To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Robert C. Lovingood entitled "A Study of Site-based Management As It Relates to the Local Board of Education, Central Office Administration, Building Level Administration, School Instructional Staff, Support Staff and Community Members and the Approval of Site-based Management Decision Making in the Monroe County, Tennessee, Public School District." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Leadership Studies in Education.

George W. Harris, Jr.
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of The Graduate School

A STUDY OF SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT AS IT RELATES TO THE LOCAL BOARD OF EDUCATION, CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATION, BUILDING LEVEL ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF, SUPPORT STAFF AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS, AND THE APPROVAL OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING MONROE COUNTY, TENNESSEE, PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Robert Charles Lovingood
August 1997

Copyright © Bob Lovingood, 1997

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Darlene Lovingood, who has given me encouragement to stay the course until completion.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank the members of my doctoral committee: Dr. George W. Harris, Jr. (Chairman), Dr. Phyllis E. Huff, Dr. Michael C. Hannum, Dr. Francis M. Gross, and Dr. Bill C. Wallace.

A special thanks goes to Elouise Webb, a colleague in the Danforth Program, who encouraged me when I was down and out. Elouise would call and say, "Bob, you can do this." Thank you, Dr. Webb, for all of your help and support.

I want to thank Dr. Donald Dessart for his expertise and assistance concerning questions relating to the statistical section of my study.

I want to thank all of the individuals who participated in this study. Without their cooperation I could not have gained the information necessary to complete this study.

I want to say how much I love and appreciate my wife and our sons. They stood by me when the going was tough and went without things to see me through this adventure.

ABSTRACT

The Monroe County School District, located in East Tennessee approximately forty-five (45) miles south of Knoxville, Tennessee, has a student population, kindergarten through twelfth grade, of four thousand nine hundred (4,900). The county is predominantly rural with four (4) incorporated towns nestled near the Cherokee National Forest: Madisonville, Tellico, Sweetwater, and Vonore. Monroe County is the fifth largest land area in the state of Tennessee with its borders reaching North Carolina. Three comprehensive high schools were strategically placed to serve one thousand eight hundred seventy (1,870) students grades nine (9) through twelve (12): Sequoyah High School, Sweetwater High School and Tellico Plains High School. Scattered across the vast land area are eight (8) elementary schools serving kindergarten through eighth grade: Rural Vale Elementary School, Coker Creek Elementary School, Tellico Plains Elementary and Jr. High School, Madisonville Primary,Intermediate and Middle School and Vonore Elementary School. Normally, fifty percent (50%) of the Monroe County student population qualify for free or reduced lunch. Providing a quality education to the students of this Appalachian area is the main concern of the Monroe County School System. Advances were made recently through technology grants and a new building program to improve the overall educational program. However, studies were needed to determine if the current school management system could sufficiently lead Monroe County students successfully into the twenty-first century.

The purpose of this study was to ask school decision makers in Monroe County if they prefer to continue the present type of school management operation or move to site-based management as a way of managing the operation of their local schools. The study also gathered information as to the knowledge of the groups on site based management. The study involved nine (9) local Board of Education members, ten (10) central office administrators, eleven (11) building level principals, two hundred twenty-eight (228) school instructional staff, one hundred twenty-six (126) support staff and sixty-four (64) community members belonging to local Parent-Teacher Organizations. Rate of completion for each of the following groups was as follows: Local board of education members one hundred percent (100%), central office administration one hundred percent (100%), building level principals one hundred percent (100%), school instructional staff seventy-eight percent (78%), support staff sixty-three percent (63%) and 63 community members volunteered to complete the survey.

The data were analyzed by looking at the means of various groups as well as determining the standard deviation and analysis of variance, which was used to determine the statistical significance of the various responding groups. The level of significance was established at .05 to be statistically significant. The researcher also analyzed the frequencies as related to number of times certain responses occurred in the various groups.

This study was very helpful to the citizens of Monroe County who desire to improve the quality of education in the Monroe County School District.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
	Introduction	1
	Background of the Problem	6
	The Problem	6
	Purpose of the Study	7
	Importance of the Study	7
	Hypotheses	8
	Definition of Terms	9
	Procedures and Data Analysis	10
	Introduction	10
	The Population	10
	Data Collection Procedures	11
	Data Analyses	12
	Assumptions	13
	Limitations of the Study	13
	Delimitations of the Study	13
	Organization of the Study	13
	Research Questions	14
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
	Introduction	15
	Benefits of Site-based Management	18
	Limitations of Site-based Management	20
III.	METHODOLOGY	24
	Introduction	24
	Selection of Groups	24
	Specific Procedures for Data Collection	25
	Data Analysis	27
	Conclusion	28
IV.	FINDINGS	29
	Introduction	29
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, and RECOMMENDATIONS	77
	Summary	77
	Conclusions	81
	Recommendations	82

BIBLIOGRAPHY 84

APPENDICES 89

Appendix A: Approval Letter to Conduct Study 90

Appendix B: Survey Instrument 91

Appendix C: Letter to Participants 93

VITA 94

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Demographic Data	31
II	Participant's Education & School Association	33
III	Frequency Data on Participation in Various Groups	34
IV	Frequency Distribution – Question #1	36
V	Descriptive Statistics – Mean Question #1	37
VI	Frequency Distribution – Question #2	39
VII	Descriptive Statistics – Mean Question #2	41
VIII	Frequency Distribution – Question #3	42
IX	Descriptive Statistics – Mean Question #3	43
X	Frequency Distribution – Question #4	45
XI	Descriptive Statistics – Mean Question #4	47
XII	Frequency Distribution – Question #5	48
XIII	Descriptive Statistics – Mean Question #5	50
XIV	Frequency Distribution – Question #6	51
XV	Descriptive Statistics – Mean Question #6	53
XVI	Frequency Distribution – Question #7	54
XVII	Descriptive Statistics – Mean Question #7	55
XVIII	Frequency Distribution – Question #8	57
XIX	Descriptive Statistics – Mean Question #8	58
XX	Frequency Distribution – Question #9	60
XXI	Descriptive Statistics – Question #9	61

XXII	Frequency Distribution – Question #10	62
XXIII	Descriptive Statistics – Question #10	64
XXIV	Frequency Distribution – Question #11	66
XXV	Descriptive Statistics – Question #11	67
XXVI	Frequency Distribution – Question #12	69
XXVII	Descriptive Statistics - Question #12	70
XXVIII	Frequency Distribution – Question #13	71
XXIX	Descriptive Statistics – Question #13	73
XXX	Frequency Distribution – Question #14	74
XXXI	Descriptive Statistics – Question #14	76

CHAPTER I
OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Introduction

During the last decade, contemporary trends in the field of education forced many educational leaders to take a hard look at site-based management (SBM) as an alternative to the traditional method of operating public schools. Site-based management is a process that involves the persons responsible for implementing decisions in actually making those decisions. Site-based management calls for the delegation of some important decision making authority to the local school and its community and a restructuring of the way decisions are made. However, the existing literature on school reform does not cite school-based decision making as a cure-all for more efficient school management.

During the middle 1980s, decentralization became an important reform theme. A new reform paradigm was for schools to be operated by a committee rather than by an administrator. The emphasis was for teachers and other individuals to become key players in the governance of the school. This new form of decentralization was known as school-based or site-based management. In the past, educational guidelines have been established at the state level and disseminated to the local level by the board of education and the superintendent. Building principals were charged with implementing the mandates of their school systems. In many states, including Tennessee, the state legislature has provided the opportunity for school systems to establish site-based management to provide an increased opportunity for involvement in the decision-making process.

According to experts on site-based management such as Clung & White (1988); Lashway (1996); and Barthes (1990), site-based management can be defined as a change in the formal governance of a school system that allows those most affected by a decision to help make the decision. Site-based management proponents insist that their reform has a wide variety of positive effects in schools, including higher teacher satisfaction, improved student learning and the development of new forms of leadership. Liontos (1994) determined that the primary purpose of site-based management is to improve teaching and learning and that since the greater portion of a student's learning takes place in classrooms, teachers should be deeply involved in the decision-making process. However, contemporary researchers, such as Barthes (1990); Clung & White (1988); and Lashway (1996), revealed numerous concerns related to the impact of this administrative structure as an educational reform.

In 1991, the state of Tennessee legislature added an amendment to the Educational Improvement Act which gave local boards the authority to implement site-based decision making at the local school level (Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 2, Part 2). The designated areas included but were not limited to management, curriculum, classroom management, professional development of teachers/staff and budget-including classroom teachers. A survey of school systems in 1990 indicated that 24 school systems in Tennessee were implementing site-based management to some extent and that 28 others anticipated doing so in the future. Currently, of the approximately 1600 school in Tennessee and 149 school systems, only 178 schools in the state have

formalized some form of site-based management (Frazier, State Board of Education Minutes: March, 1994, p. 1).

The motivation for site-based management may come from superintendents, school boards, school personnel or the general public. School districts that have initiated site-based management programs or incorporated school-based management philosophies have also emphasized increased authority of teachers, students, parents and community members (Clung & White, 1988, pp. 19-23).

In 1994, Charles Frazier, State School Board member and chair of the ad hoc committee on school leadership and school decision making, reviewed the status of site-based management in Tennessee schools at the July 29, 1994 State Board and ad hoc committee meeting (1994 State Board of Education Minutes). Frazier stated that difficulties in implementing the process included extra resources required in time, funds and staff development; identifying and acquiring some external facilitator support; and developing flexibility by local boards of education. Frazier continued by stating that site-based management is a process and a means to the goal of school improvement and student learning and should not be viewed or pursued as an end. Frazier ascertained that the State Board of Education must model the shared decision making process by trimming its own regulations and limiting the promulgation of new state requirements. In addition, the state must provide more training support. In order for site-based management to be effective, Frazier resolved that the state board should encourage, facilitate and broker resources.

When asked what specific recommendations he would make to develop more use of the site-based management process by local schools, Frazier offered the following:

1. Work with local boards of education to develop model policies that provide flexibility while conveying to the public that appropriate accountability still remains with the local boards.

2. Work with principals and teachers to help understand and develop non-traditional alliances aimed at accomplishing results.

3. Train local school leaders in the process of helping people embrace new ideas and creating additional time for planning professional development and shared decision making process.

The overall site-based management process, according to Frazier, should always be evaluated in terms of school improvement and student learning indicators. He said that the new principles for leadership training adopted by the state board in March, 1994, will focus on state supported training on organizational development as well as professional development for individuals. Training will be tied to developing and implementing short and long-range plans of local school systems for school improvement and student learning.

