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The purpose of this study was to analyze ways in which the roles of instructional support staff as perceived by principals and instructional support staff members in a large, suburban school district have been affected by the implementation of site-based decision making (SBDM). Research questions focused on changes which have occurred in the roles of instructional support staff and in the services provided to schools by support staff since the implementation of SBDM, the roles which support staff members believe they have in SBDM, the perceptions of principals regarding the roles of instructional support staff in SBDM, and a comparison of the views of instructional support staff and principals regarding the district's implementation of SBDM.

Open-ended interviews which focused on the research questions were conducted with seven key informants from instructional support staff and seven principals. A questionnaire based on the analysis of all the interview transcripts was completed by 33 central instructional support staff members and 22 principals in order to compare the perceptions of the larger group with those of the key informants. Pertinent documents were also collected and
analyzed. Data analysis was ongoing and followed a constant comparative model.

Findings suggest that principals generally feel more positive than support staff members about SBDM. From the outset, both groups should understand that the purpose of moving to SBDM is to improve student achievement. A comprehensive staff development program is necessary to build this philosophical foundation.

Districts implementing SBDM should communicate to principals and site-based teams that their responsibility includes utilizing the best available resources, which would include instructional support staff. However, support staff must be willing to serve as a resource rather than an authority figure. Opportunities which enable instructional support staff to feel valuable to, and valued by, principals and campus teams will provide a basis for future success.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The publication of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, the 1983 report compiled by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, served as a clarion call to action for state legislatures and school districts across the country. The initial wave of school reform efforts, consisting primarily of top-down, centralized mandates (Kirst, 1989; Pajak, 1993; Passow, 1989; Raywid, 1990), met with varying degrees of acceptance and success in the nation's schools and school districts. Passow (1989) notes that following the 1986-87 Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) report, a number of reports were written recommending a change in the focus of reform efforts.

The individual school came to be acknowledged as the unit or center of change (Boyer, 1983; Chubb, 1988; Goodlad, 1984; Lindelow, 1981; Sirotnik, 1987). It became clear to many that "if restructuring is to be successful, it must be building-based" (Harvey & Crandall, 1988, p. 12). In fact, it has been stated that: "No element of restructuring has received more attention than the issue of devolution of authority to the school site" (J. Murphy, 1991, p. 36). Marburger (1985) suggests that centrally organized school districts
create a psychological distance as well as a physical distance between schools and the central office and that a decentralized form of organization better serves schools by sharing the power and decisions with those teachers, principals, parents, and citizens who care most about the quality of education that students receive at each local school (p. 26). Thus, many schools and districts, viewing the purpose of restructuring the system as providing schools with the flexibility and the decision-making authority to do what is best for their particular students, selected site-based decision making or school-based management as the vehicle which would transport them to higher levels of educational reform.

A 1988 report, compiled by the Association of California School Administrators, based on recommendations from California's Commission on Public School Administration and Leadership, supports school-based decision making as a reform to improve public school administration. This document further suggests that while it is the responsibility of the school board and superintendent to provide a clear and unifying vision for the district, it is the responsibility of the central office to support implementation of this vision at the school site and to provide direction to those schools which have difficulty transforming the vision into effective, quality programs.

A district's move from centralization to decentralization, from decision making at the central office to decision making at the school site, is likely to have an effect on the roles of all professional
personnel in that district. In site-based decision making, the power of the superintendent and school board is shared with those who are most familiar with the goals and needs which are unique to each local school (Guthrie, 1986; Marburger, 1985; J. Murphy, 1991). The principal is given more authority and autonomy over the school and the teachers and parents become more active participants in school planning, programs, policies, and governance (Caldwell & Wood, 1988; Clune & White, 1988; Lewis, 1989; Malen & Ogawa, 1988).

The shift from centralized management to site-based decision making means that the roles of central office staff change from those of decision makers to support personnel (Harrison, Killion & Mitchell, 1989). While a traditional central office imposes structures, goals, and requirements on principals and teachers (Tewel & Holzman 1991), a decentralized system of decision making requires that the superintendent and other district office personnel know how to facilitate rather than dictate (Lindelow & Heyndericks, 1989). Those who work as central office supervisors must become troubleshooters, adept at assisting principals and teachers with identifying problems and developing solutions (Lucas, 1988).

This study was designed to add to the body of research on the changing role of a school district's central instructional support staff as it relates to the implementation of site-based decision making. The need for initiation, leadership, commitment, and management by central administrators has been identified as a key factor in the process of implementing local school improvement (Anderson et al.,
Duttweiler and Mutchler (1990) note that change at the school level must be accompanied by changes at all levels of the system for real improvement to take place and that schools' efforts to change are severely hampered without central district leadership and support.

Cox (1983) states that "central office personnel—curriculum coordinators, program directors, and specialists—have emerged as significant actors in the process of change. In fact, central office staff may well be the linchpins of school improvement efforts, linking together the external assisters and the building level administrators and teachers. They appear to be the most appropriate local sources of assistance in actually using new practices" (p. 10). If these central office personnel are indeed critical linchpins of school improvement (Fullan, 1982) then it is of significance to determine the role played by central instructional support staff in schools and districts which are implementing site-based decision making.

Background

During the 1991 regular legislative session, the Texas state legislature adopted Section 21.931 of the Texas Education Code (Appendix A). This legislation directed that by January 1, 1992, the state's commissioner of education was to identify or make available to school districts various models for implementing site-based decision making. Further, the commissioner was directed to arrange for training in site-based decision making through one or more
sources for school board trustees, superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, and other members of school communities. This law also required that each school district in Texas develop and implement a plan for site-based decision making not later than September 1, 1992, and that each plan must be submitted to the commissioner for approval.

Prior to the passage of this legislation, several Texas school districts had begun to implement site-based decision making. Across the country, many other districts had based their initial restructuring efforts on the principles of shared governance or site-based decision making. David (1989) states that such restructuring generally requires "a major shift in how people in school systems think about roles and relationships. The shift is from a system characterized by controlling and directing what goes on at the next lower level to guiding and facilitating professionals in their quest for more productive learning opportunities for students" (p. 28).

The structural changes which result from a school district's move to site-based decision making are typically accompanied by a reduction in both the number of levels in the district's hierarchy and the number of personnel in middle management (Sickler, 1988). In some districts, those who formerly occupied these mid-management roles are reassigned to support functions in individual schools (Snider, 1989), while in other districts the money which had been used to fund these mid-management positions is freed up to support new initiatives at school sites (Sickler, 1988).
As central offices become smaller in restructured school districts, personnel previously housed at the district level, and the responsibilities which historically were undertaken by those staff members, are likely to be transferred to schools (Lindelow, 1981). Those who remain as middle managers are likely to find that their role is "more focused on providing services directly to schools" (David, 1989, p. 29).

Statement of the Problem
The problem for this study was to describe the effects of one school district's implementation of site-based decision making on the roles of central instructional support staff members.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to analyze how the roles of central instructional support staff as perceived by principals and central instructional support staff members in one selected school district have been affected by the implementation of site-based decision making.

Research Questions
The problem for this study focused on and was guided by the following research questions:
1. What changes have occurred in the roles of central instructional support staff members since the school district implemented site-based decision making?

2. What roles do central instructional support staff members believe that they have in site-based decision making in the schools?

3. What changes have occurred in the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff members since the implementation of site-based decision making?

4. What are the perceptions of school principals regarding the roles of central instructional support staff members in site-based decision making?

5. How do the views of central instructional support staff members compare with the views of the principals regarding the district's implementation of site-based decision making?

Significance of the Study

This study provides a description of the roles of central instructional support staff in a school district which has been implementing site-based decision making for approximately six years. The changed, or changing, roles of central instructional staff are presented from the perspective of both central instructional support staff and building principals.

Since the state of Texas mandated that each school district in the state develop and implement a plan for site-based decision making not later than September 1, 1992, the results of this study
should provide valuable information to districts which are currently in the early phases of implementing site-based decision making. Further, school districts in other parts of the country which have adopted site-based decision making can profit from the results of this study. The effects of site-based decision making on the role of central instructional support staff, these critical linchpins of school improvement (Fullan, 1982), are likely be felt throughout the system. It is also significant to note that with funding for public schools a persistent concern, the cost of retraining instructional support staff to assume the changing role which may result from site-based decision making can be estimated with a relatively high degree of accuracy, while the loss of those who cannot adapt to change "bears an inestimable price in lost experience, expertise, and leadership" (Cunningham, 1992, p. 32).

Definition of Terms

1. Site-based decision making is defined by the Texas Education Agency as "a process for decentralizing decisions to improve the educational outcomes at every school campus through a collaborative effort by which principals, teachers, campus staff, district staff, parents, and community representatives assess educational outcomes of all students, determine goals and strategies, and ensure that strategies are implemented and adjusted to improve student achievement" (Resource guide..., 1992, p. II-1).
2. **Site-based leadership** is the term which the district in this study has adopted to refer to site-based decision making.

3. **Central instructional support staff** includes the directors and curriculum specialists, or coordinators, who provide assistance, guidance, and technical support to teachers and principals in the areas of basic instruction and special programs. The work of this group has historically included: (a) curriculum writing, (b) providing staff development for teachers and principals regarding issues related to curriculum and instruction, (c) setting district instructional priorities, (d) planning and providing appropriate staff development programs for new teachers, (e) participating in program evaluation, (f) facilitating the effective implementation of federal and state mandates as well as district policies, (g) being available on an "on call" basis to assist principals and teachers with problems related to curriculum or instruction, and (h) promoting the use of research in decision-making. Additionally, prior to the 1994-1995 school year, members of central instructional support staff were routinely assigned to assist principals in the evaluation of teachers through the use of the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS) instrument.

4. **Basic instruction** encompasses reading, language arts, foreign language, mathematics, social studies, science, health, computer instruction, technology/occupational instruction, music, art, and physical education. The directors and curriculum specialists in basic instruction report to the district's assistant superintendent for instruction.
5. **Special programs** include the areas of special education, bilingual education, English as a second language (ESL), guidance and counseling, programs for gifted students, psychological services, and health services. The directors and curriculum specialists in special programs also report to the district's assistant superintendent for instruction.

6. The **Instructional Leadership Team (ILT)**, chaired by the assistant superintendent for instruction, includes all central instructional support staff members in the district as well as representatives from the district's staff development and research and testing departments. The Instructional Leadership Team meets once each month during the school year.

7. The **Instructional Leadership Team Advisory Board** is made up of selected members of the Instructional Leadership Team. The ILT Advisory Board, also headed by the assistant superintendent for instruction, typically meets monthly, one to two weeks prior to the Instructional Leadership Team meeting. Members of the ILT Advisory Board provide input and feedback to the assistant superintendent from the various departments or areas of instruction, develop plans and goals for the division of instruction, and assist in setting the agenda for the monthly ILT meetings.

8. This district's **Site-Based Leadership Cabinet** is defined as an internal, working group designed to monitor and support schools and the district in efforts related to site-based decision making. The
cabinet is composed of elementary and secondary principals, assistant principals, and central staff representatives.

9. The district authorizes each junior high school and high school to have **departmental chairpersons** in English/language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, and physical education. Departmental chairpersons are selected by the principal and serve for a single year. The duties of a departmental chairperson include providing assistance in the organization of the department and the development of departmental policy, assisting with the development of plans for evaluation and improvement within the subject area, and providing assistance to new members of the department staff.

10. **Contact teachers** are designated in each elementary school in the areas of language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, and technology. Contact teachers are selected by the principal and serve for a single year. The duties of a contact teacher include serving as a communication link between district instructional specialists and school staff, providing the school staff with content-specific information received at district meetings, and providing leadership in curriculum and instruction.

11. According to Section 11.273 of the Texas Education Code, a school campus or district may apply to the state board of education for a **waiver** of a requirement or prohibition imposed by law or rule that the campus or district determines inhibits student achievement.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

During the past decade there has been tremendous growth in the base of research related to site-based decision making. In contrast, relatively few studies have focused on the role of central instructional support staff in school districts, and even less has been written regarding the role of central instructional staff in site-based decision making. The following review of related literature provides a brief overview of site-based decision making, including its roots in the business community and the effects of site-based decision making on corporate middle managers. Information related to the perceptions which central instructional support staff have about their role in schools is presented, as are recent reports describing the role which can be played by central instructional support staff in site-based decision making.

Proponents of school reform and restructuring have found support for fundamentally different operating systems from contemporary management theory and from activities in the corporate world (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986; Schlechty, 1990; Thompson, 1988). In the 1980s, American business, faced with poor product quality, declining
employee morale, and increasingly disgruntled customers, looked inward to determine how the most successful of their peers were operating and to search for industry best practices that, presumably, would lead to superior performance (Camp, 1989; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982).

