours at (515)-294-5521 or call after hours at (515)-233-2531.

Richard P. Manatt  
Director, School Improvement Model Projects  
Education Administration

Pauline Sampson  
Research Associate
February 22, 1999

Dear Site Council Member:

We are currently conducting a follow-up survey of site-based management in public schools. The School Improvement Model Projects Office at Iowa State University is conducting this follow-up study to collect and report the opinions of those who lead, operate, and support schools. Your district has been selected, by initial survey, to participate in this follow-up study. The researchers anticipate that data collected will provide other schools with guidance for critical decisions regarding site-based management.

Your school is among nine school districts sampled nation-wide. We are enclosing materials necessary to participate in our poll on site-based management and student achievement. We ask that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the pre-addressed, postage paid envelope. Confidentially of all respondents will be preserved. Responses will not be identified with specific individuals, schools, or districts. Please return as soon as possible, but no later than March 31, 1999.

Approval from the Iowa State University Human Subjects Release Committee was obtained on December 21, 1998.

Realizing the many demands on your time, we sincerely appreciate your assistance with this vital education issue. Results of this study will be provided after completion of the analysis. Please contact us if you have questions or concerns during school hours at (515)-294-5521 or call after hours at (515)-233-2531.

Richard P. Manatt
Director, School Improvement Model Projects
Education Administration

Pauline Sampson
Research Associate
February 22, 1999

Dear Parent:

We are currently conducting a follow-up survey of site-based management in public schools. The School Improvement Model Projects Office at Iowa State University is conducting this follow-up study to collect and report the opinions of those who lead, operate, and support schools. Your district has been selected, by initial survey, to participate in this follow-up study. The researchers anticipate that data collected will provide other schools with guidance for critical decisions regarding site-based management.

Your school is among nine school districts sampled nation-wide. We are enclosing materials necessary to participate in our poll on site-based management and student achievement. We ask that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the pre-addressed, postage paid envelope. Confidentially of all respondents will be preserved. Responses will not be identified with specific individuals, schools, or districts. Please return as soon as possible, but no later than March 31, 1999.

Approval from the Iowa State University Human Subjects Release Committee was obtained on December 21, 1998.

Realizing the many demands on your time, we sincerely appreciate your assistance with this vital education issue. Results of this study will be provided after completion of the analysis. Please contact us if you have questions or concerns during school hours at (515)-294-5521 or call after hours at (515)-233-2531.

Richard P. Manatt
Director, School Improvement Model Projects
Education Administration

Pauline Sampson
Research Associate
February 22, 1999

Dear Administrator:

We are currently conducting a follow-up survey of site-based management in public schools. The School Improvement Model Projects Office at Iowa State University is conducting this follow-up study to collect and report the opinions of those who lead, operate, and support schools. Your district has been selected, by initial survey, to participate in this follow-up study. The researchers anticipate that data collected will provide other schools with guidance for critical decisions regarding site-based management.

Your school is among nine school districts sampled nation-wide. We are enclosing materials necessary to participate in our poll on site-based management and student achievement. We ask that you route the enclosed questionnaire to your site councils for all members to complete. We also ask that at least two parents from each building not on the site councils be given the questionnaire. Confidentially of all respondents will be preserved. Responses will not be identified with specific individuals, schools, or districts. Pre-addressed, postage-paid envelopes are enclosed with the questionnaire. Please ask that the responses be returned as soon as possible, but no later than March 31, 1999.

Approval from the Iowa State University Human Subjects Release Committee was obtained on December 21, 1998.

In addition, any information you can share on your district student data, policies or protocols on site-based management, or information related to your site-based model would be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed, prepaid postage large envelope is enclosed.

Realizing the many demands on your time, we sincerely appreciate your assistance with this vital education issue. Results of this study will be provided after completion of the analysis. Please contact us if you have questions or concerns during school hours at (515)-294-5521 or call after hours at (515)-233-2531.

Richard P. Manatt
Director, School Improvement Model Projects
Education Administration

Pauline Sampson
Research Associate
February 22, 1999

Dear Parent:

We are currently conducting a follow-up survey of site-based management in public schools. The School Improvement Model Projects Office at Iowa State University is conducting this follow-up study to collect and report the opinions of those who lead, operate, and support schools. Your district has been selected, by initial survey, to participate in this follow-up study. The researchers anticipate that data collected will provide other schools with guidance for critical decisions regarding site-based management.