According to the literature, more than 44 states across the country have experimented with various aspects of site-based management, White (1988); Weiss (1993); and Herman & Herman (1993). In California, more than 60 districts are managed under a philosophy of shared decision-making or have incorporated site-based management programs. Other states, such as Florida, Minnesota and New York, have numerous school districts that are actively involved in initiating site-based management programs. To date, Kentucky and Texas are the only states with state mandated site-based management.

The ideas of site-based management actually began in the 1960s and 1970s. New York City began a city-wide decentralization program in 1967, and Detroit, Michigan, adopted a decentralization plan in 1970 (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992). Some individuals have questioned the potential success of site-based management since earlier efforts were ineffective. Some advocates of this process argue that the previous efforts in site-based management served merely to reorganize administrative responsibilities by replacing one form of bureaucracy with another. Past reforms failed to transfer power to the school site and in essence preserved the process of doing business as usual. Site-based management differs from past decentralization efforts in that it changes the entire system of district and school organization and restructures most roles in the district (David, Purkey & White, 1988). According to educational researcher Paula White (1989), the purpose of site-based management is not simply to reorganize administrative responsibilities, but to make changes in traditional structures of authority, with new relationships among teachers, administrators, parents and students.

National groups, such as the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association and the National governors' Association, have called for increased flexibility at the school site and a limit on state regulations that interfere with local authority. Support for site-based management comes from state and local policy makers, teachers, administrators and school board members who believe that the closer a decision is made to a student served by the decision, the better it will serve the student.

Background of the Problem

In 1992, the state of Tennessee implemented the Education Improvement Act (EIA) to improve teaching and student learning in Tennessee. While the EIA held school board and superintendents more accountable for the improvement of education at the local level, it also established a means for implementing site-based management. Many school systems in Tennessee have studied site-based management; however, only a few systems are implementing that administrative structure.

The Problem

The problem to be investigated in this study concerned the perspectives of local decision-makers on the traditional method of school operation versus the site-based management. This study sought to determine the knowledge base of decision makers on site-based management, their perspectives about a change in the way schools are operated, the empowerment of principals, teachers and other staff members and the perspectives of parent and other community decision making participants.

Educational research indicates that climate is a predictor of implementing site-based management. Site-based management is most likely to occur in schools where both the principal and teachers are open to shared decision making and willingness to become involved in school improvement efforts. For site-based management to occur, principals must see the importance of this reform and be willing to implement it.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if local school decision-makers believe site-based management would be more effective than the present management system. The perspectives of the local board of education, central office administrators, building level administrators, school instructional staff, school support staff and community members will be ascertained in this study. This study compared group perceptions about the present management style (i.e. personnel recommendations, textbook recommendations, etc.) being brought to the director of schools or board of education for action. Site-based management would establish councils to look at personnel, curriculum, textbooks and other areas of the local school operation. The findings and conclusions reached should add to the existing research on site-based management and could serve as a preliminary process for the Monroe County School System to implement site-based management.

Importance of the Study

Since the report of a Nation at Risk (1983), school reform has been a priority throughout the United States. Numerous legislative changes have been passed down from the national level to the states to help establish more effective schools. Accountability has become the focal point for local school systems. In the state of Tennessee, accountability is centered on (1) attendance; (2) promotion rate; (3) proficiency scores; (4) value added assessment; and (5) the dropout rate. The writer is of the opinion that many programs have been

designed to enhance these areas, including site-based management. The writer is also of the opinion that a general consensus by educators has been that if principals and teachers had more authority in the decision-making process, they could establish more effective schools.

This study will be important because its focus is on a new and potentially creative school administrative structure. It provides for the empowerment of principals as well as teachers, support staff and community members. It provides for a shared vision and shared decision-making at the school level. It is an ongoing change process. Site-based management allows for increased school unity. Everyone has an opportunity to be a player in the decision-making process. The findings of this study will be of interest to other educators involved in the restructuring of school management systems.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses to be examined in this study are stated in the null hypotheses form for statistical testing:

1. The views of the local board of education members will not differ from other participants in this study concerning site-based management.
2. The views of the central office administrators will not differ from other participants in this study concerning site-based management.
3. The views of building level administrators will not differ from other participants in this study concerning site-based management.
4. The views of the school instructional staff will not differ from other participants in this study concerning site-based management.
5. The views of the school support staff will not differ from other participants in this study concerning site-based management.

6. The views of school community members will not differ from the other participants concerning site- based management.

Definition of Terms

Several important terms are defined below for the purpose of this study:

Attendance: A daily tabulation of the number of students present and absent at an individual school.

Building level management: School decisions affecting the school are made on site and not at the central office level.

Dropout rate: Percentage or number of students who leave school prior to receiving a high school diploma in a given year or term.

Education Improvement Act: A law passed in 1992 by Tennessee Legislature for the restructuring and improvement of schools in Tennessee.

Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO): This is an organization of parents and teachers that strive for the success of goals that have been established at the local schools.

Proficiency scores: Scores obtained by all ninth grade students on a comprehensive test required by the state of Tennessee.

Promotion rate: The number of students who successfully meet the necessary academic requirements to go from one grade level to another.

Site-based management: A type of school decision making that allows interested community stakeholders to take an active role in the organization, staffing governance and educational issues of a school. It is a term used interchangeable with school-based decision making.

Value added assessment: That quality of assessment that goes beyond the mere validation of student acquisition of knowledge. The emphasis is on student learning that can be applied and has some value in the world beyond the classroom.

Procedures and Data Analyses

Introduction

During the last decade, educational researchers have provided a growing amount of information on site-based management. While several school systems have implemented various forms of site-based management, the majority of school systems are reluctant to utilize the structure. Some school systems have implemented various parts of the structure. Many educational researchers have found that site-based management is a difficult process to implement. First of all, the process is not immediate. Successful site-based management requires a good communication system among key players involved in decision-making. Change is not instantaneous. The process of change requires more than the first year of implementation and is ongoing. The effectiveness of site-based management dwells in the hands of the school's site-based team.

The Population

The population for this study included nine local school board members, ten supervisors, eleven building level principals, two hundred twenty-eight school instructional staff, one hundred twenty-six support staff and sixty-four community

members belonging to local Parent-Teacher Organizations. Community members were selected nonrandomly from those attending the monthly PTO meeting in April, 1997.

Monroe County School District is centered in a rural setting in East Tennessee. The school community is composed of four small towns which produce a combined population of approximately 31,000 residents who fall within low to middle income range. A large percent of the students are on free and/or reduced lunch. The school system is comprised of grades K-12. The educational staff is composed of 475 professional and support staff members. There are three high schools and eight K-8 schools. Approximately 20-25% of the students continued their education after graduating from high school.

Data Collection Procedures

For the purpose of this study, the data was collected by survey (see Appendix B). A questionnaire was given to all individuals within the population sample of this study. The questionnaire contained a Liekert-type scale to record responses. The perspectives of all participants were identified to determine a basis for establishing site-based management in the Monroe County Schools. Survey questions also identified the knowledge base of all decision-makers involved in this reform structure. All participants responded to survey questions based on the knowledge that they have about site-based management at the present time. A matrix was constructed to view responses to the various survey questions.

Data Analyses

This study is descriptive in nature. The survey data were analyzed in several ways. First, means were compiled for each question in the survey. Second, composite mean scores were analyzed to look at the standard deviation comparing all mean scores. The perspectives of the sample for this study will be analyzed to determine a basis for the establishment of site-based management in Monroe County Schools. The means and composite means will provide valuable insight into the perceptions of all participants as related to each question in this survey.

The following descriptive statistics will be used in this study:

The Mean

As used in this study, the mean will be determined for each of the responses to questions in this study.

The Standard Deviation

Standard deviation is a measure of variability around the mean. For this study, the standard deviations will be used to analyze participant responses as related to the calculated means.

Analysis of Variance

Tukey's HSD (Highest Significant Difference) will be used to determine the statistical significance of differences between the responding groups.

Frequencies

The number of times responses occur.

Assumptions

The assumptions of this study were that all participants responded freely and willingly. All responses were based upon current knowledge that participants have about site-based management at the time the survey is administered. All participants were able to give adequate perspectives when comparing traditional school operation procedures and site-based management.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to local school decision-makers in Monroe County School District. The population sample included nine school board members, eleven principals, nine supervisors, three hundred fifty-four teachers and support staff along with sixty-four PTO members and community members involved in the decision making process of Monroe County Schools.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited to community members who are active participants in the PTO. No effort was be made to include other community members at large in this study.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 includes an introduction, background of the problem, problem statement, purpose of the study, importance of the study, the research question, the population, data

collection method, data analysis, assumptions, limitations and delimitations and organization of the study. Specific terms for the study will also be defined.

Chapter 2 provides a review of related literature on site-based management in general. A review of available literature related to site-based management initiatives in the state of Tennessee will also be presented.

Chapter 3 focuses on the methods and procedures used to conduct this study.

Chapter 4 includes the presentation of data and findings of the study.

Chapter 5 contains a summary, conclusions and recommendations.

Research Questions

1. Are local school decision-makers satisfied with the present system of school management?
2. Is there enough dissatisfaction present to warrant dissolving our present system of school management?
3. Do local school decision-makers want to move to site-based management?

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

During the last decade, school-based management appeared to offer a new and exciting way to reform school management. Local school systems were finally given an opportunity to decide how their schools would be managed. A consensus among many educators has been that if school improvement is to be effective, it will have to come from within (Barth, 1990). In addition, many educators supported the idea that those closest to the students and those likely to be most affected by the decisions should make them. Site-based management offered several avenues for the decentralization of school management in the areas of budget, curriculum, staffing and support services.

Site-based budgeting allows principals and/or the site-based management committee to allocate funds across a variety of budget categories according to priorities established at the local school level. However, a lack of sufficient funds has caused many local schools systems to shy away from site-based management. Site-based management is not an easy task due to the fact that there can be various interpretations of implementation from school to school within a given district. Individual schools and districts will have to determine the level of decentralization in the schools. John Goodlad (1984), in *A Place Called School,* recognized the need for some centralization a system of checks and balances, stating that "authority and responsibility must be differentiated and distributed across the system" (p. 274).

The literature on site-based management (Site-based Management, 1991) states that participating schools and districts will have to address many questions when developing the structure for their site-based management program: (1) Who will participate in the program?; (2) What will they do?; (3) How will this change their roles and relationships with other staff?; and (4) How much authority should be delegated to the school level? Changes will have to made at the central office level as well as the school level (p. 3).

Programs related to site-based management cover a wide range of activities and districts may incorporate all or a portion of the available possibilities into their program. There are no absolute guidelines as to one best method of implementation. However, conditions must be right for this type of reform and it begins with a sufficient budget to carry out the process. In addition, the effectiveness of site-based management depends upon the creativity of all of the participants in the decision making process.