Generally, it was discovered that the most effective organizations had decentralized operations. This decentralization was accomplished by placing the responsibility for decision making with those in the organization closest to the customer, by adopting a management philosophy based on empowerment rather than control, by focusing on product quality, and by learning to view employees at all levels as partners in the corporation (Peters & Waterman, 1982). Thus, businesses became less hierarchically organized, with "less obvious structuring and certainly less layering" (p. 270).

Corporate competition with Japan led to innumerable comparisons between the American system and the Japanese system. Peters and Waterman (1982) reveal that one of the biggest contrasts between Japanese and American corporations is in the number of middle management levels. Citing the philosophy espoused by Ed Carlson, former chairman of United Airlines, these authors point out that, in most organizations, "middle management has little role beyond 'make work' activities, such as stopping ideas coming down and stopping ideas going up... Hands-on management becomes a lot more workable when there are fewer people in the middle" (p. 313).
Ornstein (1989) notes that "in an effort to reduce controllable expenses and increase efficiency, many [American] corporations have done away with vast numbers of corporate managers" (p. 806). Since some corporate executives view the lessons learned by business as the foundation for educational reform (Kearns, 1988a, 1988b), considerable pressure has been exerted on schools to adopt new and improved corporate organizational structures. In the words of David T. Kearns, chairman and chief executive officer of the Xerox Corporation, "Schools today ought to look like the smartest high-tech companies look, with lean structures and flat organizations" (1988b, p. 567). It is not surprising, then, that along with placing more decision-making responsibility at the level of the school, the idea of streamlining central office staff has spread to more and more school districts.

Historically, the majority of central instructional support staff members have served in a mid-level position designed to link the needs of the school system as an organization and the needs of individual teachers and building principals (Diamond, 1979). Studies of instructional supervisors have frequently been surveys of supervisors, administrators, and/or teachers concerning their perceptions of the supervisor's role (Brande, 1981; Carlton, 1970; Carmon, 1970; Kyle, 1984; Lovell & Phelps, 1976; Spears, 1980; Young & Heichberger, 1975). Such studies have sought to identify areas of agreement among various professional personnel in public
schools with regard to preferred roles and/or activities for instructional supervisors.

A descriptive study of central office supervisors reported by Blumberg (1984) was conducted by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Committee on Research on Central Office Supervision. The responses of 75 central office supervisors indicated that: (a) the nature of role expectations and job titles of central office supervisors are idiosyncratic; (b) many supervisors feel that the efficacy of their role is continually questioned; (c) the number of central office supervisors employed in a particular district is related to both the number of pupils and the number of schools; and (d) as the number of central office positions has been reduced, respondents were required to assume additional responsibilities.

In a study of four outstanding central office instructional supervisors, Floyd (1987) found that credibility and flexibility were the key attributes which enabled these subjects to work effectively with the teachers and administrators in their school districts, and to influence the curriculum and instructional programs. Credibility is derived from the instructional supervisor's professional skills, experience, and leadership in matters related to instruction. Flexibility comes from one's ability to adapt to, and respond appropriately and effectively to, the fragmented and ambiguous role of central office instructional supervisor.

It seems apparent that the attributes of credibility and flexibility will serve central office instructional supervisors well as
school districts become more decentralized. Decentralization calls for a shift from a system of centrally enforced rules to what has been referred to as management by exception. "Under this approach, middle managers concentrate their attention on those units with problems and unrealized potential, while giving maximum freedom to others. Such administrative attention might take the form of extra doses of on-site consultation, professional development, persuasion, prodding, or sanctions—depending on the situation" (J. T. Murphy, 1989, p. 811).

Duttweiler and Mutchler (1990) report that the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) developed and conducted a survey in 1989 of educators who at that time were implementing either school-based management or shared decision making. According to these authors, responses to the SEDL survey indicate skepticism that "the central office can continue to function as a collection of departments with budgets and tasks imposed from above. Sites that have been engaged in school-based management for some time tend to describe central office as a flexible service department that responds to needs emerging from below, that is, from the individual schools. A 'supply and demand' cycle may emerge in which central staffing and resource allocation is based on school site 'demand' for specific curriculum materials, training, and technical assistance" (p. 67).

Although decentralization means that those closest to the problem have the opportunity to solve the problem, Hill and Bonan
(1991) caution that it must not be assumed that those closest to the problem will also have the prerequisite knowledge and resources necessary to reach a solution. Schools must be able to freely ask for assistance and request advice without "reopening the doors to regulation" (p. 17). The central office must no longer be an enforcement agency staffed by police officers, but a service agency staffed by facilitators and coordinators (J. T. Murphy, 1989). "The implicit assumption is that schools can be trusted and that, while they may need help, they do not need control" (p. 811).

It follows, then, that site-based decision making calls for central office staff to become primarily support personnel rather than decision makers (Harrison, Killion, & Mitchell, 1989). The ultimate realization of this role is one in which individual schools contract with central office personnel for the services they require. Building personnel determine the priorities for their school, and central office staff support those efforts rather than leading or directing the schools' efforts (p. 57).

Cunningham (1992) adds that the concept of school-based or campus-based management calls for district level administrators to take on the role of 'planning support consultants'. District level personnel must provide technical support to school management teams as they analyze the status of their campus in order to decide where discrepancies exist between their current status and district goals. It is the responsibility of the school management team to determine which discrepancies are of the highest priority for their
campus and how the school will go about reducing these discrepancies. Although district level support is an integral part of the process a school uses to develop objectives and action plans, it must remain support. District level staff may not substitute their judgment for that of the school management team. Although the curriculum content, staff development, instructional standards, budget, staffing, and appraisal guidelines which are parts of initial districtwide programming will serve to influence the procedures selected by school management teams, these must be influencing factors and not directing factors (p. 30).

In reporting on one school district's restructuring plan, Lucas (1988) notes that the district superintendent sees the central office staff becoming troubleshooters, helping teachers and principals identify problems and develop solutions. Restructuring efforts in another district have required central office staff "to review services and methods of delivery to ensure they are compatible with and support the schools' new roles" (Delahant, 1990, p. 17). Another study notes that one result of the authority shift caused by one district's move to site-based decision making was a redirection of central office staff to provide support to school site initiatives and to monitor outcomes (Richardson, 1986).

Asayesh (1994) points out that "decentralization has placed new pressures on central office staff without always providing commensurate opportunities for learning how to handle those pressures... As the decentralization movement has re-emphasized the
role of the schoolhouse and de-emphasized the role of central office. central office administrators have typically not received the kind of support and training they need to make a difficult transition" (p. 3). This author quotes an assistant superintendent who stated that in her school district 'central office staff have been sort of a step-child with site-based... With the new emphasis on individual schools, central office staff not only did not receive special training in their new role, but were often cut out of the information loop' (Asayesh, 1994, p.3).

If, as Fullan (1991) states, "the purpose of reform should be to help schools accomplish their educational goals more efficiently and effectively for all students" (p. 203), then it would seem to follow that school districts have an opportunity to make central office staff key players in assisting schools attain their goals. The role which is developed for central instructional support staff in site-based decision making should encourage these people to use their knowledge, experience, and expertise not only to assist in the implementation of specific programs but, more importantly, to help establish both the districtwide and school level conditions necessary for continuous improvement (Fullan, 1990).
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

As site-based decision making is implemented in any school or district, central office personnel can expect changes in roles and shifts in authority. Central staff members must adjust to new roles as supporters and facilitators to the schools, as opposed to bosses or supervisors (Caldwell & Wood, 1988; Clune & White, 1988).

Cavender (1992) states that central staff members face a major role change as site-based decision making is advanced. It is necessary for this group to move from directing to being service-oriented and willing to "provide what is necessary to make schools successful. The new norm will be that staff does not report to but rather works with colleagues, forming an important framework of support" (p. 8).

The purpose of this study was to analyze how the roles of central instructional support staff, as perceived by principals and central instructional support staff members in one school district, have been affected by the implementation of site-based decision making. This study, which was exploratory in nature, focused on and was guided by research questions which asked the following: (a)
what changes have occurred in the roles of central instructional support staff members since the school district implemented site-based decision making, (b) what roles do central instructional support staff members believe that they have in site-based decision making in the schools, (c) what changes have occurred in the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff members since the implementation of site-based decision making, (d) what are the perceptions of principals regarding the roles of central instructional support staff members in site-based decision making, and (e) how do the views of central instructional support staff members compare with the views of principals regarding the district's implementation of site-based decision making?

Interviews, questionnaires, and an extensive document search were the primary methods used to collect information about the perceptions of central instructional support staff members and principals concerning the roles of central instructional staff in site-based decision making. A qualitative design was chosen in order "to provide rich, descriptive data about the contexts, activities, and beliefs" of the key informants and respondents (Goetz & LeCompte, p. 17). The inclusion of a quantitative component in the analysis of questionnaire data provides a graphic display and description of the information obtained from the total of 55 questionnaire respondents.
Research Design

Site of the Study

The school district which was the site of this study is a suburban district in a large metropolitan area in Texas. The district employs approximately 2500 professional staff members and serves approximately 33,000 students in four high schools (grades 10-12), nine junior high schools (grades 7-9), and 36 elementary schools (K-6). In addition to serving kindergarten through sixth grade students, ten of the elementary schools have pre-kindergarten classes for four year old students who are economically disadvantaged and/or speak limited English, and five elementary campuses are sites for early childhood classes which are special education programs for identified handicapped students who are from three years of age through five years of age.

The school district is divided into two attendance areas, each under the direction of an Area Assistant Superintendent. For the purpose of this study, these two areas were designated Attendance Area I and Attendance Area II. Attendance Area I includes two high schools, four junior high schools, and 17 elementary schools. Attendance Area II is comprised of two high schools, five junior high schools, and 19 elementary schools.

Background

The school district which was studied introduced the concept of site-based decision making in the spring of 1987. At that time, eight
principals were selected to research the concept of site-based decision making and analyze both its possibilities and potential problems. Out of the total of 49 schools in this district, the eight schools represented by these principals consisted of two high schools, one junior high school, and five elementary schools. During the 1987-1988 school year, a pilot program of site-based decision making was launched at these eight sites.

By the 1988-1989 school year, every school in the district had its own site-based planning team composed of staff members, parents, and community representatives. In the fall of 1988, all of the site-based planning teams participated in a weekend retreat designed to assist schools in developing their own mission, belief statements, and action plans.

During the course of the 1988-1989 school year, a number of central instructional support staff members were assigned to serve as facilitators for some of the site-based planning teams while others on central staff were assigned to be members of a particular school's planning team. This practice met with only limited success. Some planning teams expected their central staff representative to be in attendance at every meeting while others rarely notified the central staff representative of the dates and times of planning team meetings. Some central staff members who served as facilitators during the retreat were subsequently asked to facilitate all of the team meetings for that particular school. Other central staff facilitators were seldom called upon for any type of assistance. The
practice of assigning central instructional staff members to school planning teams, either as facilitators or participants, was discontinued after the 1988-1989 school year.

However, over the next few years, the concept of site-based decision making in the district continued to evolve and expand. Components which have been included in the district's concept of site-based decision making are: (a) The principal is seen as the leader in facilitating change; (b) School planning teams determine goals, measure progress, and address effective school correlates; (c) The district strategic plan drives the improvement process; (d) School site budgeting provides for flexibility; (e) Performance reports chart progress toward achievement of goals; and (f) School plans are used to determine each school's staff development needs.

In the spring of 1991, a district level team was formed to address the requirements imposed on school districts by Section 21.931 of the Texas Education Code. This team, co-chaired by two assistant superintendents, consisted of two secondary principals, three elementary principals, two secondary assistant principals, one elementary assistant principal, and three representatives from the central instructional support staff. It is of note that the three elementary principals and one elementary assistant principal in this group had all previously served as members of the district's central instructional support staff.

Working through mid-June of 1991 and reconvening in August of that year, this district level team, which had come to be referred
to as the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet, developed a booklet containing a brief history of the development of site-based decision making in the district, a position paper, legal references, definitions of terms related to site-based decision making, and descriptions of the formation and operation of the school level and district level councils which would guide the district's continued implementation of site-based decision making. This document was presented to the Board of Trustees and distributed to all principals in August, 1991.