Your school is among nine school districts sampled nation-wide. We are enclosing materials necessary to participate in our poll on site-based management and student achievement. We ask that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the pre-addressed, postage paid envelope. Confidentiality of all respondents will be preserved. Responses will not be identified with specific individuals, schools, or districts. Please return as soon as possible, but no later than March 31, 1999.

Approval from the Iowa State University Human Subjects Release Committee was obtained on December 21, 1998.

Realizing the many demands on your time, we sincerely appreciate your assistance with this vital education issue. Results of this study will be provided after completion of the analysis. Please contact us if you have questions or concerns during school hours at (515)-294-5521 or call after hours at (515)-233-2531.

Richard P. Manatt
Director, School Improvement Model Projects
Education Administration

Pauline Sampson
Research Associate
APPENDIX E. HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE APPROVAL
Information for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects
Iowa State University

(Please type and use the attached instructions for completing this form)

1. Title of Project: Site-based Management and Parents' Perceptions of Student Achievement

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.

   Pauline M. Sampson  
   Typed Name of Principal Investigator Date Signature of Principal Investigator

3. Professional Studies in Education 1124 Harding Ave 233-2531
   Department Campus Address Campus Telephone

4. Principal Investigator(s) (check all that apply)
   □ Faculty □ Staff □ Graduate Student □ Undergraduate Student

5. Project (check all that apply)
   □ Research □ Thesis or dissertation □ Class project □ Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)

6. Number of subjects (complete all that apply)
   2000 # Adults, non-students # ISU student # minors under 14 other (explain) # minors 14-17

7. Brief description of proposed research involving human subjects: (See instructions, Item 7. Use additional page if needed.)
   Educational experts demonstrate that site-based management is often instituted in schools for the improvement of schools. There has been no comprehensive study to document the variety of site-based models used by schools. The problem of this research is to document, characterize, and compare the different site-based models and perceptions of school stakeholders regarding student achievement. Stakeholders are defined in this study as school board members, superintendents, principals, teachers, and parents).

   The researcher selected a sample of public school districts across all geographic regions of the United States. Sampling procedures provide for questionnaires to be mailed to 900 school districts. A follow-up questionnaire will be completed for at least two school districts for the five different models of site-based management.

   (Please do not send research, thesis, dissertation proposals.)

8. Informed Consent: □ Signed informed consent will be obtained (Attach a copy of your form)
   □ Modified informed consent will be obtained (See instructions, item 8.)
   □ Not applicable to this project.
9. Confidentiality of Data: Describe below the methods to be used to ensure the confidentiality of data obtained. (See instructions, item 9.)
The respondent will be provided a stamped, self-addressed survey instrument so that responses can be mailed directly to the researcher. No data will be required on the survey which could identify the respondent to anyone not involved in this project. A code number will be stamped on the survey instrument so that the researcher can link the survey with geographic area. The purpose is to permit the researcher to determine which respondents have returned the survey and facilitate follow-up. Surveys will be destroyed upon completion of the project.

10. What risks or discomfort will be part of the study? Will subjects in the research be placed at risk or incur discomfort? Describe any risks to the subjects and precautions that will be taken to minimize them. (The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to subjects’ dignity and self-respect as well as psychological or emotional risk. See instructions, item 10.)

No risk to subjects dignity or self-respect, nor any physical risks.

11. CHECK ALL of the following that apply to your research: Not applicable.

- A. Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
- B. Samples (Blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
- C. Administration of substances (food, drugs, etc.) to subjects
- D. Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
- E. Deception of subjects
- F. Subjects under 14 years of age and/or Subjects 14-17 years of age
- G. Subjects in institutions (nursing homes, prison, etc.)
- H. Research must be approved by another institution or agency. (Attach letters of approval)

If you checked any of the items in 11, please complete the following in the space below (include any attachments):

Items A - D Describe the procedures and note the safety precautions being taken.

Item E Describe how subjects will be deceived; justify the deception; indicate the debriefing procedure, including the timing and information to be presented to subjects.

Item F For subjects under the age of 14, indicate how informed consent from parents of legally authorized representatives as well as from subjects will be obtained.