Site-based management curriculum development enables school staff to develop the instructional program, to select instructional materials and textbooks and to design in-service training programs. When curriculum design is done at the local school site, individual schools acquire greater discretion over curriculum development. The school staff selects instructional materials and methods and develops curricula that are appropriate to the needs of their students.

As a part of the site-based implementation, provisions must be made for the noninstructional staff of the school. After in-depth research on site-based management, Candoli (1991) developed a strategic plan for site-based

management in which he recommends that all noninstructional services remain on a highly centralized basis. Candoli's rationale for this recommendation is that "the noninstructional services area does not deal directly with the provision of educational programs to students and, further, that many of the noninstructional tasks are more efficiently and effectively performed on a larger, more massive scale" (p. 177).

> Candoli continued, "By establishing these services on a centralized basis, economy of scale is realized. Additional, the direct management of the noninstructional area by specially trained personnel allows those persons directly involved with the instructional process to devote their full energy and talent to working with the clients to be served" *(Ibid.)*.

However, Candoli does acknowledge the fact that each school system entering into site-based management will have to develop its own approach to the provision of support activities.

An increase in community participation is often a central objective of site-based management. The formation of school site committees includes community members in cooperation with the principal, teachers and occasionally students, in shared decision making regarding school issues. The selection, composition and responsibilities of the council vary from district to district and from school to school. Members volunteer or are elected to be on the council. In his book, *From Vision to Practice*, Wallace (1996) concluded that the district's stakeholders must be included in developing the vision and initiatives of the excellence agenda. His reasons are twofold: (a) to develop a constituency for the vision and the excellence agenda and (b) to build a constituency for the financial support of the agenda and the strategic plan (p. 181).

Site-based management councils are involved in activities, such as interviewing and recommending candidates for staff positions, establishing school priorities, making school budget recommendations and assessing the effectiveness of school programs (Marburger, 1985). By improving communication and understanding between the school and community, the site-based management committee creates a better learning environment for students. Under site-based management, individual schools and school districts determine the personnel responsible for specific decisions and the degree to which budget, curriculum and hiring decisions will be decentralized.

Benefits of Site-based Management

Participation in staffing decisions allows the site-based management committee to determine the distribution of full-time and part-time positions and the number of classroom teachers and teacher aide positions. Advocates of site-based management argue that if school personnel are involved in making hiring decisions, they will select staff that reflect their own values, goals and objectives (Rosenholtz, 1985). A general assumption among advocates of site-based management is that by improving communication and understanding between the school and the community, the site-based management committee creates a better learning environment for students. However, decisions made at the school site are subject to review by higher administrators, including the school board and superintendent.

Some researchers have attributed site-based management to student achievement (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Levin (1988) suggested that site-based decision making is related to student learning and achievement; however, the direct relationship is not clear. The difficulty in drawing a cause and effect relationship between site-based management and student achievement is that any impact of site-based management is complicated by other trends at the school site or local, state and national level.

In addition to improved learning and academic achievement, site-based management offers other benefits, such as higher self-esteem, morale and efficiency of school personnel. Increased authority over decision making provides incentive for school staff to be more efficient. Rosenholtz (1987) suggested that autonomy enhances performance:

> Jobs that give people autonomy and discretion require that they exercise judgment and choice; in doing so, they become aware of themselves as casual agents in their own performance. Loss of the capacity to control the terms of work or to determine what work is to be done, or what its aim is to be, widens the gap between the knowledge of one's unique contributions to work and any performance efficacy that can be derived from it (p. 540).

According to Lashway (1996); Liontos (1994); and Herman & Herman (1993), site-based management improves communication between school staff and the community. Participation in school budget, curriculum and staffing decisions gives school personnel the opportunity collectively to develop ideas about what is important to emphasize in teaching. According to Little (1981), the most successful schools appear to be those where staff members frequently exchange ideas about teaching. Increased authority at the school site may help

to attract and retain quality staff. Barth (1990) resolved that everyone within a school-students, teachers, parents and administrators-is capable of leading and being an active member in a "community of leaders" (pp. 123-145).

Limitations of Site-based Management

Educational researchers have identified potential problems in implementing site-based management. First of all, it may create confusion in role responsibilities. Adaption to new roles may be difficult for administrators, teachers, parents and students. They may not know what is expected of them and become frustrated. For example, principals may not know which decisions must be in collaboration with the site-based committee and which decisions they should make on their own.

Site-based management can become a power struggle between all committee players. Central office administrators may endorse the philosophy of school-based management but find it hard to allocate decision-making authority to principals. Principals may be resistant to change. Teachers and parents may want greater ownership in the decision making process, but may not devote the time to develop curricula, make budget recommendations or interview personnel. Teachers may fear that greater parental authority will interfere with their own power, goals and objectives.

White (1989) determined that it is neither practical nor feasible for a district to develop a fully centralized or decentralized system of school management. Rosenholtz (1985) agreed that when too much freedom is provided to school

staff, confusion and inconsistency result in inefficiency. Centralizing some aspects of a district or school operations allows for successful decentralization at the building level. The structure of school organization, conflicting state mandates, standardized curricula, budget and personnel constraints at the district and state levels may all contribute to problems in implementing school-based management.

While site-based management allows for more control over budget issues, decisions regarding salaries, the number of teachers and support staff, instructional supplies and equipment will be limited by the amount of available resources. In addition, hiring decisions will be limited by student enrollment, district agreements with teacher unions and state mandated student/teacher ratio requirements (Johnson, 1987).

Site-based management also raises potential conflicts with collective bargaining. For example, principals may allocate administrative responsibilities to teacher and other staff that are usually established by union contract. While collective bargaining often results in standardized procedures, site-based management, on the other hand, often leads to diversity and differentiation in procedures from school to school. And, while teacher unions have traditionally emphasized material incentives such as increased salaries and benefits, site-based management emphasizes ownership over objectives, such as what I taught and what materials are used.

According to White (1989), site-based management advocates do not believe that site-based management runs counter to union strategies. In most

instances, teacher unions have not served as obstacles to the implementation of site-based management. In school districts such as Dade County, Florida and Hammond, Indiana, the unions have worked cooperatively with the districts to obtain site-based management (National School Boards Report, 1988). In districts where union leaders have played an important role in the initiation and implementation of school-based management, the unions believe that site-based management offers an opportunity to move beyond traditional collective bargaining strategies and to acquire the status and autonomy desired by teachers (Casner-Lotto, 1988; David, 1988; McDonnell & Pascal, 1988).

While many policy makers advocate the decentralization of authority to the school, most supporters recognize that site-based management alone will not solve all school problems, such as low teacher salaries, poorly trained teachers, discipline problems or societal unrest concerning public schools. Major changes in school effectiveness can not occur unless educational reforms take a broader focus on the schools.

In order to implement site-based management, on-going support is needed from the school system. Substantial investments must be made in planning and training. Training frequently focuses on developing decision-making skills, learning how to build a consensus, problem solving and group dynamics. It is assumed that adequate funding will be provided by the state to the local districts for this purpose. Local schools will also need access to information about performance of their schools and information about instructional strategies. The role of the central office is to facilitate change and experimentation.

Site-based management requires time on the part of individual participants. It is not a quick process and participants in the process should not expect quick results. It is advisable to apply the concept to small decisions and achieve some small success before tackling some of the larger issues (Tennessee Education State Board Plan, 1991).

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The study of site-based management as it relates to the Monroe County Board of Education, central office administration, building level administration, school instructional staff, support staff, and school community members and the approval of site-based decision making within the Monroe County Public School District of Tennessee offers excellent research data concerning site-based management decision making. This managerial process was being considered by the Monroe County Public School District. All of the key decision makers were surveyed to determine their knowledge base concerning site-based management and their perspectives about a change in the operation of the Monroe County School District. The purpose of this study to determine if the above-mentioned groups believe site-based management would be more effective in educating students than our present system of school management.

The survey instrument was developed with input from these individuals and groups: the researcher and other directors of public schools, dissertation committee members, other University of Tennessee professors, neighboring school systems and other professional and support staff. The survey instrument was pilot tested with support staff in the Blount County School System.

Selection of Groups

Site-based councils are made up of individual people that form a site-based council at an individual school. It is critical that these councils have individuals committed to improving the effectiveness of the local school district as well as the individual school. These site-based councils normally consist of a principal, a teacher or teachers, a school staff person, a parent or parents, and/or

another community member. In order for site-based councils to be effective, they need the support of the local board of education, director of schools and all supervisory and administrative staff.

The researcher sought to determine the knowledge and perception of the various groups about site based management in Monroe County Schools. Furthermore the researcher sought to determine the perceptions of the various groups surveyed as to the effectiveness of the present school management system and to learn if these groups believed that a move to site-based management in the Monroe County Public School District would be beneficial. These groups were selected because of their critical importance to the success of a local school system.

Specific Procedures for Data Collection

Six primary groups supplied sources of data for this study. All groups were administered the same survey instrument. (See appendix B)

The first group surveyed was the local board of education which is composed of nine members. The board members were asked to read the letter to participants, complete the survey, and leave the surveys on the table. The researcher left the area and did not make any other comments. All nine surveys were completed and left on the table.

The second group surveyed was the central office administration. Each supervisor was given a survey by the secretary and asked to complete the survey and return it to her. The researcher made no other comment.

The building-level administrators (principals) were given the survey in a principals' meeting, asked to read the letter, complete the survey, and leave the surveys stacked on the back table. The researcher made no other comments.

Each principal was asked to give the instructional and support staff surveys to the appropriate personnel in their school. The instructional support group is made up of general purpose teacher assistants, special education teacher assistants, Title I teacher assistants, food service personnel, secretaries, custodians, maintenance employees, and specialized bus drivers. This group is composed of individuals who are not required to have a professional certificate to perform their job functions. These people were asked to read and complete the surveys and return them to the principal.

The principals were also asked to distribute the survey to parents who came to PTO meetings in April, 1997. These school community members were asked to complete the survey and leave it on the table after completion. Participation in PTO was lower than usual, probably because school was almost over for the year. Most parents participate in PTOs better in the beginning of a school year.

The questionnaire consisted of fourteen statements with a Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 5 for each response. Each statement was designed to determine the individual's knowledge of site-based management, his/her attitude toward the present style of school management in the Monroe County Public School District and his/her desire or willingness to approve site-based decision making in the Monroe County Public School District. In addition to the fourteen statements, each person completing the survey was asked to provide demographic data relating to gender, age, education, race, type of school association, and position. Age was seperated into the following categories: less than 35 years of age, 35-44 years of age, 45-54 years of age and greater than 54 years of age. Race categories used were: Caucasian, African American, Spanish, or other. Education categories used were: highest degree earned, no

diploma, high school diploma, General Equivalency Diploma, Bachelors degree, Master's degree, educational specialist and doctorate. The teachers were categorized by high school and elementary school. Some schools in the Monroe County School District are K-8; others are K-2, K-4, 3-5, 5-8, and 6-8 schools.