Two members of the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet, an elementary principal and a central instructional support staff member, presented the document to the members of the district's division of instruction at a meeting of the Instructional Leadership Team in September, 1991. The Instructional Leadership Team, headed by the district's assistant superintendent for instruction, consists of all of the directors and program specialists for the areas of basic instruction and special programs.

The Site-Based Leadership Cabinet continued to meet monthly during the 1991-1992 school year. This group was charged with developing the district's plan for site-based decision making which, by law, had to be submitted to the state commissioner of education no later than September 1, 1992. Subcommittees were assigned to write various segments of the district plan and by May, 1992, two members of this group, an elementary principal and a central staff member, were given the responsibility of compiling information from
the subcommittees and writing the actual plan which would be sent to the commissioner of education.

The schools district's Board of Trustees approved the district's plan for site-based decision making in August, 1992, and the plan was then submitted to the state commissioner of education for approval. In October, 1992, the district superintendent was notified by a representative from the office of the commissioner that the plan had been approved and had also received a commendation from the commissioner.

In accordance with the state mandate, the district's plan for site-based decision making is primarily focused on the establishment of school committees and the role of these school committees regarding decision making related to goal setting, curriculum, budgeting, staffing patterns, and school organization. The district plan for site-based decision making points out the need for support and guidance from central administration in order to ensure the success of site-based decision making and also refers to representation from central staff and/or central administration on two different district councils; however, the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making is not specifically defined or explained in the district plan.

**Participants in the Study**

Key informants are individuals within a setting who possess status, special knowledge, communicative skills, or insights, and who
are willing to share their knowledge of the setting with the researcher (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Key informants for the interviews conducted during this study were seven members of the district's central instructional support staff and seven school principals from Attendance Area I.

The seven members of the district's central instructional support staff were: the assistant superintendent for instruction, the coordinating director of basic instruction, the administrative director for language arts/reading, the administrative director for mathematics, the administrative director for science, the administrative director for social studies, and the director for administrator staff development. Three of these seven informants, including the assistant superintendent for instruction, were previously assigned as elementary school principals in this district; one of the six directors was an assistant principal at a junior high school.

The seven principals from Attendance Area I who served as key informants included five elementary principals, one junior high school principal, and one senior high school principal. Each of the five elementary principals was selected because, in addition to being an elementary principal for at least three years, he or she had previously served the district as a member of the central instructional support staff. The two secondary principals were selected based upon the recommendation of the assistant superintendent who supervises all of the building administrators in
Attendance Area I. In the opinion of the area superintendent, these two secondary principals have been outstanding in their efforts to establish, promote, and develop site-based decision making in their respective buildings.

All 25 principals in Attendance Area II and all of the 38 remaining members of central instructional support staff were asked to respond to a written questionnaire. Following approval by the assistant superintendent who oversees Attendance Area II, those principals received their questionnaires via the district's inter-school mail. With the approval of the assistant superintendent for instruction, central instructional support staff members were presented with the questionnaire during the course of a regularly scheduled meeting of the Instructional Leadership Team. None of the key informants was considered eligible to complete a questionnaire.

Each interview participant and questionnaire respondent was provided with a letter which explained the purpose of the study and assured participants/respondents of confidentiality. Gaining entre into the various school or office settings for the purpose of completing the study was accomplished by obtaining oral permission from the participants prior to conducting the interviews or administering the questionnaires.
Methodology

This study took place within the context of the selected school district using primarily a qualitative design, augmented by a quantitative component in the analysis of questionnaire data. Qualitative methodology allows investigation of a subject when the researcher is, in the absence of prior research in that particular area, seeking to identify those dimensions which describe the area and provide grounded theory as a guide to further research. A conceptually ordered presentation of findings gathered through qualitative research is said to be grounded in the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Qualitative design demands that data analysis be ongoing and follow a constant comparative model. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1992), "designs of all qualitative studies involve the combination of data collection with analysis" (p. 72). The constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987) is a research design for multidata sources in which the formal analysis begins early in the study and is near completion by the time all data have been collected.

Glaser (cited in Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p. 74) outlines the steps in the constant comparative method of developing theory as follows: (a) Begin collecting data; (b) Look for key issues, recurrent events, or activities in the data that become categories of focus; (c) Collect data that provide many incidents of the categories of focus with an eye to seeing the diversity of the dimensions under the categories; (d) Write
about the categories which are being explored, attempting to describe and account for all the incidents which are in the data while continually searching for new incidents; (e) Work with the data and emerging model to discover basic social processes and relationships; and (f) Engage in sampling, coding, and writing as the analysis focuses on the core categories.

Glaser (1978) cautions that, although the constant comparative method can be viewed as a series of steps, the above steps actually occur all at once. Data analysis is an iterative process in which the researcher "keeps doubling back to more data collection and coding" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p. 74).

In order to strengthen a qualitative study's usefulness for other settings or populations, it is necessary for the researcher to triangulate the data. Marshall and Rossman (1989) state that "triangulation is the act of bringing more than one source of data to bear on a single point" (p. 146). Data from multiple sources, including interviews, questionnaires, and document searches, were gathered during the course of this study.

In accordance with the views of Rossman and Wilson (1989), the use of more than one data gathering technique was employed in order to strengthen the usefulness and applicability of this study to other settings, as well as to elaborate, corroborate, or illuminate the research. Further, by comparing and verifying raw data from several methods of data collection, the process of triangulation is an
effective means of minimizing the effects of researcher bias (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Data collection for this study included formal and informal interviews with the seven central instructional support staff members and the seven principals from Attendance Area I who participated as key informants, a questionnaire completed by principals from Attendance Area II, a questionnaire completed by members of central instructional support staff who did not serve as key informants, and document searches. A field test of the questionnaires and basic interview questions was conducted with administrative staff members in two neighboring school districts in order to ensure the adequacy and appropriateness of these items.

Data Collection

In November, 1992, the researcher held a preliminary conference with the district's assistant superintendent for instruction in order to discuss the feasibility of conducting the proposed study. The assistant superintendent expressed approval and indicated that such a study might prove to be particularly beneficial to the district's central instructional staff because, in addition to the district's commitment to site-based decision making, the mission of the division of instruction is to be supportive and responsive to the needs of schools and teachers in order to strengthen the quality of instruction.
Interviews allow a researcher to explore complex issues in a particular setting by examining the concrete experience of, and the meaning that experience has for, people in that setting (Seidman, 1991). Open-ended, in-depth interviews, focused on the research questions which guide this study (Appendix B), were conducted with all key informants. All interviews were taped and transcribed in order to facilitate data collection and analysis. Informal conversational interviews were also conducted with key informants during the course of this study. Information provided during an informal interview was included as an addendum to the transcript of the formal interview with that particular key informant.

Data collection began in June of 1993 with the first of fourteen formal interviews with key informants. Following completion and analysis of all of the interviews, a questionnaire (Appendix C) was distributed to those members of the district's central instructional support staff who had not served as key informants in order to obtain their views regarding the roles of central instructional support staff members in site-based decision making. A questionnaire (Appendix D) similar to the one presented to the central instructional support staff members was then distributed to all principals in Attendance Area II. Section B, questions 1B and 2B, of the questionnaire was derived from the responses of the key informants regarding their perceptions of the roles of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making. This provided a means
of comparing the perceptions of the larger group with those of the key informants.

Pertinent documents, both current and historical, relating either to the development of site-based decision making in the district or to the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making, were collected and analyzed. These documents included memos, meeting agendas, minutes of meetings, organizational charts, staffing information, school board policies, strategic planning documents, newsletters, and booklets. The purpose of this document search was to find references to the role of central instructional staff members in site-based decision making. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) note that by conducting a document search "researchers can get access to the 'official perspective,' as well as to the ways various school personnel communicate" (p. 136).

As a three-year member of the district's Site-Based Leadership Cabinet, and a former member of the district's central instructional support staff, this researcher was able to gather data from an emic, or insider's, point of view. Notes taken during the 1992-1993 monthly meetings of the Instructional Leadership Team and the Instructional Leadership Team Advisory Board, as well as during all meetings of the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet, were compiled and analyzed as part of the document search.
Data Analysis

This study incorporated analysis of information obtained from interviews with two groups of key informants, analysis of questionnaires completed by two groups of respondents, and analysis of pertinent historical and current documents. This was done in order to triangulate the data and to address the problem of the study and the research questions.

Data analysis was ongoing, following the constant comparative model. Marshall and Rossman (1989) describe data analysis as "the process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the mass of collected data.... Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships among categories of data; it builds grounded theory" (p. 112).

The coding and reduction of raw data was continuous. When using qualitative design, it is the researcher's task to identify the meaningful chunks of data, develop the concepts or categories to organize these chunks, and discover the meaningful patterns which emerge (Padilla, 1991). Miles and Huberman (1984) state that "data reduction is not something separate from analysis. It is part of analysis.... Data reduction is a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards, and organizes data in such a way that 'final' conclusions can be drawn and verified" (p. 21). These authors also view the creation and use of displays, such as matrices and charts, as part of data analysis. However, they recommend that display
formats be developed "near the end of data collection when they can be more contextually and empirically grounded" (p. 89).

Triangulation, the process of comparing and verifying raw data from several methods of data collection, was employed in an effort to minimize the effects of researcher bias (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984). Indefinite triangulation of data occurred throughout the data collection process. This was accomplished through extensive iterative review of the data collected from all data sources. Notes taken by this researcher during the course of the review revealed emerging patterns and categories.

Data from interviews with central instructional support staff members were compared to the interview responses of principals. Questionnaire responses from central instructional staff members were compared to the questionnaire responses of the principals. Interview data and questionnaire data were compared in order to determine if key informants generally expressed the views of the group which they were selected to represent. Information from central instructional support staff members and principals was then compared to the data obtained from document searches.

Quantitative methodology was employed in the analysis of data obtained from the questionnaires. Section A of the questionnaires was composed of eight statements concerning site-based decision making. Participants were instructed to use a Likert scale to mark their responses to each of the eight items, labeled 1A through 8A. The scale ranged from a rating of 1, indicating strong disagreement
with the statement, to a rating of 5, indicating strong agreement with the statement.

Likert scale responses from 33 central instructional support staff members were compared with responses from 22 principals through the use of the CROSSTABS procedure in SPSS®. This procedure yields a distribution of chi square which provides a descriptive measure of the magnitude of the difference between the responses of the two groups. A significance level of .05 was used in the analysis of this data.

Questions 1B and 2B of the questionnaire listed 25 roles which were described by the two groups of key informants as roles played by central instructional support staff. Question 1B asked each central instructional support staff respondent to check all of the 25 listed roles which are part of his/her job. A similar question was posed to principals by asking that they check all of the roles which they believe are included in the role of central instructional support staff.

Question 2B of the questionnaire also listed the 25 roles obtained from key informant interviews. Both the principals and the central instructional support staff respondents were directed to put a check beside all of the central instructional support staff roles which they believe have changed significantly since the district's move toward site-based decision making.

Analysis of the data obtained from items 1B and 2B of the questionnaires yielded the percentage of principals and the percentage of central instructional support staff who checked each of
the 25 roles listed. Graphic representations of this information are included in Chapter 4 of this study.

In order to respond to questions 3B, 4B, and 5B of the questionnaires, participants were required to write their views and comments. Responses to these three questions, dealing with (a) principals' expectations regarding the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making, (b) the impact site-based decision making has had on the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff, and (c) the impact of site-based decision making on the services which schools request of central instructional support staff, provided another source of data. These comments are reported and compared to information obtained during interviews with key informants.

Summary

Multiple data sources were used in this study of the perceptions of principals and central instructional support staff members with regard to the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making. Data obtained from interviews with two groups of key informants, questionnaires completed by two groups of respondents, and a search of historical and current documents, created the thick description contained in this study. Triangulation of the information obtained from all sources served to verify the representativeness and accuracy of the data.
Employing the constant comparative model ensured that data analysis was ongoing. Grounded theory was developed through triangulation of data obtained from all sources. The information which emerged allowed the researcher to develop explanations and hypotheses for the research questions, as well as provide a focus for further study.
CHAPTER IV

NARRATIVE OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to describe the roles of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making as perceived by principals and central instructional support staff members. Sources of data for this study were: (a) current and historical documents, (b) structured interviews with central instructional support staff members as key informants, (c) structured interviews conducted with principals as key informants, (d) informal interviews with key informants, (e) a questionnaire completed by principals, and (f) a questionnaire completed by central instructional support staff members. The key informants and the group of questionnaire respondents are each clustered into two groups: (a) central instructional support staff members, and (b) principals. As prescribed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), data from all sources were analyzed in order to develop grounded theory.