Item G & H Specify the agency or institution that must approve the project. If subjects in any outside agency or institution are involved, approval must be obtained prior to beginning the research, and the letter of approval should be filed.
Last name of Principal Investigator  Sampson

Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. ☑ Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) the purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #’s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research
   d) if applicable, the location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) that participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. ☐ Signed consent form (if applicable)

14. ☐ Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

15. ☑ Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:
   First contact                                      Last contact
   __________________________________________________________________________
   January 12, 1999                                   July 1, 2000
   Month/Day/Year                                      Month/Day/Year

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:
   __________________________
   August 1, 2000
   Month/Day/Year

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer  Date  Department or Administrative Unit
   __________________________
   Dr. Sue                                        12/1/99  E.1 Adm

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:
   ☑ Project approved     ☐ Project not approved     ☐ No action required
   __________________________
   Dr. Keith                       12/21/98  Dr. Keith
   Name of Committee Chairperson  Date  Signature of Committee Chairperson
APPENDIX F. OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES TO PHASE II SURVEY
22. What was the greatest success of your council?

- The greatest success is the relationship building between the community and the school. The community Breakfast Club has promoted this aspect and has made a big change in the community.
- Dedication to making our school better and providing continued improvement for the sake of our children.
- Monthly school plan decisions to most benefit our students.
- Monthly school plan decisions to most benefit our students.
- Monthly school plan decisions to most benefit our students.
- Achievement over all the areas that [illegible] this meetings.
- Monthly school plan decisions to most benefit our students.
- Keeping everything that needed to be done in order.
- Involvement with students and teachers getting together on goals.
- The communication and the information that we have.
- The information about everything that goes on and they do in the school.
- Look over the students’ grade levels.
- The greatest success of our council is that we get important information about things that we don’t know.
- The council has been a great vehicle for parent/school communications.
- Regular meetings and being well organized.
- Involvement of parents.
- Open, honest sharing of concerns, ideas, and respect for one another.
- Parents being involved with the school.
- Generating interest and support. People on the council seem to want to be there and work together effectively.
• Making important decisions concerning the use of money.

• All the information we receive.

• We were able to sit around a table and discuss what was needed at our school and reach many decisions and set many goals for our students.

• More progressing students.

• Very well organized with interpreters for non-English speaking and notes that go home have English, Spanish, and Hmong.

• Working together with the vital people that affect children—parent, teacher, and administrator.

• We function as a training site for professional development, instructional practices, staff, curriculum. School days are innovative and the council has maintained and moved our school forward.

• Communication of issues and curriculum implementation.

• Changes in curriculum and outdoor classroom.

• Facilities [illegible] is very effective.

• Working together to meet the needs of our students and staff. Improve quality of life at school, updating library, starting "outdoor classroom" project, and improving curriculum.

• Decision to implement middle school pre-advanced placement for next year.

• Getting it started. This is the first year in this building.

• Helping to change the curriculum of the school to a more inclusive, gifted program.

• We work together to achieve common goals. Have established goals this year that are near implementation.

• Implementation of IBK.

• Meetings are fairly informational within an informal setting. Provides an opportunity to hear from administration, teachers, and parents.

• Putting together the IB program. Designing facilities for science, math, and the library.

• Organized the writing of the Site Improvement Plan.

• Decisions on the addition to the school. Also, upcoming decisions regarding IB.
• Openness and willingness to work together for students.

• Our greatest success was establish a best plan for our curriculum.

• Strengthening commitments of parental support and school to each other (school and community). Planned and began building outdoor classroom (PTA monetary support). Support for Byrd M.S. as it adopts a PreAP curriculum. Monetary support for core enrichment supplies needed in '99/'00. Parental support and participation in Byrd Showcase. Library improvements.

• I like it because now that I am here I am aware of the importance of being involved in the school because it has helped my daughter to improve and be a better human being.
ITEM 22. What was the greatest success of your council?