The program Stat-Star Version 2 (copyright 1991 by Academy Software) was used to derive the mean and standard deviation scores for the data. The ANOVA was calculated for all data. The program then calculated the correlation of data with alpha set at .05 level of significance. A descriptive analysis of the data was made to determine a frequency distribution, including the range and mode with all of the data.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed to determine the correlations among various groups. One-way analysis of the variance was used in the data analysis. The standard deviation, which is a measure of variability, was used to analyze participant responses as related to the calculated means. The frequencies were calculated to determine the mode.

Using these methods of analyzing the data provided a comprehensive picture of the beliefs and perceptions of survey respondents. It was important for the researcher to ascertain not only the perceptions of each group but also how the groups differed. Using the one-way ANOVA and the Tukey's Highest Significant Difference Test (HSD) helped the researcher determine areas of significant difference among respondent groups.

Conclusion

By comparing all group responses to the survey questions, a determination was made as to the approval of site-based decision making management in the Monroe County Public School District. The researcher gathered valuable information as to the participants' perceptions about the present management style, knowledge of site-based management and willingness to move toward this type of school management.

CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

Introduction

Fourteen questions were asked in this study. The questions were answered by collecting, analyzing and compiling quantitative data answered by four hundred forty-eight (448) respondents. The respondents consisted of the following seven groups: school board members, supervisors, principals, high school teachers (HS 9-12), elementary teachers (Elem. K-8), support staff and members of the local Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). The respondents were also classified according to race, gender, age, education and school association. The statistical analyses of the data were organized in frequency distribution, means high to low and Tukey's Highest Significant Difference (HSD).

The Monroe County School System employs one hundred seventy-two (172) elementary teachers (K-8), one hundred twenty-two (122) high school teachers (9-12) and two hundred (200) full time support staff. Ninety-nine (95) high school teachers and one hundred thirty-three (133) elementary teachers completed the survey for a combined total of seventy-eight percent (78%). One hundred twenty-six (126) or sixty-three percent (63%) of the support staff completed the survey. During the month of April, 1997, questionnaires were presented at elementary school Parent Teacher Organization meetings. Parent-Teacher Organizations were established only at the elementary level. The parents were asked to complete the survey. A total of sixty-four (64) parents returned the completed survey. The following groups were included in the final

analysis of the data with one hundred percent (100%) participation: nine school board members, ten supervisors and eleven principals.

For purpose of presentation, the Strongly Agree and Agree categories were combined in all tables. This information was put into the narrative relating to each table discussed. Also, the abbreviation for elementary teachers (K-8) shown in the graphs as Elem. Tchs. and high school (9-12) teachers is shown as H.S. Tchs. Abbreviations used for the support staff are Sp. Staff and for the board members are Bd. Memb.

All groups are compared at the .05 level of significance in the various mean contrasts tables. These tables make comparison of all groups' means in determining the level of significance. Tukey's Highest Significant Difference compares the means individually with all groups surveyed. The means were compared from high to low in the various tables.

A total of three hundred thirty (330) females and one hundred eighteen (118) males completed the survey. Ten were minority individuals classified as African Americans, and four hundred twenty-seven (427) were Caucasians.

The groups were also broken down by age as shown in Table I. One hundred twenty-nine (129) participants were less than 35 years of age. One hundred twenty-three (123) were in the 35-44 age group. One hundred thirty (130) individuals represented the age group of 45-54 and sixty-four (64) participants were greater than age fifty-four. The vast majority of respondents (86%) were under the age of 55.

TABLE I

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Males	118	26%
Females	330	74%
Total	448	100%
Race		
Minority (African American)	10	2%
Caucasian	427	98%
Non responding	11	
Total	448	100%
Age		
Less than 35	129	29%
35-44	123	28%
45-54	130	29%
54 and Over	64	14%
Non responding	2	
Total	448	100%

The education category levels of the study participants are shown in Table II indicates that twelve had no diploma, one hundred forty-four (144) had a high school diploma, and fifteen (15) had the General Equivalency Diploma. One hundred thirty (130) individuals had a Bachelor's degree and one hundred twelve (112) had earned the Master's degree. Eleven participants held the educational specialist degree and four participants had attained the doctorate degree.

The participants' school association results reported in Table II indicates that a total of two hundred eighty-nine (289) individuals or seventy (70) percent were associated with elementary education, while thirty (30) percent of those surveyed were associated with high school. The large majority of people surveyed had an association with elementary schools (some combination of K-8) in Monroe County.

The Monroe County School System had three kindergarten through eighth grade elementary schools, one kindergarten through second grade and another kindergarten through fourth grade school. One intermediate school served grades three, four, and five and one middle school grades six, seven and eight. Finally, there was a junior high school with grades five, six, seven and eight. All three Monroe County high schools included grades nine through twelve.

The data presented in Table III indicates that all board members, supervisors and principals in Monroe County completed this survey and represented two (2) percent of the total number of people surveyed. The results of the study also indicate that one out of four hundred forty-eight (448) did not complete this part of the demographic information. The information in Table III shows that one hundred thirty-three (133) of the respondents or thirty (30)

TABLE II
PARTICIPANTS' EDUCATION
and SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

	Frequency	Percent
a. Education		
No Diploma	12	3%
High School Diploma	144	34%
GED	15	4%
Bachelor's	130	30%
Master's	112	26%
Ed. Specialist	11	2%
Doctorate	4	1%
Non responding	20	
Total	448	100%
b. School Association		
Elementary (K-8)	289	70%
High School (9-12)	133	30%
Non responding	26	0
Total	448	100%

TABLE III
FREQUENCY DATA on PARTICIPATION IN VARIOUS GROUPS

	Frequency	Percent
Board Members	9	2%
Supervisors	10	2%
Principals	11	2%
Elementary Teachers	133	30%
High School Teachers	95	21%
Support Staff	126	29%
PTO Parents	63	14%
Non responding	1	0
Total	448	100%

percent of the respondents completing the survey were elementary teachers and ninety-five (95) or twenty-one (21) percent were high school teachers. The support staff group numbered one hundred twenty-six (126) and made up twenty-nine (29) percent of the total. The PTO parents responding numbered sixty-three (63) individuals which was fourteen (14) percent of the grand total surveyed.

Question Number 1: The Current organizational leadership structure is meeting the educational needs of children in Monroe County. (i.e. school board, director of schools, principal, supervisor, etc.)

As indicated in Table IV, two hundred eighty-five (285) individuals or sixty-three (63) percent of the groups surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that the present system of organizational leadership is meeting the needs of children in Monroe County. Sixty (60) people or fourteen (14) percent had no opinion regarding this question, and one hundred and four (104) individuals or twenty-three (23) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that the current educational leadership was meeting the educational needs in Monroe County. Four hundred forty-nine (449) people responded to this question.

The descriptive statistics to question number one are represented in Table V. All responding groups were generally positive with the supervisor group being the most positive with a mean of 4.400 and the parent group being the least positive with a mean of 3.048. Tukey's Highest Significant Difference Test was also used.

As previously stated, a one-way ANOVA was performed on the data predetermined level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. As presented in Table V, the level

TABLE IV
Frequency Distribution
Question #1

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	5	18	(23)	11	25	3	(28)	62
Sp. Staff	0	8	(8)	29	79	13	(92)	129
Elem.Tchs.	2	39	(41)	11	74	7	(81)	133
H.S. Tchs.	7	24	(31)	8	54	2	(56)	95
Principals	0	1	(1)	0	7	3	(10)	11
Supv.	0	0	(0)	0	6	4	(10)	10
Bd.Memb.	0	0	(0)	1	8	1	(9)	10
TOTAL	14	90	(104)	60	252	33	(285)	448
Percentage	3%	20%	(23%)	14%	56%	7%	(63%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

TABLE V
QUESTION #1
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Supervisors	Principals	Bd. Memb.	Sp. Staff	Elem.Tch	H.S.Tch	Parent
4.400	4.091	4.000	3.752	3.338	3.211	3.048

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	High	Elem.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors		n/s	.01	.05	n/s	.01
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S. Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

n/s - no significant difference between groups

of significance for question one was reached between perceptions of the supervisor group compared to the elementary teacher group (.05) and the high school teacher group (.01). The system administrative leadership, supervisors and principals, had a much higher opinion of how well the existing needs were being met than did teachers and parents; however as previously stated, all were positive in varying degrees.

The six groups do differ using the Tukey's Highest Significant Difference Test (HSD). Supervisors differ from high school teachers at a level of .01, elementary teachers at a level of .05, and parents at a level of .01.

Since the probability is small (.05 or less) the null hypothesis was rejected for this question. There were significant differences, and they are not all equal in how the respondents answered this question.

Question Number 2: School Board policies that regulate the school system allow our school to make the decisions needed to run a quality educational program.

According to Table VI two hundred forty-four (244) respondents or fifty-eight (58) percent agreed or strongly agreed that present school board policies that regulate the school system allow the schools to make decisions needed to run a quality educational program. However, one hundred twenty (120) or twenty-nine (29) percent of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with the school board policies needed to run a quality educational program. Fifty-seven (57) respondents or fourteen percent were neutral on this question.

TABLE VI
Frequency Distribution
Question #2

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	4	16	(20)	13	31	0	(31)	64
Sp.Staff	3	20	(23)	16	61	3	(64)	103
Elem.Tchs.	4	40	(44)	14	66	5	(71)	129
H.S.Tchs.	4	28	(32)	12	51	0	(51)	95
Principals	0	1	(1)	1	6	3	(9)	11
Supv.	0	0	(0)	1	8	1	(9)	10
Bd.Memb.	0	0	(0)	0	8	1	(9)	9
TOTAL	15	105	(120)	57	231	13	(244)	421
Percentage	4%	25%	(29%)	13%	55%	3%	(58%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

A grand total of four hundred twenty-one (421)individuals responded to this question.

The response from various groups to question two is presented in Table VII. All groups were positive to this question. Parents were the least positive with a mean of 3.081, while the Monroe County School Board members were the most positive with a mean of 4.111.

Tukey's (HSD) Test indicated only one area with a level of significance. Tukey's (HSD) test indicated that the level of difference between the board members and the parents to be at the stated level of significance at .05 Therefore, the null hypothesis for this question was rejected. It is very significant that all groups surveyed felt that school board policies presently in place allowed the school to make the decisions needed to run a quality educational program.

Question 3: I have enough input into training needs related to teaching and learning in our school system.