This chapter is divided into seven sections. The first section contains information obtained from document searches. The second section presents information provided by the central instructional support staff members who served as key informants. Section three includes information given by the principals from Attendance Area I.
who were key informants. Section four provides a comparison of the themes expressed in the responses of the two groups of key interview informants. The fifth section outlines the roles and categories derived from key informant interviews which were then included in the questionnaires completed by 22 principals from Attendance Area II and 33 respondents from central instructional support staff. Section six provides quantitative data and graphic displays of the information obtained from the two sets of questionnaires, and the final section provides a summary of the findings of this study.

Each section of this chapter contains direct quotations or other specific examples from the various data sources which are representative of the information collected during each aspect of data gathering. These examples were selected based on the frequency with which such an example occurred in the data and the judged representativeness of the item. Key informants are identified by their group and a number; e.g., CS-3 represents the third interview subject from among the group of central instructional support staff informants and P-1 represents the first interview subject from among the group of principals who participated as informants. Similarly, questionnaire respondents are identified by their group, the letter Q, and a number; e.g., PQ-5 represents the fifth questionnaire subject from among the group of principals who completed the questionnaire. Site-based decision making is frequently abbreviated as SBDM in the following sections.
There were five questions which constituted the common core for interviews with both central instructional staff members and principals who served as key informants. These questions, which were provided to the informants prior to the actual interview, were: (a) how has the district's move to site-based decision making affected the roles of central instructional support staff members, (b) what roles do central instructional support staff members currently have in site-based decision making in the schools, (c) what roles do you think central instructional staff members should have in site-based decision making, (d) what impacts has site-based decision making had on the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff members, and (e) what impacts has site-based decision making had on the services requested of central instructional support staff by personnel in the schools? Typically, remarks made by an individual informant during the course of the interview would open other avenues for exploration and discussion, but all key informants addressed the common core of questions during the structured interview and the majority were given the opportunity to revisit their opinions during brief, informal follow-up interviews.

Document Search

In order to complete this phase of the research, pertinent documents, both current and historical, were collected and analyzed. Since the school district being studied began the initial phases of
site-based decision making in 1987, documents used in this research date from the beginning of the 1987-1988 school year to the spring of 1994 when the research was completed. These documents, relating either to the development of site-based decision making in the district or to the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making, included memos, meeting agendas, minutes of meetings, job descriptions, organizational charts, budget information, school board policies, strategic planning documents, newsletters, and booklets. The purpose of this document search was three-fold: (a) to determine the extent of the involvement of central instructional support staff in the development of site-based decision making in the district, (b) to find references to the role(s) of central instructional support staff members in site-based decision making processes, and (c) to investigate the downsizing of central instructional support staff which was referred to by many of the key informants when discussing the roles of, or expectations for, instructional support staff personnel.

**Development of Site-Based Decision Making**

In the fall of 1987, a committee was formed to update the district's strategic plan. The membership of this committee included both building level administrators and central instructional staff members as well as central office administrators and community representatives. A letter dated September 29, 1987, (document 87/1) from the superintendent to persons selected to serve on the committee indicated that the group was charged with (a) reviewing
and revising the district's beliefs, mission, and policies, (b)
completing an internal and external analysis, (c) identifying critical
issues, and (d) reviewing and revising objectives and strategies.

A draft of the revised District Strategic Plan was presented to
the board of trustees for approval in February, 1988. One of the six
belief statements contained in the strategic plan indicated the
district's intent on moving toward site-based decision making by
stating that:

The individual school is the basic decision-making unit within
the district. (document 88/1, p.1)

Further, the seven strategic policies outlined in the plan contained
the following statement:

The district will subscribe to the principles of participatory
management. (document 88/1, p.2)

The final section of this strategic plan listed nine strategies
which the district would employ in order to achieve its objectives.
One of these strategies addressed the issue of site-based decision
making by stating that the district would:

Develop a school-based management system which focuses on
participatory site-based decision making and strategic school
effectiveness plans. (document 88/1, p. 6)

Following approval by the district's board of trustees, nine
strategic planning action teams were formed. One of these teams, co-
chaired by an elementary principal and a junior high school
principal, was directed to study site-based decision making and
"chart the direction for school-based management" in the district
In addition to the principals who served as co-chairs, the team included six building level administrators, five central instructional support staff members, and three teachers (document 88/3).

The initial meeting of this team was on February 25, 1988. Minutes of the meeting indicate that one recommendation from this strategic planning action team was that central instructional staff be trained in the principles of site-based decision making so that central staff could provide support for the schools (document 88/4, p. 2). Another suggestion from this group was that central instructional staff members could be selected to serve as facilitators for school level strategic planning (document 88/4, p. 2).

This site-based management action team met twice more and the action plan for school-based management developed by this group was presented to, and approved by, the district’s strategic planning team in April of 1988. The action plan recommended that central instructional support staff should be involved in the implementation of the following activities:

Communicate short and long range plans regarding school-based management to district key personnel. (document 88/5, p.1)

Create a central advisory committee to ensure school-based management success. (document 88/5, p.2)

Establish guidelines and procedures for forming and maintaining local core committees and parent advisory committees. (document 88/5, p. 2)
Conduct local staff development. (document 88/5, p. 2)

Develop ways to prioritize learning objectives to address district's strategic plan and local strategic plans. (document 88/5, p. 5)

Develop remediation, reteaching, and enrichment strategies for curricular areas. (document 88/5, p. 5)

Communicate curricular modifications, trends, and innovations via building personnel. (document 88/5, p. 5)

Develop a building system for keying pertinent instructional information to building objectives, strategies, key result areas, etc. (document 88/5, p. 6)

Develop plans to use and manage student performance information to modify teaching. (document 88/5, p. 6)

A memo (document 88/6) dated April 28, 1988, from one of the co-chairs of the action plan committee for school-based management to the deputy superintendent suggests that this group be officially designated as the District School-Based Management Advisory Committee. Further, in noting the need to proceed with the activities outlined in the action plan, the author of the memo indicates that "steps should be taken to include central support staff in the two optional summer inservices on school-based management" (88/6).

The agenda (document 88/7) for the May 17, 1988, meeting of the School-Based Management Advisory Committee lists five broad topics for discussion. One of these items concerns a conference on school-based management planned for the summer of that year. In this section of the agenda is the question, "Central staff - Who goes?"
The committee determined that all central administrators and support personnel would be invited by the deputy superintendent to attend the conference.

A June 3, 1988, memo (document 88/8) from the director of program planning to the area assistant superintendents outlined planning options for school-based management facilitator training scheduled for October 10, 1988, and planning options for retreats which were scheduled to be held in October or November of that year in each of the four attendance areas. Selected members of central instructional support staff would be included among the facilitators, and those serving as facilitators would then be assigned to work with a particular school or schools during the retreats.

Arrangements were made for a two-day conference on school-based management which would be offered in both June and August of 1988. This schedule was adopted in order to accommodate the summer schedules of the principals, instructional support staff, central administrators, and teachers who were invited to attend. Notes (document 88/9) from one of the conference presenters, who was also a member of the School-Based Management Advisory Committee, indicate that central instructional support staff would be assigned to each school. These central instructional support staff members would serve either as facilitators or as members of an individual school's planning team during the 1988-1989 school year.

The School-Based Management Advisory Committee developed a document entitled "Process Guide for Building Level Strategic
Planning" (document 88/10) which outlined the responsibilities of building principals, facilitators, and school planning teams for the 1988-1989 strategic planning cycle. Of the 22 responsibilities listed in the process guide, 17 were assigned to the principal. Facilitators and/or members of central instructional support staff were listed as having only two specific responsibilities (document 88/10, pp. 1 & 2).

Training for those selected to be school planning facilitators was held in September, 1988 (document 88/11). Since individual schools had been given the option to select one of their teachers to be their team's facilitator or to request that someone from outside the school staff serve as their facilitator, the facilitator group included both teachers and central instructional support staff members. It was anticipated that each facilitator would work with a school planning team during the retreats scheduled for October or November, and would then provide ongoing assistance to that school team as each group continued to meet on their own campus during the remainder of the year. In some instances, central instructional staff members were also assigned to serve as ad hoc members of school planning teams during both the retreat and the remainder of the school year.

School planning teams attended one of four retreats held in the fall of 1988. An agenda for one such retreat (document 88/12) indicates that groups received information about school-based management from a principal of one of the 1987-1988 pilot schools
and then were given an overview of the strategic planning process by the deputy superintendent. School planning teams, guided by their facilitator, then worked to develop their own mission statement, beliefs, objectives, and strategies. At the close of the two-day session, each team shared its school's mission statement and belief statements with all of those in attendance.

Throughout the remainder of the 1988-1989 school year, school planning teams continued to pursue the goals and objectives which they had developed during the two-day retreat. Action plans were developed by teams on each campus which would enable individual schools to better meet the needs of their students, staff, and community. Meeting agendas, memos, and other internal communications indicate that there was considerable support and encouragement from the highest level of school administration for schools to become more autonomous (documents 88/13, 88/14, 89/1, and 89/2).

As regular meetings of campus committees were held, many of the facilitators from central instructional support staff who had worked with school teams during the retreat continued to serve in that role. Scheduling conflicts and other job responsibilities often made it difficult for some central staff personnel to continue as a facilitator. Although some of the central instructional support staff members who had been assigned to school teams prior to the retreat continued to participate on a team, many who were assigned to school teams attended only one or two meetings subsequent to the
retreat. Any number of reasons could explain the decline in central staff participation, from waning interest or inability to attend meetings on a particular day of the week, to lack of notification from the school as to the dates or times of meetings. As one central instructional support staff key informant noted during an interview:

We tried at one time to have central people involved on site-based teams, either as facilitators or just as a regular member of a team, but it was hard to keep that going. I think it was hard for people to really feel invested in what was going on in a school, and maybe it was hard for the schools to accept people who were just sort of arbitrarily assigned to work with them. I've always thought it's a good idea to have central [instructional support] staff on school site-based teams, but I'm just not sure that assigning people to a team is the right way to do it. (CS-5, p. 3)

By the end of the 1988-1989 school year, each school in the district had action teams working toward the achievement of the particular objectives outlined in their campus strategic plan. However, many of the action plans which schools submitted were accompanied by requests for additional funds. A memo to principals from the deputy superintendent indicated that additional monies would not be available in the 1989-1990 budget for the specific purpose of funding site-based projects. Schools were encouraged to undertake projects which would either require no additional funds or would make "the greatest impact on student and school performance through the use of existing funds" (document 89/3).

As the 1989-1990 school year began, all of the district's school-based management teams selected one or two facilitators from within their own staff (document 89/4). No one from central
instructional support staff was officially assigned to be a school's facilitator or to serve on a school's planning team. Thus, as the second year of districtwide school-based management activities got underway, members of central instructional support staff were, in essence, excluded from the planning which was taking place at individual school sites.

Throughout the 1989-1990 and 1990-1991 school years, campus teams continued to develop site-specific plans and to participate in activities focused on their individual schools. During that period, agendas from districtwide meetings (documents 89/5, 89/6, 90/1, and 90/2) and meetings held within the specific attendance areas (documents 89/7, 90/3, 90/4, and 91/1) indicate that site-based management was a topic of continuing interest and concern. The board of trustees received occasional reports and updates (documents 89/8, 90/5, 90/6, and 91/2) regarding the progress of site-based decision making in the district. In addition, the district's strategic plan, which was revised in early 1990 (document 90/7), reflected the ongoing commitment to the development of "a school-based management system which focuses on participatory site-based decision making and strategic school effectiveness plans" (document 90/7, p. 6).

By April of 1991, an Ad Hoc Site-Based Management Team was selected in order to "help formulate future direction for the district's Site-Based Management Steering Committee, as well as deal with immediate site-based management needs" (document 91/3). This
group, headed by two assistant superintendents, was composed of one high school principal, one junior high school principal, two junior high school assistant principals, three elementary principals, one elementary assistant principal, and three members of central instructional support staff.

The primary impetus in the formation of this committee came from Texas Senate Bill 1, which added and/or amended several sections of the Texas Education Code. One of the additions to Chapter 21 of the Texas Education Code (TEC, § 21.7532) indicated that: "For each school year, the principal of each school campus, with the assistance of parents, community residents, and the professional staff of the school... shall establish academic and other performance objectives of the campus for each academic excellence indicator adopted under Section 21.7531" (document 91/4, p. 49).