- We worked well together. There is a variety of people on our site team. We have parents, teachers, community people as well as our principal on the team.
- Cohesive planning ability.
- Read Across America Day.
- Accomplishment of outcomes of our goals and objectives through the positive unified efforts of our staff.
- Revamped the schedule for 99-00 school year.
- The site level team utilized the five school goals to drive the objectives for the school year.
- Bring better organization to our school. Better communication among staff. Better morale to staff.
- To hire our school nurse for more hours per week. To hire our P-5 coordinator support teacher.
- District and school goal driven and the cooperation of whole staff to meet the goals.
- The direction the whole school has.
- Cooperation of members for betterment of school and common goals. Respect towards everyone's position.
- Strategic plan. Success for All Program (SFA) Reading.
- Beginning a continuous learning calendar (year round) school, three year pilot program.
- Improving test scores through acquiring a Title I teacher and assistant.
- That we accomplish most of the goals we set out to do.
- Year round school.
- Hiring home/school coordinator.
- We have some discretion about where Title I money can be spent.
- Goal making. Grant ideas.
• The greatest success is keeping communication open for the staff and community members. It is a healthy way to keep everyone informed.

• Bring the total staff closer.

• Managing our site plan.

• Cooperativeness.

• Our consistent collaborative, "student center" efforts that are driven by our site's strategic plan.

• Spearheading Everyday Math Curriculum adoption. Plan for implementation. Organization of study groups.

• Implementation of SFA.

• Mutual vision for our school is the greatest factor when considering options for programming.

• Positive student recognition.

• Goals for year. Facility study. Calendar activities.

• In previous years more people participated and we had a good representation of interests. Partly due to Wisconsin's QEO (Qualified Economic Offer) Schools have large budget constraints and power is being taken away from quality programming in our school system.

• There were many things discussed and resolved with no one thing greater than other. All matters need attending to and that's what we done.

• We keep bringing down the number of absences. We are instituting breakfast for the kids. Instituting programs for special needs children.

• Since this is my first year on this site council, I haven't witnessed everything. But I am impressed with the council's interest in Interession program put into use while year-round students are on their breaks. My son has benefitted greatly from this program.

• It meets the requirement that the school have one.

• Creating new approaches to reducing student truancy.

• This year our primary task has been collecting and reporting data to insure our Title One Grant. When this is completed, the extra funds will greatly enhance and impact our school.

• As a result of our council's work we have been able to implement several innovative programs that address student needs, which have been instrumental in the achievement improvement in
our building. These are programs that we created without District help (but with its approval). As a result we have been named as an exemplary school in our district.

- Really working together for the good of the students in trying to accomplish our site goals as best we could with our budget and receiving some award money for improvements in academic testing areas and facility improvements.

- It gives a voice to the staff at the administrative center. A chance to come together with people, we generally do not see on a daily basis.

- The way we work together—decision-making skills. We also have shared leadership. (We all take turns being facilitators and recorders.)

- We keep the building running smoothly. We have been exploring year-round education calendar. A principal of a year-round school came to talk with us and we sent representatives to the national conference of year-round schools to learn more.

- Compromise with teachers to provide the best times for teacher-staff-parent conferences coordinating time off for teachers and students. Monthly recognition of students for good deeds not academically related.

- Staff training and development.

- Once we set our goals—our team has begun to work collectively and efficiently.

- To address student achievement by developing sample report cards and portfolios.

- Successful planning/starting pilot of year-round school.

- Working through a needs assessment that involved surveying staff, students and parents and then using this information for a Title I school plan.

- We meet on a consistent basis and are able to make recommendations on behalf of our school.

- Improving student experiences. The computer lab for students, parents, staff. Improvement of student writing.

- Goal planning, grant writing, inservice planning.

- Budget and implementation of intervention program for students in danger of retention.

- We are just finishing a needs assessment for Title I funding. It was a lot of work, but well worth the time.

- Able to make decisions as a small group—representing all via input by others to our members.

- To make decisions representing our school community for the good of our students.
• Hiring personnel—P-5, Bilingual assistants, etc. Understanding budget.

• Accomplishing things needed for school—physical objects, like computer lab.

• To address student achievement by developing sample report cards and portfolios.
23. What was the least successful aspect of your council?