The results according to Table VIII indicates one hundred seventy-nine (179) respondents or forty-two (42) percent felt they had enough input into training needs related to teaching and learning in the school system. While the majority felt they had enough input into training related to teaching and learning, one hundred fifty-three (153) respondents or thirty-six (36) percent did not feel they had enough input into staff development needs.

The descriptive statistics to question three are presented in Table IX. The board members, supervisors, principals and support staff were positive. The supervisors were the most positive group with a mean of 4.200 and principals with a mean of 4.091, with board members (mean of 3.333) and support staff (mean of 3.326) being somewhat less positive. Three significant groups felt they did not have enough input into training needs related to teaching and learning in

TABLE VII
QUESTION #2
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Bd.Memb.	Supervisors	Principals	Sp. Staff	Elem.	High	Parents
4.111	4.000	4.000	3.419	3.218	3.158	3.081

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	High	Elem.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	.05
Supervisors		n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significant difference between groups

TABLE VIII
Frequency Distribution
Question #3

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	7	17	(24)	21	16	3	(19)	64
Sp.Staff	2	20	(22)	35	39	7	(46)	103
Elem.Tchs.	12	54	(66)	13	44	6	(50)	129
H.S.Tchs.	9	30	(39)	14	38	4	(42)	95
Principals	0	0	(0)	1	8	2	(10)	11
Supv.	0	0	(0)	1	6	3	(9)	10
Bd.Memb.	0	1	(1)	5	2	1	(3)	9
TOTAL	31	122	(152)	90	153	26	(179)	421
Percentage	7%	30%	(37%)	21%	36%	6%	(42%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

TABLE IX
QUESTION #3
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Supervisors	Principals	Bd.Memb.	Sp.Staff	H.S.Tchs.	Parents	Elem.Tchs.
4.200	4.091	3.333	3.326	2.979	2.855	2.835

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors		n/s	.05	.01	n/s	.01
Principals			.05	.01	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significant difference between groups

the Monroe County School System. These were high school teachers with a mean of 2.979, elementary teachers with a 2.835 mean and parents with a mean of 2.855.

The Tukey's HSD Test showed a significant level of difference of .05 with various groups. The high school teachers compared to the supervisors showed a .05 level of significance, principals compared to high school teachers showed a .05 level of significance also. Parents had a negative level of significance with .01.

Tukey's (HSD) test showed levels of significance at the .05 level between supervisors and high school teachers. The principals and parents were low, at the .05 level of significance. There were other areas less significant such as the supervisors and elementary teachers (.01) and supervisors and parents (.01). The supervisors and parents also were at the .01 level. The null hypothesis in this case would be rejected because there were significant levels of difference between the various groups.

Question 4: Under the current management system, school administrators seek advice from school decision makers as they attempt to establish the educational program.

According to the data in Table X one hundred ninety-four (194) respondents or forty-six (46) percent agreed or strongly agreed that school decision makers seek advice from other individuals and/or groups to help establish educational programs. One hundred thirty-three (133) respondents or thirty-two (32) percent felt they did not have enough input in those decisions and ninety-four (94) respondents or twenty-two (22) percent had no opinion. Four hundred twenty-one individuals in the various groups answered this question.

TABLE X
Frequency Distribution
Question #4

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	5	19	(24)	22	17	1	(18)	64
Sp.Staff	1	15	(16)	23	55	9	(64)	103
Elem.Tchs.	12	38	(50)	29	44	6	(50)	129
H.S.Tchs.	5	33	(38)	18	36	3	(39)	95
Principals	0	1	(1)	1	5	4	(9)	11
Supv.	0	2	(2)	0	6	2	(8)	10
Bd.Memb.	1	1	(2)	1	5	1	(6)	9
TOTAL	24	109	(133)	94	168	26	(194)	421
Percentage	6%	26%	(32%)	22%	40%	6%	(46%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

The data shows that principals (mean 4.091), supervisors (mean 3.800), support staff (mean 3.558), and board members (mean 3.444) were generally positive about the administrators seeking advice from other decision makers as they attempt to establish the educational program. Other groups surveyed did not believe administrators sought their advice under the present management system. The high school teachers (mean 2.989), elementary teachers (mean 2.985) and parents (mean 2.839) responded more negatively to this question. (Table XI)

Tukey's (HSD) test indicated a significant level of difference (.05) between principal perception as compared to high school and elementary teachers' perceptions. These perceptions were not all equal. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected concerning the question of school administrators seeking advice from school decision makers as they attempt to establish the educational program.

Question 5: School administrators currently encourage school decision makers to be an integral part of the decision making process. (teachers, support staff, community members, etc.)

According to the data results from Table XII two hundred twenty-four (224) respondents or fifty-three (53) percent agreed or strongly agreed that school administrators encourage school decision makers to be an integral part of the decision making process. However, one hundred thirty-four (134) participants or thirty-two (32) percent strongly disagreed or disagreed that they were encouraged by school decision makers to be an integral part of the decision making process. Sixty-three respondents or fifteen (15) percent had no opinion on this question.

TABLE XI
QUESTION #4
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Principals	Supervisors	Sp.Staff	Bd.Memb.	High	Elem.	Parents
4.091	3.800	3.558	3.444	2.989	2.985	2.839

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	High	Elem.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors.		n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Principals			.05	.05	n/s	.01
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significant difference between groups

TABLE XII
Frequency Distribution
Question #5

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	2	18	(20)	13	27	4	(31)	64
Sp.Staff	4	16	(20)	13	62	8	(70)	103
Elem.Tchs.	9	46	(55)	23	46	5	(51)	129
H.S.Tchs.	8	27	(35)	12	37	11	(48)	95
Principals	0	0	(0)	1	5	5	(10)	11
Supv.	0	2	(2)	0	6	2	(8)	10
Bd.Memb.	1	1	(2)	1	5	1	(6)	9
TOTAL	24	110	(134)	63	188	36	(224)	421
Percentage	6%	26%	(32%)	15%	45%	8%	(53%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

The mean responses to this question are presented in Table XIII. The principals (mean 4.364), supervisors (mean 3.800), board members (mean 3.444), and support staff (mean 3.488) were positive about administrators encouraging decision makers to be an integral part of the decision-making process. The teachers' mean was somewhat less positive. It should be noted that the support staff felt they were an integral part of the decision-making process.

The response from elementary teachers (mean 2.970) was more negative than from other school personnel. Their response corresponds with question four in that these people did not feel they are encouraged to be an integral part of the decision-making process. This response indicated a need to involve elementary teachers more in the decision making process.

The Tukey (HSD) test indicated principals had a significant level of difference at .05 with high school teachers and .01 with elementary teachers. There was a significant level of .05 difference between the principals and the parents surveyed. The null hypotheses concerning this question was rejected because there were areas of significant differences. The parent group, high school teacher group and elementary teacher group appeared to perceive that they were being left out of the decision-making process.

Question 6: I prefer a site-based council at the local school to make decisions.

The data from Table XIV indicates two hundred fifty-five (255) or sixty (60) percent of the participants agree or strongly agree that they prefer a site-based council at the local school level to make school decisions. Fifty (50) participants or twelve (12) percent strongly disagree with the formation of site-based councils to make decisions at the local school. However, one hundred sixteen (116)

TABLE XIII
QUESTION #5
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Principals	Supervisors	Sp.Staff	Bd.Memb.	Parent	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.
4.364	3.800	3.488	3.444	3.210	3.168	2.970

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	High	Elem.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors		n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Principals			.05	.01	n/s	.05
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significant difference between groups

TABLE XIV
Frequency Distribution
Question #6

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	1	3	(4)	17	26	17	(43)	64
Sp.Staff	2	10	(12)	31	49	11	(60)	103
Elem.Tchs.	5	17	(22)	31	60	16	(76)	129
H.S.Tchs.	2	4	(6)	26	36	27	(63)	95
Principals	1	1	(2)	5	3	1	(4)	11
Supv.	2	1	(3)	4	2	1	(3)	10
Bd.Memb.	1	0	(1)	2	6	0	(6)	9
TOTAL	14	36	(50)	116	182	73	(255)	421
Percentage	3%	9%	(12%)	28%	43%	17%	(60%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

participants or twenty-eight (28) percent had no opinion on this question. Four hundred twenty-one (421) participants answered this question.

The responses for this question are presented in Table XV. The majority of group respondents were positive. Parents had a mean of 3.871, high school teachers of 3.511, support staff of 3.550, elementary school teachers of 3.511, board members of 3.444, and principals of 3.182. The supervisors (mean of 2.900) responses indicated the most negative response to this question.

The Tukey's (HSD) test performed indicated one level of significant difference concerning this question. The null hypothesis concerning this question was rejected. The .05 level of significance was reached between supervisors' and parents' perceptions about a site based council at the local school making decisions. Supervisors were evenly divided on the question of a site-based council at the local school making decisions.

Question 7: I would like to learn more about site-based management.

The data from Table XVI indicates that three hundred forty-eight (348) participants or eighty-three (83) percent agreed or strongly agreed that they would like to learn more about site-based management. Only twenty (20) participants or five (5) percent disagreed with learning more about site-based management. Fifty-three (53) participants or twelve (12) percent had no opinion about learning more about site-based management. A total of four hundred twenty-one (421) participants answered this question.

The responses for this question are shown in Table XVII. Every group surveyed showed a positive response to learning more about site-based management. The board members (mean of 3.778), supervisors (mean of 4.200), principals (mean of 4.182), high school teachers (mean of 4.126),

TABLE XV
QUESTION #6
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Parents	H.S.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Elem.Tchs.	Bd.Memb.	Principals	Supervisors
3.871	3.511	3.550	3.511	3.444	3.182	2.900

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors		n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	.05
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significance difference between groups

TABLE XVI
Frequency Distribution
Question #7

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	0	2	(2)	12	28	22	(50)	64
Sp.Staff	1	4	(5)	13	72	13	(85)	103
Elem.Tchs.	3	5	(8)	18	74	29	(103)	129
H.S.Tchs.	1	3	(4)	9	52	30	(82)	95
Principals	0	0	(0)	0	9	2	(11)	11
Supv.	0	0	(0)	0	8	2	(10)	10
Bd.Memb.	1	0	(1)	1	5	2	(7)	9
TOTAL	6	14	(20)	53	248	100	(348)	421
Percentage	1%	3%	(4%)	13%	59%	24%	(83%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

TABLE XVII
QUESTION #7
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Parents	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Bd.Memb.
4.200	4.182	4.126	4.065	3.940	3.891	3.778

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

No significant difference.

elementary teachers (mean of 3.940), support staff (mean of 3.891), and parents (mean of 4.094) were all very positive in their response. The Tukey's (HSD) test showed no significant level of difference among any of the respondents. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected regarding this question.