This, and other requirements spelled out in Senate Bill 1, appeared to indicate that site-based decision making was no longer simply a process which the district was electing to employ; rather, there seemed to be clear indications from the legislature that the state was moving toward requiring school districts to make significant decisions at each school site. The district which is the subject of this study was interested in finding the best possible way to meld the process already in place with the new state requirements. Issues such as increased community involvement and greater local school accountability had to be addressed. It was the
task of the Ad Hoc Site-Based Management Committee to determine the next steps to be taken.

The second meeting of the ad hoc group, held on May 2, 1991, included time for committee members to express their ideas, questions, and concerns about developing a new framework for site-based management in the district. Participant's notes (document 91/5) indicate that some of the issues generated during this brainstorming session included specific questions or concerns involving central instructional support staff, such as:

What roles, responsibilities, power, and decision making processes will be at the building level and which will be at the central staff level? (91/5, p. 2)

What types of decisions will principals make? What about central staff? (91/5, p. 2)

May need to look at some innovative reorganization of central support staff. (91/5, p. 2)

Schools might 'adopt' a central office person. (91/5, p. 3)

Model for the future might be that the system sets expectations for students, the local building sets local goals, and central staff assists buildings in reaching their goals. (91/5, p. 3)

The agenda for the May 2 meeting (document 91/6) and participant's notes (document 91/7) taken during that meeting, reveal that the Ad Hoc Site-Based Management Committee was divided into three subcommittees. One group was given the task of investigating the legal requirements for formation of school and district planning councils, another was to draft a district position
paper on school-based management, and the third subcommittee was asked to develop definitions of terms related to school-based management and descriptions of the role(s) played by specific persons or groups. Each subcommittee was directed to present an interim report at the next Ad Hoc Committee meeting which was scheduled for May 16.

When the Ad Hoc Site-Based Management Committee met on May 16, 1991, each subcommittee gave a status report (documents 91/8, 91/9, and 91/10) and all members of the group were asked for feedback regarding the work of each subcommittee. The subcommittees were then asked to make all necessary revisions prior to the next meeting which would be held on May 22.

The work of all three subcommittees was further revised at the May 22 meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee. Final presentations (documents 91/11, 91/12, and 91/13) were made at a meeting on May 28, 1991. Only one of the subcommittee reports contained a specific reference to central support staff. The group which developed definitions of terms and descriptions of roles included the following under the heading of 'Central Staff':

In a fully operational site-based management system, all central administrative staff members, including those in line positions as well as those in staff positions, take on the role of providing support and assistance for the schools, rather than being primarily supervisors or decision makers. (91/12, p. 4)

Neither the subcommittee which drafted the position paper on site-based management in the district nor the group which investigated the formation of the campus and district planning
councils mentioned central staff directly. The position paper (91/11) perhaps alluded to central support staff in noting that the issues related to site-based management included:

Clarification of roles, responsibilities, and interdependence of key decision makers (91/11, p. 1)

Training for key decision makers in processes and leadership skills for the support of site-based management (91/11, p. 2)

The Ad Hoc Committee for Site-Based Management continued to meet in June of 1991 in order to tackle issues such as the appropriate composition of the legally required district council and school councils, and to chart future directions for the group. A draft of the description of the proposed District Steering Committee (document 91/14) was presented to the membership on June 11. In this proposal, the District Steering Committee is defined as follows:

The District Steering Committee is a team which serves as a planning and advisory council for the purpose of supporting site-based management. It is a parallel organization to central office in that the District Steering Committee oversees the daily operations of site-based management efforts, while central office oversees the daily functioning of district operations. (91/14, p. 1)

Participant's notes (document 91/15) taken during the course of this meeting indicate that there was considerable discussion concerning the membership of the District Steering Committee. While it was generally agreed that the steering committee should have representation from central instructional support staff as well as from schools and the community, no decision was made at that time as to the exact composition of this proposed advisory council.
When the district's Ad Hoc Committee for Site-Based Management reconvened in August, 1991, one of the first items to be discussed was a proposal to change the name of site-based decision making in the district from site-based management to site-based leadership (document 91/16). Members of the group agreed that this would be a positive change, more in keeping with the ideas set forth in the position paper, that the district was entering a second stage of the implementation process.

Subcommittees finalized their proposals regarding the Local School Councils which would operate at each campus, and the District Education Council which, according to requirements outlined in Section 21.930 of the Texas Education Code (document 91/17), was designed to serve as a districtwide educational improvement council comprised of two-thirds classroom teachers and one-third other campus-based staff. The entire Ad Hoc Committee also discussed the responsibilities and membership of the District Council for Site-Based Leadership, which had initially been referred to as the District Steering Committee.

As the 1991-1992 school year began, a document was prepared (document 91/18) and presented to the board of trustees, the superintendent’s council, all principals, and the Instructional Leadership Team which was composed of all central instructional support staff members. This document was in the form of a booklet and included the position paper, definitions of terms and roles, and descriptions of the various campus and district committees which
would be established in order to meet legal requirements and broaden the district's commitment to site-based decision making, or site-based leadership.

Another topic discussed by the Ad Hoc Committee was the future of the committee itself. Although the initial intent was for this group to deal with immediate needs, it had become apparent that there was still much to be done in order to meet all state requirements and district expectations with regard to site-based decision making. It was determined that the group would continue to serve the district in an advisory capacity and, as such, the name Site-Based Leadership Cabinet was adopted.

The Site-Based Leadership Cabinet met regularly throughout the 1991-1992 school year. Agendas for these meetings from August through March (documents 91/19, 91/20, 91/21, 91/22, 92/1, 92/2, 92/3, 92/4, 92/5 and 92/6), indicate that issues addressed by this group, and subcommittees chaired by members of this committee, included the development of a communication management plan, delineation of decision making parameters, funding and budgeting, classroom productivity, staff development needs, and evaluation.

Three members of central instructional support staff continued to serve on the Site-Based leadership Cabinet. However, numerous documents (91/23, 91/24, 91/25, 91/26, 92/7, 92/8, 92/9, 92/10, and 92/11) revealed that while there was extensive participation by principals on subcommittees or any of the districtwide site-based
committees, central staff membership was limited to only one or two individuals per committee. The focus was on the schools, and principals played a much more direct and significant role than did central staff.

In October of 1991, members were selected for the District Council for Site-Based Leadership. This group, composed of district personnel and community leaders, was "designed to serve as a planning, advisory, and decision-making council for the purpose of supporting Site-Based Leadership" in the schools (document 91/27, p. 1). Membership on the council included three principals, four teachers, a representative from the board of trustees, four community leaders, the deputy and assistant superintendents, and two representatives from central instructional support staff.

The first task which this council was to accomplish was to review and refine the district's strategic plan (document 91/27, p. 2). Agendas for the meetings of the District Council for Site-Based Leadership (documents 91/28, 91/29, 91/30, and 92/12) indicate that, in addition to updating the strategic plan, the group also reviewed state mandates dealing with site-based decision making, worked toward defining parameters for district level and building level decision-making roles and responsibilities, and discussed the possibility of seeking discretionary funds for site-based budgeting and incentives.

The revision of the strategic plan (document 92/13) was completed in February, 1992, and submitted to the board of trustees
for approval. At that point, the work of the District Council for Site-Based Leadership was considered to be complete and the council was disbanded.

Agendas for Site-Based Leadership Cabinet meetings held from April through June of 1992 (documents 92/14, 92/15, 92/16, 92/17, and 92/18), indicate that the work of this group became focused on preparation of the district's plan for site-based decision making. By law, this plan had to be submitted to the state commissioner of education for approval no later than September 1 of that year.

Augmenting the work of the cabinet, a District Advisory Council composed of school and community leaders was appointed in May (document 92/19). The purpose of this group was to review the work of the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet and provide input during the development of the district plan for site-based decision making. Composed of three representatives from the board of trustees, four principals, four teachers, two high school students, seven community representatives, three assistant superintendents, and three representatives from central instructional staff, the council met in May and June of 1992 (documents 92/20, 92/21, 92/23, 92/24, and 92/25) in order to complete the first phase of its task.

The assistant superintendent who chaired the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet designated two members of the cabinet to be in charge of writing and compiling the final document. At the time, one of these persons was a member of central instructional support staff and the other was an elementary principal. These two
representatives worked during the summer of 1992, and completed a draft of the district's plan for site-based decision making (document 92/26). This draft was reviewed and revised by the District Advisory Council at that group's final meeting in August (documents 92/27, 92/28, and 92/29). The finalized district plan for site-based decision making was submitted to the board of trustees on August 17, 1992 (document 92/30), and the plan was then forwarded to the state commissioner of education. In the fall of 1992, following approval by the commissioner, a copy of the district plan for site-based decision making was distributed to each principal and all central administrative offices.

For the 1992-1993 school year, the membership of the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet changed slightly. The group included six elementary principals, one junior high school principal, two secondary school assistant principals, four representatives from central instructional support staff, the coordinating director of staff development for the district, the director of staff development for administrators, and one representative from the department of organizational development and evaluation (document 92/31).

Agendas for the 1992-1993 meetings of the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet (documents 92/32, 92/33, 92/34, 92/35, 93/1, 93/2, 93/3, 93/4, and 93/5) note three high priority issues: (a) finalizing the section of the district plan which would outline decision-making parameters and clearly delineate which decisions were the responsibility of central administration and which decisions
were to be made at the building level, (b) continuing to provide input to principals regarding the composition, selection, responsibilities, and operation of school councils throughout the district, and (c) participating in the updating of the district's strategic plan.

Five subcommittees, chaired by members of the cabinet and composed primarily of principals, representatives from central administration, and personnel from central instructional support staff, each worked on one of the five sections of the decision making parameters. The five sections of the document paralleled the five areas in which school site-based decision making committees have a role, as specified in Section 21.931 of the Texas Education Code. These five areas are: goal setting, curriculum, budgeting, staffing patterns, and school organization. The document entitled "Decision-Making Parameters" was finalized in April of 1993 (document 93/8).

The District Advisory Council, composed of school and community leaders, was reconvened in the fall of 1992 to serve as the body which would revise the district's strategic plan. The membership of this group included four representatives of the board of trustees, five community leaders, four teachers, two students, three principals, the superintendent and deputy superintendent, four assistant superintendents, the district's chief financial officer, three representatives from central instructional support staff, the coordinating director of staff development, the director of staff development for administrators, and a representative from organizational development and evaluation (document 92/32).
The District Advisory Council met in October and November of 1992 and January of 1993 (documents 92/33, 92/34, 92/35, and 93/6). In addition to the district's mission, beliefs, and operational strategies, the revision of the district's strategic plan (document 93/7) included specific student performance targets and instructional priorities.

As with the strategic plan of previous years, this document reflected the district commitment to site-based decision making through statements of belief such as:

The individual school is the fundamental decision-making unit within the district for teaching and learning. (93/7, p. 3)

Consensus leads to quality decisions. (93/7, p. 3)

Education is a school and community partnership. (93/7, p. 3)

In the fall of 1993, the membership of the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet changed rather significantly. Chaired by an elementary principal who had been a member of the group since its inception, the cabinet was composed of five elementary principals, one elementary assistant principal, two secondary principals, one secondary assistant principal, four teachers, and three representatives from central instructional support staff (document 93/9). The director of administrative staff development served as the program coordinator and three assistant superintendents served as advisors to the group.
The agenda for the cabinet's first meeting (document 93/10) noted that this group's responsibilities were to: (a) plan and deliver training for staff and site-based facilitators, (b) revise guidelines for campus improvement plans, (c) advise on policies and regulations, (d) review decision-making parameters and board updates, and (e) recommend future training and directions for site-based decision making. Meeting only four times during the 1993-1994 school year (documents 93/10, 94/1, 94/2, and 94/3), the cabinet primarily focused on legal updates, training needs for principals and building facilitators, the possibility of instituting incentives for building facilitators, and the development of a survey which could be used as a planning tool for local school councils.