- We need to continue to further the goals and procedures.
- Different languages spoken by members.
- No students are allowed to be involved.
- Not enough time to discuss all aspects at each meeting.
- Community involvement.
- Nothing.
- Student involvement.
- It is difficult to have real impact instead of just being a rubber stamp.
- None!
- N/A.
- Not supplying students what they needed.
- I can’t think of anything.
- There is nothing.
- The later times accommodates the parent’s later needs and we as teachers stay until 5:00 and go to 6:30–7:00. A very late work day!
- We have a difficult time getting all members of our council to all meetings. Everyone is very busy. We do use phone and written communication.
- Finding grants for goals.
- Wish we could have gotten more community involvement (non-parent or staff).
- Communication within and outside of school community.
- Building, grounds repairs, and maintenance request.
- Ability to attract non-council school patrons to attend meetings and become interested in the process.
• Implementation of technology and the bond issue.

• Did not address curriculum needs (what is happening today in the classroom).

• Getting greater numbers of parents to participate.

• The council is not able (because of district limitations) to make major decisions concerning our facilities and personnel.

• We do not have a feel for the whole school population and we have little genuine authority.

• Did not achieve commitment for a yearly retreat (6th grade). Difficulty in attracting new members to committee because of time commitment.
ITEM 23. What was the least successful aspect of your council?

- Finding enough time.
- The team had a successful school year and it does not appear to have any difficulties at this time.
- Trying to get community parents/business involved with the school on a continuous basis.
- We didn’t always have a current up to date budget, so we could not make decisions that we met to make. We are still dependent on Administration for the current budget figures. Everything is a very slow process. We may vote to do something, but are overruled by administration.
- The time involved.
- Too many meetings at the beginning of the year.
- Sometimes powerless regarding decisions that greatly impact us.
- Lack of protocol. Limited direction. Lack of training and expectations of new members. Limited effort to integrate special education needs to general education. A general lack of understanding of the site base process.
- A sense that certain issues are sensitive and can’t always be dealt with openly.
- Disorganization and lack of language. Team planning the first year I was on the team when the group was dominated by one member.
- It requires a lot of time.
- The members seem to all be from the same group of friends and although this group agrees it doesn’t always take into account how other groups think.
- Lack of follow through by on-site administration.
- Disseminating information to other staff.
- I believe the council has very little impact on school policies/procedures.
- We have no dollars to implement real change—council is basically staff.
- We don’t receive an agenda ahead of time. This might help us begin thinking about what we will be discussing.
• Keeping parents on council.

• Time to meet.

• Every year we write a site level plan and we are still creating a plan for the district office rather than a document that helps make student learning better. Our plan does that but it is not the #1 direct purpose currently.

• Conferences. District giving trivial assignments to site councils.

• Having members prepare and do things outside of our meeting time to be able to use our group time most efficiently.

• Follow through on goals.

• Calendar activities.

• The ineffectual chair, a new and harried principal, and sort of a current lack of direction have taken steam away from a group that was once focused, strong, and dynamic.

• Lack of interest by faculty, support persons, etc. Difficult to get people to serve and attend regularly.

• Not enough grants to send teachers to seminars.

• We really have no function, other than cosmetic. Policy is made at the district level, or by the principal, and the council is window dressing.

• Building air handling/quality concerns.

• Support from administration for additional counselor. After two years it was accomplished. Budget.

• It’s taken a long time to get to our goals but as stated above—now that we’ve set some—we’re moving at rapid speed.

• Acquiring volunteers in the community that are not directly related to the school.

• Very time consuming to work well. We are very limited as to what changes we can actually make.

• Having a convenient time to meet for teachers and community members/parents.

• Parent involvement.

• Gaining business/community support.
• We have a diverse council that works well together and is very successful. If I had to choose one aspect of our council that could be improved, it would be better communication with parents.

• Lack of time to do everything and lack of experience.

• Getting more of the community involved.

• Too much talk and no real control over outcomes.

• I do not recall any specific aspect that has been unsuccessful. We have had aspects that were rough sometimes because gaining consensus takes time—but nothing that remained difficult or had to be abandoned. Perhaps the aspect that continues to need some rethinking is how to motivate parents to want to be members—and once they are—remain committed. Their attendance is always regular.

• Not having enough of a budget to accomplish some facility goals as well as some other extracurricular goals.

• The lack of an active district level village partnership council makes us quite isolated.

• Trying to understand the forms, paperwork generated from the administration of our district.

• With so many people it is difficult to make headway because we all have our own opinions about things. Also, at times, you don't feel you can be as honest with "outsiders" on the team without hurting feelings.
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