Question 8: Site-based management will improve instruction in the local school.

Table XVIII indicates that two hundred twenty-three (223) participants or fifty-three (53) percent believed site-based management would improve instruction in the local school. One hundred sixty-three (163) or thirty-nine (39) percent that had no opinion on this question. Only fifty-five (55) participants or thirteen (13) percent did not think site-based management would improve instruction in the local school. Four hundred twenty-one (421) participants answered this particular question.

The data indicated that high school teachers were the most positive with a mean of 3.705. Parents (mean of 3.645), principals (mean of 3.636), support staff (3.558), elementary teachers (3.429), and board members (3.000) responses were also positive. The supervisors (2.800) were less positive about site-based management improving instruction at the local level than any other group. (Table XIX)

Tukeys test of significance performed for this question gave one level of significant difference. The supervisors as compared to high school teachers showed a level of .05 significance. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 9: Site-based management would allow for support staff input at the building level better than our present management system.

TABLE XVIII
Frequency Distribution
Question #8

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	1	3	(4)	24	25	11	(36)	64
Sp.Staff	3	5	(8)	34	53	8	(61)	103
Elem.Tchs.	3	11	(14)	55	49	11	(60)	129
H.S.Tchs.	1	3	(4)	35	40	16	(56)	95
Principals	0	1	(1)	4	4	2	(6)	11
Supv.	2	1	(3)	5	1	1	(2)	10
Bd.Memb.	1	0	(1)	6	2	0	(2)	9
TOTAL	11	24	(35)	163	174	49	(223)	421
Percentage	2%	6%	(8%)	39%	41%	12%	(53%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

TABLE XIX
QUESTION #8
Descriptive Statistics – Means

H.S.Tchs.	Parents	Principals	Sp.Staff	Elem.Tchs.	Bd.Memb.	Supervisors
3.705	3.645	3.636	3.558	3.429	3.000	2.800

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors		n/s	.05	n/s	n/s	n/s
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significant difference between groups

The data from Table XX shows two hundred sixty-seven (267) individuals or sixty-four (64) percent agreed or strongly agreed that site-based management would allow for staff input at the building level better than our present management system. A total of one hundred seventeen (117) participants or twenty-eight (28) percent were neutral on this question and only thirty-six (36) participants or eight (8) percent did not agree that site-based management would allow for more support staff input.

The majority of respondents were positive about site-based management allowing for more input at the building level than the present management system. All positive responses had means that ranged from supervisors (3.100) who were the lowest positive means, to high school teachers (3.800) who had the highest response. The board members' responses (2.440) were the least positive. The support staff mean of 3.605 may indicate this group felt a site-based management council would give them more input at the building level. (Table XXI)

Tukey's HSD test indicated some areas of difference with board members and principals, high school teachers, elementary teachers, support staff and parents at the .01 level. However, the level of significant difference has been established at the .05 level. Since the levels of difference were small, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 10: Site-based management would allow for instructional staff input at the building level better than our present management system.

The data for this question is presented in Table XXII. A total of two hundred seventy-eight (278) respondents or sixty-six (66) percent agreed or strongly agreed that site-based management would allow for more instructional

TABLE XX
Frequency Distribution
Question #9

			(SD&D)				(A&SA)	
	SD	D	Total	N	A	SA	Total	Grand Total
Parents	0	2	(2)	21	30	11	(41)	64
Sp.Staff	6	5	(11)	20	63	9	(72)	103
Elem.Tchs.	1	10	(11)	38	66	14	(80)	129
H.S.Tchs.	0	5	(5)	30	39	21	(60)	95
Principals	0	2	(2)	1	6	2	(8)	11
Supv.	2	0	(2)	4	3	1	(4)	10
Bd.Memb.	3	1	(4)	3	2	0	(2)	9
TOTAL	12	24	(36)	117	209	58	(267)	421
Percentage	2%	6%	(8%)	28%	50%	14%	(64%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

TABLE XXI
QUESTION #9
Descriptive Statistics – Means

H.S.Tchs.	Parents	Principals	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Supervisors	Bd.Memb.
3.800	3.774	3.727	3.647	3.605	3.100	2.444

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
Supervisors		n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significant difference between groups

TABLE XXII
Frequency Distribution
Question #10

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	0	3	(3)	19	33	9	(42)	64
Sp.Staff	5	9	(14)	20	61	81	(69)	103
Elem.Tchs.	2	11	(13)	27	74	15	(89)	129
H.S.Tchs.	1	4	(5)	27	41	22	(63)	95
Principals	0	2	(2)	2	5	2	(7)	11
Supv.	2	0	(2)	3	4	1	(5)	10
Bd.Memb.	2	2	(4)	2	3	0	(3)	9
TOTAL	12	31	(43)	100	221	57	(278)	421
Percentage	3%	7%	(10%)	24%	52%	14%	(66%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

staff input at the building level better than our present management system. One hundred (100) respondents or twenty-four (24) percent that had no opinion on this question. However, a small number, forty-three (43) or ten (10) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed on this question. Four hundred twenty-one (421) individuals answered this question.

The analysis of the data in Table XXIII indicated high school teachers had the most positive mean with a 3.832, parents were very close with a 3.742 mean followed by elementary teachers' mean of 3.699, principals' mean of 3.636, support staff's mean of 3.581, and supervisors' mean of 3.200. The board members' mean of 2.667 indicated a less positive response that site-based management would allow for more instructional staff input at the building level than our present management system.

Tukey's (HSD) test indicates there are areas of significant difference between the responses. Significant areas of difference existed between the board members' responses as compared to the principals response which was at the .05 level of significance. There was a smaller level of significance (.01) between the board members' and high school teachers' and parents' response. Two other areas of significant levels of difference existed between board members and elementary teachers at the .05 level and board members and support staff .05 level of significance and a less significant difference between board members and parents (.01) Tukey's test has proven there are significant levels of difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis that site-based management allows for instructional staff input at the building level better than our present management system was rejected.

TABLE XXIII
QUESTION #10
Descriptive Statistics – Means

H.S.Tchs.	Parents	Elem.Tchs.	Bd.Memb.	Principals	Sp.Staff	Supervisors
3.832	3.742	3.699	2.667	3.636	3.581	3.200

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01
Supervisors		n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significant difference between groups

Question 11: Site-based management empowers all individuals involved in the decision-making process.

A total of two hundred fifty-six (256) or sixty-one (61) percent of respondents believed site-based management would empower all individuals involved in the decision making process. One hundred thirty-six (136) or thirty-two (32) percent of the respondents had no opinion on this question. Only twenty-nine (29) respondents or seven (7) percent thought site-based management would not empower all individuals who make school related decisions. (Table XXIV)

The data from Table XXV indicates principals had the highest mean (4.000), followed by high school teachers (3.737), elementary teachers (3.654), support staff (3.535), and board members (3.000). Supervisors were less positive than other responding groups when asked the question, "Does site-based management empower all individuals involved in the decision making process?"

Tukey's (HSD) test showed areas of significant difference (.05) between supervisors and high school and elementary teachers. There were other areas of less significance between responses of board members as compared to principals and supervisors, each with a .01 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 12: Whenever possible, final decisions about school operations should be made at the school level.

A total of three hundred forty-eight (348) respondents or seventy-six (76) percent felt that whenever possible, final decisions about school operations should be made at the school level. Seventy-nine (79) respondents or seventeen (17) percent were neutral on this question. Only thirty-three (33) individuals or

TABLE XXIV
Frequency Distribution
Question #11

			(SD&D)				(A&SA)	
	SD	D	Total	N	A	SA	Total	Grand Total
Parents	1	2	(3)	24	30	7	(37)	64
Sp.Staff	5	3	(8)	34	53	8	(61)	103
Elem.Tchs.	2	6	(8)	40	69	12	(81)	129
H.S.Tchs.	1	3	(4)	30	47	14	(61)	95
Principals	0	0	(0)	2	7	2	(9)	11
Supv.	2	2	(4)	3	2	1	(3)	10
Bd.Memb.	2	0	(2)	3	4	0	(4)	9
TOTAL	13	16	(19)	136	212	44	(256)	421
Percentage	3%	4%	(7%)	32%	50%	11%	(61%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

TABLE XXV
QUESTION #11
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.	Parents	Sp.Staff	Bd.Memb.	Supervisors
4.000	3.737	3.654	3.629	3.535	3.000	2.800

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	.01	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors		01	.05	.05	n/s	n/s
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns – no significant difference between groups

seven (7) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that school decisions should be made at the local level whenever possible. (Table XXVI)

All groups responded positively to the question. Principals (4.455) felt very strongly that decisions should be made at the local school level. All groups responded positively ranging from principals (4.455) to school board members (3.111). (Table XXVII)

The data presented on Table XXVII indicated only areas of minor significance. These minor areas of difference were between board members and principals (.01 level), board members and high school teachers (.01) and supervisors and principals' perceptions (.01). A significant level of difference (.05) existed between the supervisors' perceptions as compared to the high school teachers' perceptions. Therefore, the respondents were not equal and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 13: Monroe County Schools will be more effective with site-based management (building level management).

A total of two hundred thirty-six (236) respondents or fifty-six (56) percent felt Monroe County Schools would be more effective with site-based management (building level management). One hundred forty-seven (147) respondents or thirty-five (35) percent were neutral on this question. Only thirty-eight (38) respondents or nine (9) percent did not believe Monroe County would be more effective under site-based management. Four hundred twenty-one individuals answered this question. (Table XXVIII)

TABLE XXVI
Frequency Distribution
Question #12

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	0	2	(2)	10	30	22	(52)	64
Sp.Staff	1	8	(9)	9	62	23	(85)	103
Elem.Tchs.	2	7	(9)	13	82	25	(107)	129
H.S.Tchs.	0	5	(5)	7	47	36	(83)	95
Principals	0	0	(0)	0	6	5	(11)	11
Supv.	0	4	(4)	1	3	2	(5)	10
Bd.Memb.	1	2	(3)	1	5	0	(5)	9
TOTAL	4	29	(32)	79	235	113	(348)	421
Percentage	1%	6%	(7%)	17%	51%	25%	(76%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

TABLE XXVII
QUESTION #12
Descriptive Statistics – Means

Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Parents	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Supervisors	Bd.Memb.
4.455	4.200	4.129	3.940	3.891	3.300	3.111

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	.01	.01	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors		.01	.05	n/s	n/s	n/s
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns - no significant difference between groups

TABLE XXVIII
Frequency Distribution
Question #13

	SD	D	(SD&D) Total	N	A	SA	(A&SA) Total	Grand Total
Parents	3	1	(4)	23	25	12	(37)	64
Sp.Staff	3	8	(11)	25	57	10	(67)	103
Elem.Tchs.	3	12	(15)	53	48	13	(61)	129
H.S.Tchs.	0	2	(2)	31	42	20	(62)	95
Principals	0	1	(1)	4	4	2	(6)	11
Supv.	2	1	(3)	5	1	1	(2)	10
Bd.Memb.	1	1	(2)	6	1	0	(1)	9
TOTAL	12	26	(38)	147	178	58	(236)	421
Percentage	3%	6%	(9%)	35%	42%	14%	(56%)	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-No opinion, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

The data shown in Table XXIX indicates the majority of respondent groups were positive. The groups that felt most positive were the high school teachers (mean of 3.842), parents (mean of 3.645), principals (mean of 3.636), and support staff (mean of 3.566). Supervisors and board members were least positive, with means of 2.800 and 2.778 respectively. The majority of responding groups' means indicated Monroe County Schools would be more effective with site-based management.