Participant's notes (document 93/11) indicate that at the first cabinet meeting in November of 1993, one of the representatives from central instructional support staff commented on various ways schools could access assistance from instructional support staff when writing school plans. Also, the elementary principal serving as chairperson of the cabinet reported a concern from the assistant superintendent for instruction that central instructional support staff members were often being consulted by school teams after the teams had developed action plans instead of early in the planning process. The assistant superintendent had suggested the development of a checklist for school action teams and local school councils to use as planning was initiated. This checklist (document 93/10, p. 2) included items such as:
What types of research/knowledge base are you going to use to support your activities/new program? How will you explain this change to your community? (93/10, p. 2)

Have you looked at the legal guidelines? The district policy? (93/10, p. 2)

Does this activity require a waiver? If so, how will it impact the school and the community? Who will write it? (93/10, p. 2)

Are there other district personnel that need to be involved? (i.e., central office specialists, other schools, District Education Council, etc.) (93/10, p. 2)

Another indication of concern on the part of the Division of Instruction regarding site-based decision making is found in the minutes of the September 28, 1993, meeting of the Instructional Cabinet (document 93/12). The item, credited to the assistant superintendent for instruction, is as follows:

Cabinet members were reminded that as we work with schools we should ask principals to remember to involve central staff in the school planning process so that the schools will think about compliance issues, budget impacts, textbooks, resources, etc. as they plan. (93/12, p. 2)

At the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet's final meeting of the 1993-1994 school year, the district's action plans for site-based decision making (document 94/4) were reviewed and revised. According to participant's notes (document 94/5), it was noted at the conclusion of the meeting that, since a new superintendent would be assuming his duties on July 1, 1994, the responsibilities of the Site-Based Leadership Cabinet and the direction for site-based decision
making in the district might be subject to significant changes during the 1994-1995 school year.

Table 1 provides a summary of the information obtained from the document search. In this chronology of the district's development and implementation of site-based decision making, the items or events listed are those judged to be particularly significant to central instructional support staff.
### Table 1

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1988</td>
<td>88/1</td>
<td>District Strategic Plan Statements indicated the district's intent on moving toward SBDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1988</td>
<td>88/2 and 88/3</td>
<td>Memo re: formation of strategic planning action teams An action team is designated to study SBDM and chart the district's direction; five representatives from central staff (CS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1988</td>
<td>88/4</td>
<td>Minutes of action team meeting Recommended that CS be trained in principles of SBDM and that CS members serve as facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1988</td>
<td>88/5</td>
<td>Action plan for school-based management Recommended CS involvement in a number of activities linked to SBDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1988</td>
<td>88/9</td>
<td>Conference notes CS members assigned to serve as facilitators or on school planning teams during 1988-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1988</td>
<td>88/11</td>
<td>Memo re: facilitator training Selected CS members attend training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October/November</td>
<td>88/12</td>
<td>Planning team from each school attends SBDM retreat; CS serve as facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>89/4</td>
<td>No one from CS assigned as facilitator or member of any school's planning team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>91/3</td>
<td>Three representatives from central staff were included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>91/5</td>
<td>Discussion of roles and involvement of CS in SBDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>91/18</td>
<td>Presented to board of trustees, principals, and all central staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>91/23-26</td>
<td>Indicate minimal involvement of CS on districtwide site-based committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and 92/7-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>91/27</td>
<td>Two representatives from central staff were included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>92/19</td>
<td>Three representatives from CS were included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 1992</td>
<td>92/30 District Plan for Site-Based Decision Making</td>
<td>Approved by board of trustees, then distributed to all principals and CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>92/31 List of members of Site-Based Leadership Cabinet</td>
<td>Four representatives from central staff were included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1993</td>
<td>93/8 Decision-Making Parameters</td>
<td>Responsibilities delineated for school councils, principals, central instructional support staff, and other administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>93/9 List of members of Site-Based Leadership Cabinet</td>
<td>Three representatives from central staff were included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1993</td>
<td>93/10 Checklist for schools to use as a planning tool</td>
<td>Suggested to SBL Cabinet by assistant superintendent for instruction; to be used by school teams as a guide to know when to call for assistance from central staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>93/12 Minutes from meeting of Instructional Cabinet</td>
<td>Item notes that members should remind principals to involve CS in school planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Downsizing of Central Instructional Support Staff

Many of the key informants and questionnaire respondents noted that the number of central instructional support staff has been reduced in recent years. Figures provided by the assistant superintendent for instruction (document 94/5) reveal that during the 1990-1991 school year the instructional support staff consisted of 71 FTEs, or full time equivalents, but by the 1993-1994 school year that number had been reduced to 46 FTEs. Table 2, which concludes this section, illustrates the changes in personnel on central instructional support staff between the 1990-1991 school year and the 1993-1994 school year.

It should also be noted that, prior to 1993-1994, the division of instruction consisted of four departments: (a) general instruction, (b) special programs, (c) technology and occupational education, and (d) extended programs. At the end of the 1992-1993 school year, a decision was made to incorporate the department of technology and occupational education into the department of general instruction, thereby reducing the division to three departments.

Staff reduction in the division of instruction was accomplished primarily through attrition. An early retirement program allowed several members of central instructional support staff to work part time for two years prior to taking full retirement. Also, increases in student population at a number of schools created some part-time administrative positions which had not previously existed. During the 1993-1994 school year, ten central instructional support staff
members served in dual assignments. While continuing to devote half of their time to a central support staff position, nine of these individuals were assigned to be half-time assistant principals at elementary schools and one was assigned as a half-time assistant principal at a junior high school.

Although it seems unlikely that the reduction in central instructional support staff was a direct result of the district's implementation of site-based decision making, some see a close link between the two. One central instructional support staff member expressed the following:

I actually think that site-based allowed the reduction in force. We, in fact, now have fewer people on central staff but more administrative staff in buildings than we've ever had. Site-based forced everyone to concentrate their efforts on what's going on in buildings and, since there's really no money to hire new staff, what's happened is that people have just been shifted from one type of administrative job to another—or they've been forced to have two jobs. Now we [central instructional support staff] are down to bare bones and people complain because we're not responsive enough. It's a no-win deal. (CS-1, p. 23)

One of the central instructional staff members who completed a questionnaire also commented about the effects of downsizing:

For the most part, I don't think principals are aware of the staff cuts that have taken place in the past two or three years. I believe they still think there are a lot of people on central staff and a lot of services available to them on a moment's notice... I think principals and schools still think there are a lot of central staff people and services available to them when the fact of the matter is that staff reductions have made it impossible to serve schools the way they used to be served. (CSQ-3)
A principal who was a key informant acknowledged the effects of the reduction of central instructional support staff by commenting:

Because of downsizing and who knows what else, central staff just can't do all the things they used to do. Now I think we tend to rely more on expertise within the building than expecting that we're going to get it from central staff. With the district organization the way it is, there simply is not enough central staff to serve the schools the way they were served in the past. In fact, as far as it [SBDM] is concerned, I don't think I've ever called anybody on central staff to help with anything. (P-4, p. 6)

Comments about dual assignments were made by principals and central instructional support staff. Two of the questionnaire respondents wrote these remarks:

Dual assignments have really had an impact—probably related more to funding than to SBDM. (PQ-19)

Central staff people who have been forced to take dual assignments can't be doubly effective in two jobs. (CSQ-26)

This research reveals concerns from both principals and members of central instructional support staff regarding the district's downsizing of central staff. It seems evident that the reduction in the number of central instructional support staff and changes in support staff assignments have affected the availability of assistance provided to schools. However, it is difficult to discern if these changes can actually be attributed to the implementation of site-based decision making, or if the implementation of site-based decision making simply brought some existing problems into clearer focus.
Table 2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Superintendents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of Basic Instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Environmental Studies/Planetarium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies/Free Enterprise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts/Speech/Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Included w/ Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Vocational Ed./</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Drug Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Media Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education/Psychological Services</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education/ESL/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiological Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Services</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensatory Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Programs/Student</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total Number of Central</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Instructional Support Staff Key Informant Interviews

Effect of SBDM on Roles of Central Instructional Staff

The key informants from central instructional support staff were eager to offer opinions on how SBDM has affected their roles and the roles of their colleagues. The two themes recurring throughout their responses involved (a) loss of control/effectiveness/prestige, and (b) frustration resulting from lack of, or "after the fact," involvement in school planning.

The following comments relating to loss of control/effectiveness/prestige are typical of the opinions presented by the group of central instructional support staff informants.

It is for certain that site-based decision making has caused difficulties for central instruction. It's caused a loss of prestige for central instruction. It has become less desirable to seek a career path in central instruction, and site-based decision making played a part in that. (CS-1, transcript p. 16)

I think that we have lost a lot of quality control that we had at one time in terms of instruction and content and delivery and results. I would sure like to get that quality control back. I think we have lost the ability to have a district focus for a discipline unless everyone agrees to it. (CS-2, p. 15)

There's pretty general confusion about what our role [in SBDM] is supposed to be, and that's from the people I've talked to over here—the curriculum directors. We all have what we think our position should be, and we've been told in a 'round about way by our superiors what they think our position should be, but we have yet to hear from the buildings on what they think our job should be in helping them with site-based management. So there is confusion about what we are supposed to do. (CS-4, pp. 2-3)
One thing that central staff has is the support role. That's the role we've always had, and that's the role we are allowed to have now in site-based decision making, but we're not able to perform that role very effectively because the decisions that are being made at the sites are so fragmented. They're so diverse that you can't mobilize a small staff to support all those decisions, so we're not very effective now in a support role and even though we haven't been cut off from that role, we just can't be very effective in that role. (CS-1, pp. 8-9)

I still see our role as one of support for what's going on in buildings. Site-based hasn't really changed that. We provide support for the curriculum and principals and teachers. I guess it's probably not as well-defined, or maybe even as effective, as it used to be, but that still seems to be our primary role—the one people expect us to do. But I guess a lot of times maybe they don't really think to call us until they're already into something and it's beginning to look like they may have bitten off more than they can chew. Then they decide they need help. (CS-6, p. 2)

I think there's more ambiguity now for central staff. The role [in SBDM] isn't clearly defined and there's really little direction about what that role should be. Initially, and I guess it's still this way, a lot of people on central staff were uncomfortable, you know, just kind of out of the loop for decision making. People on central staff don't get the same training that schools get and the role just gets more and more gray. It seems like we hear what central staff should be doing to support the schools, but there's not much reinforcement for what is being done. (CS-7, p.1)

Frustration appears to be another aspect of the responses of central instructional staff members with regard to their role in SBDM. This was expressed most frequently when discussing their lack of involvement, or involvement "after the fact," in the development of school plans and waivers. The following comments are representative of this concern:
I got a call not long ago from a teacher at one of the junior highs and she asked what I thought about the modified block scheduling that they were planning to do in [a particular discipline]. Well, the fact of the matter is that I didn't know a thing about it, so I guess I was just silent for a little too long because she said, "You do know about this, don't you?" I had to tell her that I didn't. I guess they're really not under any requirement to consult with me, but I might have been able to give them some help. You know, if I could just be a sideline person when they're working on something like that so that if there was something in the process that I knew about that they hadn't discovered, maybe I could have shared that with them. (CS-3, p.7)

I don't see our department as playing a large role right now in anything in terms of what the schools are doing as far as making their decisions and their objectives for the year and their goals for the year. (CS-2, p. 10)

I've had a school write two proposals that were submitted to me, but the problem was that they had it all worked out and now they're coming to me and saying that they've planned what their teams wanted and they're all excited. I mean they had every detail, and now it becomes very hard to make that a workable plan... I think that had we been brought in earlier on that we could have helped them develop something that would have met their goal without it having some of the problems that it has... I mean they just have these grandiose plans that have not looked at the district plan or what we have submitted to the state and gotten approved. So you know, in that case, those people have really tried but the point is that they've done it way too late... So we work real hard not to be the spoiler, but to try to make it right and represent them right, but it puts us in a real awkward position—and a difficult one. I mean, it's a lot of wasted energy, and we have to consider how we can do this without totally wrecking their plan. (CS-5, pp. 4-6)
Even though I was assigned to be a facilitator for one of the elementaries when we first started doing site-based, it was basically just at their retreat when they developed their mission statement and their goals. Beyond that, I wasn't involved except for an occasional phone call when someone would say, "Oh, we should have invited you—we had a meeting last week." (CS-6, p. 4)

In the past, curriculum decisions really have been top-down decisions, and so that is a definite change now in site-based decision making. Not only are curriculum decisions not made in that fashion, but central staff often is unaware of curriculum decisions and changes that have been made in schools, so that's a difference. Then, as a result of that, central staff is less able to mobilize to provide support to curriculum and the schools. (CS-1, pp. 1-2)

One thing that happens fairly frequently is that a school will make a decision about writing a waiver, and they'll get pretty far into the process. When the waiver finally emerges, right before it's to be presented to the board [of trustees], it becomes apparent that for some reason or another that this is not an appropriate waiver, and so that becomes a real delicate situation. You don't want to stifle that creativity, you don't want school teams to feel they can't innovate, they can't make plans, but you have to suddenly redo that waiver because we [central instructional support staff] are the ones who have to support it to the board. The school doesn't come here and support their waiver, the assistant superintendent for instruction does, and so our staff can't be placed in a position where we are asked to support something that's not sound. It happens that way sometimes. (CS-1, pp. 3-4)

It should be noted here that despite the fact that CS-1 concurred with colleagues in voicing concerns about being called upon "after the fact," the following somewhat contradictory comment was made later in the interview:
There are some exceptions, and I think that's because we have a strong assistant superintendent who is much-respected. We're being called in more to provide input, to evaluate a plan before it is implemented. So I do see a shifting in that direction and I think it is a positive shift. (CS-1, p. 22)

Roles Central Instructional Support Staff Currently Has in SBDM

Responding to a question dealing with what roles central instructional support staff members currently have in SBDM, these key informants expressed three primary themes. The themes had to do with (a) providing support to schools, (b) addressing staff development and professional growth needs, and (c) responding to crises, complaints, or concerns. Although each of these three areas have long been aspects of the support staff role, SBDM has apparently had some effect on the performance of these duties.