Tukey's (HSD) test indicated a small level of difference (.01) between board members' responses as compared to high school teachers. However, there was one significant level of difference (.05) between the supervisors' response as compared to the high school teachers. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 14: I am willing to make the changes necessary and obtain the knowledge to move to site-based management. (i.e. expense, training, extra time for site-based council meetings, etc.)

Table XXX two hundred sixty-nine (269) respondents or sixty-five (65) percent agreed or strongly agreed that they were willing to make the changes necessary and obtain the knowledge to move to site-based management. It is to be noted that the majority of board members, principals and supervisors were willing to make this commitment. One hundred and six (106) respondents or twenty-five (25) percent had no opinion on this question. Only forty-six (46) individuals or eleven (11) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with

TABLE XXIX
QUESTION #13
Descriptive Statistics – Means

H.S.Tchs.	Parents	Principals	Sp.Staff	Elem.Tchs.	Supervisors	Bd.Memb.
3.842	3.645	3.636	3.566	3.436	2.800	2.778

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

	Supervisors	Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff.	Parents
Bd.Memb.	n/s	n/s	.01	n/s	n/s	n/s
Supervisors		n/s	.05	n/s	n/s	n/s
Principals			n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
H.S.Tchs.				n/s	n/s	n/s
Elem.Tchs.					n/s	n/s
Sp.Staff						n/s

ns- no significant difference between groups

TABLE XXX
Frequency Distribution
Question #14

			(SD&D)				(A&SA)	
	SD	D	Total	N	A	SA	Total	Grand Total
Parents	1	2	(3)	26	25	10	(35)	64
Sp.Staff	8	5	(13)	26	55	9	(64)	103
Elem.Tchs.	4	18	(22)	27	68	12	(80)	129
H.S.Tchs.	1	5	(6)	23	45	21	(66)	95
Principals	0	1	(1)	0	8	2	(10)	11
Supv.	0	0	(1)	1	7	1	(8)	10
Bd.Memb.	0	0	(0)	3	5	1	(6)	9
TOTAL	14	31	(46)	106	213	56	269	421
Percentage	3%	7%	(10%)	25%	52%	13%	64%	100%

SD-Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-Neutral, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree

making the changes necessary and obtaining the knowledge to move to site-based management. Four hundred twenty-one (421) individuals responded to this question.

According to the data presented in Table XXXI, all groups were positive concerning the question of making the changes necessary to move to site-based management in the Monroe County School System. Principals were the most positive group with a mean of 4.000, followed by high school teachers (3.842), board members (3.778), supervisors (3.700), parents (3.645), elementary teachers (3.519) and finally the support staff (3.488).

Tukey's (HSD) test indicates no areas of significant difference. The means were close, with only .455 separating all responding groups. Comparison of the means of each group indicated agreement on this question. There appeared to be a strong willingness among all participants to make necessary changes and obtain the knowledge to move toward site-based management. This was one of the strongest statements made by all groups. The null hypothesis was not rejected concerning group respondents' willingness to make changes necessary and obtain the knowledge to move to site-based management.

TABLE XXXI
QUESTION #14
Descriptive Statistics

Principals	H.S.Tchs.	Bd.Memb.	Supervisors	Parents	Elem.Tchs.	Sp.Staff
4.000	3.842	3.778	3.700	3.645	3.519	3.488

Mean Contrasts--Tukey's HSD

No significant difference between groups.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if local school decision-makers believe site-based management is more effective than our present system of school management. The data from Question One was related to the present organizational structure, and how this structure was meeting the educational needs of the students in Monroe County. Overall, the respondents were pleased with the present system of school management, especially those people that held leadership positions such as school board members, supervisors and principals. Although the other groups were not negative concerning this question their responses were not as positive as groups in leadership positions.

All groups seemed satisfied with the present system of school management but indicated a strong desire to be educated about site-based management and to consider moving toward it. Parents and teachers indicated a consistent desire to be more involved in the decision-making process.

The data concerning the present management system were positive but indicated a need to involve others in making educational decisions. For example, parents were the least positive group when asked about the present leadership structure meeting the educational needs of children in Monroe County Schools.

The data also indicated a strong need to involve teachers in the decision making process. Question Number two related to present school board policies that allow school decision makers to make needed decisions. Elementary and

high school teachers had the least positive mean scores. In contrast, school board members, supervisors and principals felt strongly that school board policies were in place to allow decision making in the local schools.

On question number three, high school teachers, elementary teachers and parents had negative means that appeared to be saying, "We are not having enough input into the training needs related to teaching and learning in the school system." This indicates that teachers and parents must be brought into the decision-making process related to teaching and learning. Teachers may need to be involved more in curriculum development related to teaching and learning. These responses confirmed a need for teachers and parents to be brought into the inner circle, which makes decisions.

Question four asked respondents if the current management system was seeking advice from school decision makers. Both parents and elementary and high school teachers had negative means. These groups felt that there was very little effort made to seek their advice when establishing the educational program. This may indicate that school administrators need to make a strong concentrated effort to get input from parents and teachers. In-service training, teacher grade level meetings, department head input and parents' total involvement may be needed for successfully educating our children.

The data concerning Question five dealt with school administrators seeking the input of teachers, community members and others. The means for parents and elementary and high school teachers was low, which indicates they felt left out of the decision making process.

Question six asked the respondents if they prefer site-based management. Most groups were positive. The majority of participants surveyed preferred site-based management in making school decisions. However, supervisors had a negative mean of 2.900. However, this group may be expected to feel left out of the school decision-making process since they are not normally a part of the school site-based council.

Question seven asked the participants if they would like to learn more about site-based management. All groups indicated a strong interest in learning more about site-based management. This desire could be a strong building block for the development of in-service training programs for these groups. Staff development and special programs for parents and teachers in which well-known individuals help inform people about the benefits of site-based management could be a key factor in making a future transition to site-based management successful.

Question eight asked the respondents if they felt site-based management would improve instruction in the school system. The majority of respondents felt site-based management would improve instruction; however, supervisors (with a mean of 2.800) questioned the improvement of instruction in the classroom. Indeed, studies such as (Edward Miller 1995) seem to show little or no gain on academic tests given children in a school system which is governed by site-based councils.

Question nine related to the support staff at the various schools. Most groups felt site-based management would provide for more support staff

involvement at the building level than the current management system. The school board members were skeptical that support staff would be more involved with site-based management. The board members' overall mean was 2.444 for this question.

Question ten dealt with input from the instructional staff. Most groups felt site-based management would allow for more instructional staff input than does the current management system. However, board members seemed more skeptical about site-based management allowing for more input. Supervisors also felt site-based management would not empower all individuals. However, the other groups felt site-based management would empower individuals.

Question eleven dealt with empowerment of individuals to make decisions. Question twelve dealt with where the final decision should be made whenever possible. All groups had very positive means. The principals and high school teachers had the greatest positive means (4.455) followed by the high school teachers (4.200). Overwhelmingly, the majority felt decisions need to be made at the school level whenever possible.

Question thirteen dealt with the various groups' responses on improving the effectiveness of the Monroe County School System by adopting site-based management. All groups, with the exception of school board members and supervisors, were positive about the effectiveness of Monroe County Schools being improved with site-based management.

Question fourteen dealt with the various groups' willingness to gain the knowledge necessary to move to site-based management. All groups were

willing to make necessary changes and to obtain the knowledge to move to site-based management. All respondents were very positive about learning more about site-based management. The null hypothesis concerning this question was accepted.

The respondents seemed to feel that site-based management would allow for staff input at the building level better than our present management system. Although there were less significant levels of difference between the groups surveyed, none were at the .05 level of significance.

The majority of respondents agreed to make the changes necessary and obtain the knowledge to move to site-based management. (i.e. expense, training, extra time for site-based council meetings, etc.) No significant levels of difference were indicated by the various groups. This situation represents an excellent foundation for the movement to site-based management for the Monroe County School System.

Conclusions

The majority of groups surveyed seem satisfied with the present management system; however, a majority of people surveyed feel as though they would like to move to site-based management. The groups wanted decisions made at the local school level as much as possible. The groups were overwhelmingly willing to learn more about site-based management and even make a time commitment.

Most groups felt a stronger need to be involved in the decision-making process, especially parents, elementary teachers and high school teachers. These groups are an essential component of a highly effective educational program. Involving parents and teachers in curriculum development and overall school decisions needs to be a priority for improving the overall educational program.

Change is very hard for most organizations. The school board, principals, supervisors, elementary and high school teachers, support staff and parents seem to have a strong desire to look at new avenues of school management to improve the overall educational programs. There is a general agreement as to the benefits of a training program to educate all groups concerning the site-based management style of school management.

Recommendations

The Monroe County School System should look at various means through programs and staff development to educate all groups on the benefits of site-based management. The school board and administrators should search for specialists who could discuss site-based management with all affected groups of people.

The present school system management and overall policies are not totally ineffective. Many groups were satisfied; however, various groups felt they needed more overall involvement in the decision-making process. One recommendation is for an educational program explaining the positive and

negative aspects of site-based management. A second recommendation is to pilot two schools in the school district for three years to see how site-based management would work in the Monroe County School System. This would allow the schools to work together to resolve difficulties that may develop. There would be a tremendous benefit, with two pilot schools walking the same road and developing solutions for problems in a team effort. After the three year period, with evaluations of the site-based management system, a more sufficient knowledge base should result in better decisions about the movement to site-based management.

To advance to site-based management the Monroe County Board of Education would have to adopt more flexible policies. All accountability standards would have to be met by the school chosen to pilot the site-based management style of management.

A final recommendation offered is to search for new ways to involve parents and teachers in the Monroe County School System. Faculty meetings with teachers to develop new avenues to seek their input into the decision-making process could be held. PTO forums would also provide parental in-put into the decisions made at the local school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambrosie, F. & Haley, P.W. (October, 1991). The role of the curriculum specialist in site-based management. NASSP Bulletin, 75(537), 73-81.

Aronstein, L.W. & DeBenedictis, K.L. (October, 1991). An interactiveworkshop: Encouraging school-based management. NASSAP Bulletin, 75(537), 67-72.

Barth, Roland S. (1990). Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference. San Francisco, California; Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Caldwell, Brian J. & Spinks, Jim M. (1992). Leading the self-managing school. Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Casner-Lotto, J. "Expanding the teacher's role: Hammond's school improvement process." Phi Delta Kappan,5(1988): 349-353.

Clune, W.H. & White, P.A. (1988). School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University.

David, J., Purkey, S., & White, P. (1988). Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts. Paper presented for the National Governors' Association, Washington, D.C.

David J. (May, 1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. Educational Leadership, 46(6), 45-51.

Educational Research Service. 1991. Site-based management.

Frazier, Charles. (1994). School-based decision making in Tennessee. State Board of Education Minutes, July 29, 1994.

Fullan, M.G. & Miles, M.B. (June, 1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(10), 745-752.

Griffin, Gary A. Influences of Shared Decision Making on School and Classroom Activity: Conversations with Five Teachers. The Elementary School Journal 96, 1 (September, 1995): 29-45. EJ 510 577.

Hallinger, P. (April, 1992). Conceptualizing school restructuring: Principals' and teachers' perceptions. (Summary). Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, 1-30.

Herman, J.J. (September, 1992). School based management: Sharing the resource decisions. NASSP Bulletin, *76*(545), 102-105.

Herman Jerry J. & Herman, Janice L. A state by state snapshot of school-based management practices. International Journal of Educational Reform, Vol.2, No. 3/July (1993): p. 1.

Hoyle, J.R. (November, 1992). Ten commandments for successful site-based management. NASSP Bulletin, 76(547), 81-87.

Johnson, S.M. Can schools be reformed at the bargaining table? Teachers College Record *2(*1987): 269-280.

Lange, J.T. (January, 1993). Site-based shared decision making: A resource for restructuring. NASSP Bulletin, 76(546), 98-107.

Lashway, Larry. The limits of shared decision making. ERIC Digest, No. 108/July (1996): p. 1.

Levin, H. M. (1988). Accelerated schools for at-risk students. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University.

Liontos, Lynn Balster. Shared Decision-Making. Eugene, Oregon: *ERIC* Clearinghouse on Educational Management (March 1994) ED 368 034.

Little, J.W. The power of organizational setting: School norms and staff development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, Los Angeles, California, 1981.

McDonnel, L.M. & Pascal, A. (1988). Teacher unions and education reforms. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University.

Marburger, C. (1985). One school at a time: School-based management a process for change. Columbia, Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Miller, Edward. Shared Decision-Making by Itself Doesn't make for Better Decisions. The Harvard Education Letter, 11, 6 (November/December 1995): 1-4.

National School Boards Association Report, 1988.

Purkey, S. & Smith, M. Effective schools: A review. The Elementary School Journal, 4(1983): 426-452.

Rogers, D. & Chung, N. H. (1983). 110 Livingston Street revisited: Decentralization in action. New York: New York University Press.

Rosenholtz, S.J. Education reform strategies: Will they increase teacher commitment? American Journal of Education, 4(1987): 534-562.

Spaulding, Angela McNabb. The Politics of the Principal: Influencing Teachers' School Based Decision Making. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans (April, 1994). ED 374 542

State Board of Education Minutes, July 29, 1994.

Taylor, B.O. & Levine, D.U. (January, 1991). Effective schools projects and school-based management. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 394-397.

Tennessee Code Annotated Amendment, 1991, Title 49, Chapter 2, Part 2.

Tennessee State Board Education Plan, 1991.

Wallace Jr., Richard C. (1996). From vision to practice. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.

Weiss, C. H. (Fall, 1993). Shared decision making about what? A comparison of schools with and without teacher participation. Teachers College Record, 95(1), 69-92

White, P.A. (1988). Resource materials on school-based management. New Burnswick, New Jersey: Center for Policy for Research in Education, Rutgers University.

White, Paula, (1989). An overview of school-based management: What does the research say? NASSP Bulletin: The journal for Middle Level and High School Administrators. Vol. 73, No.518, Reston Virginia.

Wilson, J. H. & Keedy, J. I. (November, 1991). Emerging patterns of

Wilson, J. H. & Keedy, J. I. (November, 1991). Emerging patterns of school-level and classroom-level changes in restructuring schools. (Summary). National Conference on School Restructuring. Atlanta, Georgia, 1-40.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
APPROVAL LETTER TO CONDUCT STUDY

Board of Education

MARTY ALLEN, Vice Chairman
313 Sunset Drive
Sweetwater, Tennessee
1st District

JEAN B. ALLISON
312 Povo Road
Madisonville, Tennessee
2nd District

JOHN W. HAMMONTREE
102 Hammontree Lane
Maryville, Tennessee
2nd District

ROBERT "RUSTY" VINEYARD
207 Blair Avenue
Sweetwater, Tennessee
1st District

Monroe County Department of Education

BOB LOVINGOOD, Director of Schools
205 Oak Grove Road
Madisonville, Tennessee 37354
Telephone: 442-2373
Fax: 442-1389

Chairman of School Board
Dr. JAMES DASH
302 College St.
Madisonville, Tennessee
2nd District

DEWITT UPTON
226 Washington Street
Sweetwater, Tennessee
1st District

JAMES E. MONGER
194 Mount Harmony Road
Tellico Plains, Tennessee
3rd District

KEITH SITZLER
348 County Farm Road
Madisonville, Tennessee
3rd District

STEVE ROGERS
207 Eagle Road
Tellico Plains, Tennessee
3rd District

November 12, 1996

University of Tennessee
Graduate Office
213 Student Services Building
Knoxville, TN 37996-0220

To Whom It May Concern:

Bob Lovingood, Monroe County Director of Schools and a doctoral student at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville has requested permission to conduct a survey on site-based management in the Monroe County School District. It is my understanding that all of the survey information will be reported as groups (ex school board members, administrators, teachers, support staff and community members). Individual names will not be used.

The rationale for the study is to ascertain the viewpoints of all decision makers in Monroe County as to the knowledge, interest and feasibility of implementing site-based management in the Monroe County School District. It is with great pleasure that we are granting Mr. Lovingood approval for this study.

Sincerely,

Dr. James Dash, Chairman
Monroe County School Board

JD/gs

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT SURVEY

Demographics-General Information

1. Gender __F__M **2.** Age: __<35__35-44__45-54__>54 **3.** Race: ___
4. Education - Highest degree earned: __No Diploma __HS Diploma __GED __Bachelor's __Master's __Ed. Specialist __Doctorate
5. Type of School Association: __Elementary __Middle __Jr. High __High School __Other
6. Position: __Board Member __Supervisor __Principal __Teacher __Support Staff __Parent __Student __Other

Survey Questions

Please circle the response that best reflects your perception of each statement. **Key:** 1 = SD-Strongly Disagree 2 = D-Disagree 3 = N-No Opinion/Unknown 4 = A-Agree 5 = SA-Strongly Agree

		SD	D	N	A	SA
1.	The current organizational leadership structure is meeting the educational needs of children in Monroe County. (i.e. School Board, Director of Schools, principal, supervisor, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
2.	School board policies that regulate the school system allows our school to make the decisions needed to run a quality educational program.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I have enough input into training needs related to teaching and learning in our school system.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Under the current management system, school administrators seek advice from school decision makers as they attempt to establish the educational program. (community, business, department heads, parents, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

		SD	D	N	A	SA
5.	School administrators currently encourage school decision makers to be an integral part of the decision making process. (teachers, support staff, community members, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I prefer a site based council at the local school to make school decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I would like to learn more about Site-Based Management.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Site-based management will improve instruction in the local school.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Site-based management would allow for support staff input at the building level better than our present management system.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Site-based management would allow for instructional staff input at the building level better than our present management system.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Site-based management empowers all individuals involved in the decision making process.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Whenever possible, final decisions about school operations should be made at the school level.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Monroe County Schools will be more effective with site-based management (building level management).	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I am willing to make the changes necessary and obtain the knowledge to move to site-based management. (i.e. expense, training, extra time for site-based council meetings, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C
LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

I am a doctoral student at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I am writing my dissertation on the feasibility of implementing site-based management in Monroe County Schools. Monroe County Schools are currently using the traditional management decision making process. The decisions made are a joint consensus of input from all involved parties with the ultimate and final decisions resting with the Director of Schools and the Monroe County School Board (elected representatives). (i.e. textbook committee recommendations, school calendar, personnel decisions, etc.)

Site-based management is sometimes referred to as school-based decision making. It is a type of school management that allows interested stakeholders to take an active role in the organization, staffing, governance and educational issues of a school. Because you are a stakeholder in the educational process of Monroe County Schools, I need your help to complete this study

Under both management systems there would still be a director of schools and a school board. However, fewer decisions would rest in the director of schools or school board's realm of authority

You will be asked to complete a site-based management survey. Your participation will be voluntary and you may decline or withdraw from participation at any time without penalty or prejudice.

The gathering of data for this study poses minimal risk to you. Possible outcomes of participation to you may be a renewed interest in the educational process in Monroe County, closer communication with other educational stakeholders and a contribution to the educational process in Monroe County.

All participants will be referred to as groups (ex. board members, principals, teachers, community members, etc.). There will be no reference to individual names, titles, or specific schools.

I am thanking you in advance for your participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Bob Lovingood, Director
Monroe County Schools

VITA

Robert Charles Lovingood was born on November 16, 1948 in Sweetwater, Tennessee. His residence is in the Hopewell Springs area of Monroe County near the Tellico Lake.

He attended a one-room school house called Brakebill School during his first year of school. This school was in the Monroe County School District. He transferred to Vonore Elementary where he graduated from high school in 1968. He attended Hiwassee College and graduated with an Associate of Arts Degree in 1970. He transferred to the University of Tennessee where he graduated in 1972 with a Bachelor of Science Degree.

He taught marketing for four years in Columbia, Tennessee at Columbia Central High school. He moved back to Monroe County in 1976 where he taught for one year and became Vocational Director and Principal of the Monroe County Vocational Center. He was then elected to office of Superintendent of Monroe County Schools. He continued his education at Middle Tennessee State University and University of Tennessee at Knoxville where he graduated with a Master's Degree in Educational Administration in 1975. He continued to take administrative courses receiving his +45 in 1980.

He has continued to lead the Monroe County School District forward assisting in development of technology and modern school facilities.

He is married to Darlene Shell Lovingood and they have three boys: Robby, Jeffrey and Andrew Lovingood.