All of the key informants from central instructional staff indicated that they believe that one of their primary roles is that of providing support to schools. This support may take many different forms, and may involve an individual principal or teacher, a group of principals or teachers, or a specific area of the curriculum. Comments relating to this theme included:

We're there to help them solve that problem, whatever it may be, but we're not there to direct and say, "This is what you have to do." I think our people have always wanted to help when schools have a problem. That's what we do—support the schools. Site-based may mean that they want, or ask for, different kinds of support, but support is still what we do. (CS-5, p. 23)
We're there to support what's going on in the schools and to make it easier for them if we can. I think the principals especially know that, and I think most of them don't hesitate to call when there's a question. They know we can be a good resource for them. (CS-4, p. 5)

Well, I think you know our role is a supportive role. That's just the nature of it. We don't have line authority. Never have. But I'm going to offer suggestions to schools and information to schools and let them know I can help. I'll say one thing—I'll give information to schools whether it's solicited or not. And if I know what they're planning, then I'll definitely give input whether it's solicited or not. But it would be nice if that could just be a regular part of school planning. Not that we could tell a school, "You can't do such and such," but at least we would feel like they had all the information they needed to make a decision rather than find out three years later that something didn't work and we knew there was evidence out there that could have shown them that it wouldn't work. (CS-6, p. 18)

Much of what this job has always been is just your own personal influence and relationship and rapport with campus principals and teachers. They want our support, but it comes easier if they know us and feel comfortable that we know what we're talking about. The job is all about support—support for district curriculum decisions, and support for the principals and teachers who have to follow through on what the district says, and support for whatever their [site-based] plan is for their school. (CS-7, p. 3)

I try to make sure that whether a teacher is part of a secondary [content area] department or an elementary teacher who's just kind of out there on her own that they have information from me or from [a central staff colleague] so that they know they have our support. That's how I see it. They need to know that I'm here, and not just that I can help, but that I want to help. (CS-3, p. 5)
The district's move to site-based decision making has resulted in more school-based, rather than districtwide, staff development programs. The area of staff development and professional growth appears to be one in which central instructional support staff members feel very involved. The following statements are illustrative of this involvement:

I think schools continue to expect central [instructional support] staff to be there to plan and provide staff development. But with site-based, it's more than just the districtwide [staff development] days, it's whatever they need to help them in meeting their needs or carrying out their plan. Realistically, central staff can't do that; but the fact of the matter is that, even though we know that, we still keep trying because we know it's expected. (CS-7, p. 4)

I think the role we do play, and should play, is that of communicating changes from the state—you know, state board changes. No matter whether you have site-based decision making or not, I think there's a place for central leadership in terms of staff development. I have real concerns about a school, especially a secondary school, being totally responsible for the staff development that takes place because I think what they'll end up with will tend to be a sort of generalized type of staff development. There's nothing wrong with that, but there are limits to that. You can't update someone's specific subject area in that type of setting. So I have a real reservation about that. I think there has to be a combination of central and site-based. That updating has to be up to the curriculum specialists. That's why we're here and that's what we know. We're not doing our job if we don't get that information to teachers. (CS-6, p. 24)

I've asked the department chairs in [a particular content area] to find out from the teachers what they want, and then they come to me and just lay out on the table what it is that the
teachers want and need in terms of staff development. Then I try to meet those needs. (CS-4, p. 17)

I constantly feel like I need to be even more proactive, like I constantly need to be feeding teachers information and resources so they can try some of the new things that are out there and so then they can share that same info with their colleagues. That's kind of an indirect way of making an impact, but I think it's a help for them and that it helps them continue to learn and grow. (CS-3, p. 19)

I think site-based has gotten a lot of teachers to think about what they want and what's really important for their school, and they have approached us and said that they need more inservice about one topic or another. They want more staff development time and more time to work together. Out of this I see the positives of staff development—the leadership it develops in teachers and their knowledge that they need to know more. I think the positive out of all of this [SBDM] has been that they've asked for a lot more staff development. And for our part, we've really tried to be responsive to those requests. (CS-5, pp. 13-14)

One thing that really concerns me about site-based is that I think the role of staff development has been diminished to some extent in terms of efficiency and focus. Schools are doing their own thing for a few people, spending lots of money bringing people and programs in which may or may not fit in with the philosophy of the district or the state philosophy in terms of [a particular content area]. That's probably what site-based is all about, but whenever and wherever I can, I ask questions and keep trying to jog principals and teachers into remembering that they've got to stay focused on kids and content. I guess that's kind of a mission I have because I really do believe that we're not doing all that needs to be done in terms of staff development in the content areas. (CS-2, pp. 1-2)

The third theme which emerged from the responses of these
informants with regard to the question of current roles in SBDM was that of responding to crises, complaints, or concerns.

We're called in when there is a teacher in trouble and, maybe because there aren't very many of us, we're not called in until they're really in trouble and frequently when their principal is trying to terminate. So a lot of times we're not called in to provide the kind of systematic support a teacher needs as they're beginning to flounder. We just end up getting a call when there's really a full-blown catastrophe, or at least there's a catastrophe in the making. (CS-1, p. 14)

I guess I've always been a crisis manager in terms of a teacher crisis manager, especially at secondary. If a teacher is in trouble then they call me. In the old days, we could pretty well pick out the teachers that were in trouble early and, you know, have a conference with the principal or whatever. The principal respected our opinion in that. Nowadays it's just kind of—if they get in trouble they call us and say, "Hey, come fix it," which is probably too late at that point to do. (CS-2, pp. 4-5)

You know, we get lots of calls from parents—lots and lots of calls. Some looking for some help for their kids, some just wanting to talk to me about the curriculum. I even had one that wanted to know if the school was really following the state curriculum, and wanted to come up and go through the curriculum. We get calls like that all the time. We get more parent calls than I think the schools are aware of. We try to put some water on the flames. (CS-2, p. 14)

I get lots of parent calls. Most of the time they are complaining about a teacher or a principal or whatever. I've gotten those quite a bit. When that happens I just try to calm them down, get them back to the school, tell them to talk with the teacher or principal or whatever. One really angry parent did ask me if it was true that parents were supposed to have a say in hiring or firing teachers because he had heard that site-based committees were supposed to be able to do that and he wanted to do whatever he could to get rid of this particular teacher. I sort of hedged on that one a little bit and calmed him down and
kept telling him that he really needed to talk to both the
teacher and the principal, that they needed to know his
corns. (CS 5, p. 14)

Sometimes a parent will call, or maybe if I'm at a meeting
somewhere someone from the community might ask me, about
what's going on with site-based in the schools. Sometimes I get
the feeling that they ask me questions that they've already
asked at the school, but they just want to check with someone
outside the school to see if they'll get the same answer. I do
think there's still confusion out there about what site-based is
or does, but I don't think it's as hot an issue as it was for a
while. (CS-7, p. 8)

During an informal interview with one of the central
instructional support staff informants, the following comment
reflected another aspect of this theme:

Sometimes I feel like all I do is put out fires. Most of the time,
when I get a call from a principal, it's because they've got to
have help right now. Or if it's a teacher, more often than not,
they've waited until they're in way over their heads about
something before they call and want someone to fix it. (CS-4, p.
18)

Roles Central Instructional Support Staff Should Have in SBDM

Another question posed during each interview asked
respondents to describe the role or roles which they think central
instructional support staff should have in SBDM. Again, three themes
emerged from these responses. The key informants expressed a
desire to (a) serve as a resource and advisor for schools, particularly
regarding curricular issues and current research, (b) be involved
early in the development of school plans, and (c) assist in the
development of teachers as leaders.
Serving as an advisor and resource for school personnel is a role which has historically been a part of the duties of the district's central instructional support staff. However, it appears that the increased autonomy which SBDM offers to schools has caused central support staff some concern, particularly with regard to curricular issues and the dissemination of information.

With schools developing their own plans and their own direction, I think it's imperative that we maintain a focus through the curriculum department that gives [the district] some direction to head. We've got to provide some sort of continuity for the kids in this district. If we don't, we're not going to be the district that we have been in the past... The number one thing we should do is provide guidance for the district goals. Then we should, at least it seems like we should, be able to help the schools aim towards these goals, but from different approaches based on the needs and plans of the school. (CS-4, pp. 9 & 14)

You know how the [state-mandated test] drives school plans, well when we got those results back we were very alarmed. We've never compared so poorly with other districts. So when we got those test results back, there was a sense that we needed to respond to that at the district level, and there wasn't a desire on the part of the schools to provide their own response. In that process, I think they were wanting to take the next step, and they were asking for district guidelines. They were saying they felt that they missed the kind of leverage that district guidelines gave them—and I'm talking about principals. They said it was easier for them to evaluate instruction when they had some clear guidelines to use in the evaluation, and I think that should be up to us. (CS-1, p. 10)

I don't see us telling somebody, "You've got to do this," or "You can't do that." I see us as being a resource or avenue being able to tell of other resources out there, and to bring to that group [campus SBDM teams] information that they can process.
They can throw it out, they can keep it, they can do whatever they want to with it, but at least they are aware of it. I do believe that there are times that the time is just not there for a building classroom teacher to do the kind of research that needs to be done in all of these areas and still do the job that he or she is asked to do. That's the kind of role I can see for us. (CS-3, p. 16)

I think the thing that we have to have is real clear parameters, and I think curriculum needs to be central. We should provide the focus that schools could then work from. (CS-5, p. 18)

I still think there should always be a central role in terms of getting information to schools, interpreting guidelines and regulations from the state. I don't think that's a function that schools could do efficiently. It's not that they couldn't do it, it's just not cost effective for them to do it... I also don't think teachers in the building or principals in a building could afford to belong to all of the professional organizations that central staff combined belongs to in terms of keeping up-to-date with what's going on in terms of research, what's going on in terms of classroom methods, strategies, assessment, planning, staff development—all the things that take place related to a subject area. To me, central can do that more efficiently in terms of providing schools information, updating them on changes in the law and changes in regulations... I mean I feel like that should be my responsibility to keep up-to-date on that and to share that with the principals and the teachers in the buildings. (CS-6, pp. 6-7)

Since frustration resulting from lack of, or "after the fact," involvement in school planning was one of the themes described when asked how SBDM has affected their roles, it was not surprising that one of the roles this group feels they should have is to be involved early in the development of school plans. The following are indicative of this desire for early involvement:
I think we need to be involved at the beginning and at the end of the schools' decision making cycle, and that it needs to be a different kind of involvement than it is now. I think that it's a mistake to promote the idea that each school is an autonomous entity. (CS-1, p. 6)

It would be hard to spread us out among all the schools, but if we had central people on those school teams, then I think it might work out better from the beginning. (CS-2, p. 11)

Central staff should come in at the beginning. They're a piece of the system that needs to be included in training and all the other stuff that goes along with it [SBDM]. Central staff should be able to focus support on what schools' needs are, but the way it is now, we don't even know how they arrived at the conclusion that they need certain things. (CS-7, p. 6)

If someone from Basic Instruction could meet with the site-based teams as they are planning, that person could sit and visit with teachers and with administrators and with other personnel in the building. That person could begin to really measure the heartbeat of the group and know what their concerns were, what their frustrations were, what their joys were. Then that person could come back to our group [of central instructional support staff] and tell what the school wanted to do with whatever content area it was and then maybe we could brainstorm, too, and really get things going in the right direction for that school. (CS-3, p. 15)

One informant described an instance in which a school had spent a great deal of time developing a plan for adding a compensatory course in a particular content area at one of the secondary schools. It was not until the plan was brought to her attention that it was discovered that more groundwork would be required before the plan could be approved. She added:

We found out that [a particular content area specialist] hadn't really been involved and the people who would be teaching the
course weren't involved. It was a good plan, but they really needed to have her [the content area specialist] there at the very beginning. We can be there to help things happen, and happen correctly, if only they'll let us know what they're doing. So now we're kind of picking up the pieces on that. Again, it's a problem with leaving out the central person or the most knowledgeable person very early on. (CS-5, p. 7)

Involvement on school site-based decision making teams has led to more leadership opportunities for teachers. Key informants from central instructional support staff feel that they should be active participants in the development of these emerging leaders. Those opinions are reflected in the following comments:

The department chairs and contact teachers are over here at [the Instruction Division offices] all the time. I've tried to develop within the contact teacher group, and the department chair group, staff development teams. And some of them are also on the teacher cadre. So I try to get those people in leadership positions districtwide so that will carry over into the schools. (CS-2, p. 9)

Department chairs and contact teachers are my real links to the schools. It seems like most of them, but not all, are on their school's site-based team. I think, for the most part, these are people who are viewed as leaders and decision makers in their buildings. They do a really great job, and I think it's really important for me to make sure they're informed about best practices and about what's going on in the state and in the nation so that they can intelligently share that information with the teachers in their buildings. They don't want to look like dummies any more that I do. (CS-6, p. 8)

I guess what I'm trying to say is that we should be a partner in developing that leadership potential in those teachers. (CS-3, p. 19)
Principals have always had a kind of autonomy and independence. Now, with this [SBDM], there are teachers who are playing some real key roles. Some of them haven't been put in that role before and now all of a sudden they're cast in it, and so I think they need more help. They need more structure. They need some processes in place that say you need to check with [a curriculum specialist], you need to cross-check the research, and the research should be about student outcomes. We've got to be involved and available to help those teachers know what they need to know. (CS-5, p. 12)

There are pockets within the district where the teachers see the big picture and the big focus and there are areas, especially at elementary, where they don't have a clue about teaching [a particular subject]. The contact teachers are about the only way I have of reaching those folks, so I've got to depend on them. They're a real good group and I do as much as I can to keep them attuned 'cause a lot of the time they're the only ones in the building who care a whole lot about [the subject]. If [the subject] is going to be a focus of one of their school's action plans, then they're the ones who'd have to sell it in the first place. (CS-4, p. 12)

Impacts of SBDM on Services Provided to Schools

When asked what impacts SBDM has had on the services which they provide to schools, the one recurring theme expressed by all of the central instructional support staff key informants was that they have less contact with school personnel than they have had in years past. Although SBDM is cited for some of the decrease in contact, several also expressed the view that the decrease in contact, while perhaps related to SBDM, was most likely due to the reduction in staff which has occurred over the course of the last five years.

Typical responses were:
At the elementary level, some schools contact us and some schools, it seems like, don't even pay much attention to us. You know, if [a particular content area] wasn't their focus this year in their school plan then I don't think it ever even occurs to them that there's anything I can do to be of assistance to them. (CS-2, p. 3)

The biggest thing that I think has changed is that, since schools are really trying to do their own thing and there's just more going on at the building level than there used to be, we aren't as likely to be able to require people to attend meetings and programs and inservice-type things. Oh, don't get me wrong, there are lots of people—especially teachers—who'll come to just about anything they can, but we just can't be sure anymore that we'll have 100% turnout for anything. (CS-7, p. 7)

I guess what I'm seeing is that fewer teachers are interacting with me as frequently. I just think there are fewer interchanges. I'm just hearing from them less and less. I think part of that probably is that sense of "We're in charge here" that some have gotten from site-based, but part of it is that I think they are feeling that, you know, that I have all these different buildings that I work with and that maybe I just won't have the time, or that their question or problem isn't important enough to bother me with. (CS-3, p. 9)

There are certain buildings who do ask for more help than others, but there are some who haven't asked for anything, and probably wouldn't, no matter what. There are some who oppose anything that I try to do because I try to approach it from a global point of view so that everybody is headed more or less in the same direction—so there's some kind of uniformity among the schools. I guess that may run counter to what all the principals think site-based management should do, which I think flies in the face of the purpose behind it anyway because my understanding, and maybe I'm off in left field, but my understanding is that we have a goal we're all supposed to be headed toward and how we approach getting there might be different via site-based decisions. If we don't have that common goal and if all of us don't provide somewhat similar
experiences for the kids in this district then we're going to do more harm than good. We'll splinter out and do lots of different things, and may or may not end up in the same place. (CS-4, pp. 3-4)

I sent a notice to principals about changes in [the state-mandated test], and I also made sure they all got copies of the specification booklet. Proportionately, very few teachers or principals came to the staff development programs we provided last summer or in January. This new test is a really big deal, but no—my phone is not ringing off the wall. Maybe it will be a different story when we get the first results back. Maybe it has to be their idea instead of ours. (CS-6, p. 10)

We used to have much more direct contact with teachers and spent much more time in the classrooms but I don't think I can attribute that just to site-based decision making. That [SBDM] has certainly been some part of it but it wasn't just site-based decision making that caused us to stop doing that, it was other things, too. (CS-1, p. 13)

We've talked about organizing in a different manner. We looked at a role that [the assistant superintendent] refers to as an instructional associate role. It would be sort of like assigning schools an account executive. Say an instructional associate would be assigned to anywhere from three to five schools and their role would have been to go in and troubleshoot, meet with the teams, meet with the principal, meet with the site-based team, and be like a broker for services that they need... I think if we had that we could really minimize some of the problems that I've seen with site-based. But, unfortunately, because we've down-sized and we don't have the people on central staff that we used to, then it's become harder and harder to provide the services that I see that schools really need. (CS-5, pp. 1-2)
Impacts of SBDM on Services Requested by Schools

While the previous question addressed the services which central instructional support staff is providing to the schools, this question asked what changes have occurred in the requests for service which central support staff receives from school personnel since the inception of site-based decision making. The two themes which became apparent in analyzing the responses are (a) requests for staff development opportunities, and (b) a generalized decrease in the number and/or type of requests than in the past.

Although the district continues to offer districtwide staff development programs, the move to site-based decision making has brought with it an increase in the demand for staff development at an individual school site which addresses the needs derived from that school's campus improvement plan. The following comments indicate the types of requests for staff development which central instructional support staff now receive:

A lot of the things schools are asking for have to do with stuff like dealing with conflict, team building, reaching consensus, things like that. I think requests like that probably are directly a result of site-based. They want to learn how to make decisions as a group and they're asking us to provide them with staff development on issues like that. The other thing I think is happening is that as a school gets ready to try something new to them—like, say, multi-age grouping—they want more info and they'll call and ask for help. (CS-7, p. 10)

Every staff development that my department does is done because somebody comes to me and says that their school needs some training in this or that particular area, with the exception of when the new textbooks go out. I'm assuming
they want training in that area, but that's the one big exception. I feel like staff development should reflect their needs, and their needs come to me through requests from the department chairs and contact teachers... I think we ought to saturate them with what they want and then when they quit asking, then we can start including other things. (CS-4, pp. 17-18)

I see that our principals always have wanted really good, in-depth programs focused on student achievement, so I see those same types of things being requested... but I do think we're delivering staff development in a different way because the schools are asking for so many different things. (CS-5, p. 21)

Sometimes schools ask for staff development kinds of things that just don't even fit in with what the state says or what the district is doing. Other schools have come to us and asked about certain presenters or certain topics or what we would provide because they know we have people trained in the district to provide certain kinds of presentations. It also seems to me like they're doing more generic kinds of things which are necessary, but content has been left out. So I think content suffers a great deal when those [staff development] decisions are just left to the schools. (CS-2, pp. 2-3)

Since the informants had indicated that they have less contact with school personnel than they have had in years past, it was not surprising that they also noted a generalized decrease in the number and/or type of requests for support staff services. Comments on this theme included:

There are just fewer requests from principals and from teachers. It's just fewer requests, and I'm not really sure why that is. (CS-3, p. 9)

They're not really requesting a lot. Like I said before, there's a little change in the kinds of things that they're beginning to ask for, but they're not asking for much yet. They're still in that
mode, I think, of thinking, "We're site-based so we're going to do all this stuff ourselves and make all of our own decisions," and I don't think it's really dawned on them yet that, "Hey, we can use people from Basic Instruction to do these kinds of things." They're just not at that stage yet. I think they'll get there quickly, but I don't think they're there yet. They're still—you know, when you take on a new job and you decide you're going to do it all yourself and you have a little trouble letting things be delegated out—well, I think that's where they are with site-based now. (CS-4, pp. 21-22)

Sometimes what I see is that the kind of support or service that has been requested by schools is a sort of quasi-intervention. It's as if they don't really want to ask for help, or that they want our help with just one tiny little piece of something rather than the whole thing. I'm not sure if that's an autonomy issue or what it is exactly, but it seems to me that what that does, in essence, is ask us to provide the least effective kind of support that we can offer. (CS-1, p. 13)

I've had very few requests. It's just not much at all. I did get asked by one school to be involved with writing a waiver, and occasionally I get a call for some research to support something they're doing or planning, but basically I just don't get many requests. (CS-7, p. 10)

An outlier, or aberration in the data, was noted in the following comment from one of the central staff key informants:

I think what we've done is create this ownership and leadership on everyone's part in the building so I would say we are getting more requests because of that ownership that they have. It also is more in-depth. It's really asking for things that really help them do that action plan as opposed to simply asking for materials to teach on a day-to-day basis. It's been more focused on whatever their project is that they're working on, so it's been much more focused. (CS-5, p. 22)
Interviews with Principals as Key Informants

Effect of SBDM on Roles of Central Instructional Staff

In responding to the core question which asked how SBDM had affected their roles, central instructional support staff members expressed concern about loss of control/effectiveness/prestige and frustration resulting from lack of, or "after the fact," involvement in school planning. Comments from principals who served as key informants generally mirrored both of these themes. Principals voiced the opinion that site-based decision making has resulted in both (a) a decrease in central instructional support staff's control or power and (b) a lessening of the involvement of central instructional support staff in school planning and activities. However, the tone of frustration which was apparent in the responses from central staff key informants was not evident in the responses of the principals.

Regarding the decrease in central instructional support staff's control or power, principals expressed the following:

Roles for central [instructional support] staff people used to be more clearly defined and everyone understood who was responsible for what. Now, with schools doing site-based, the schools are making the decisions and having to take on the responsibility. Central staff doesn't have anywhere near as much control over what goes on in every building and I think that's caused a great deal of uneasiness—at least, that's my perception of it. (P-5, p. 2)

You know, there just used to be a lot more done centrally than there is now. Central [instructional support staff] just doesn't do as much for buildings as they used to and I guess that's probably caused some people in the Instruction Division to question just how important they are to the schools (P-4, p. 2).
When we first started this [SBDM] I was a principal but I think some of my friends on central staff felt that they were step-children in the whole thing. They didn't know what their role was and they weren't even sure of what their role could or should be. They just didn't have a good feel for what pieces still belonged to them. I guess they probably still feel that way. You know, they really didn't have a role initially, and I guess they still don't. Oh, there are still things that are done for the schools at the central level, but they don't have anywhere near the power that they used to. (P-6, p. 4)

The way things are structured now with site-based, they [central instructional support staff] just aren't as influential as they used to be. (P-1, p. 2)

There was a time when central staff people were sought out as the authorities on anything that had to do with instruction or curriculum. Now, with site-based, I think they almost have a feeling that they've got to create a need for their job. I think everybody has become a little more polarized and, as a result, I don't think we work as closely as we used to, and that bothers me. (P-2, p. 3)

Principals also indicated their awareness of a lessening of the involvement of central instructional support staff in school planning and activities:

Schools have really gotten into doing their own planning and their own research and things like that. A lot of times they [central instructional support staff] probably feel left out because so much is taking place at the building level that they're not involved in or don't even know about. (P-3, p.3)

I don't think there are many of us [principals] who even feel very connected with central staff anymore. We just take care of ourselves. (P-4, p. 2)

As far as site-based goes, we [at this particular school] haven't reached out to central staff. None of our action teams or
facilitators or anybody has really even mentioned it. I guess they [central instructional support staff] are basically an untapped resource. (P-7, p. 3)

Five years ago when we started site-based decision making, what we got was the faculty having an opportunity to respond to their pressure points and what they saw to be the biggest issues at that time. Until this year, we've really not had an issue that was such that we saw a direct need to even contact anybody from central instruction. We really haven't seen a need to bring them in and ask them to be involved in any way. I think when I was the one making most of the decisions I had more central people involved at that time than I do now. They [central instructional support staff] just aren't in the building as much as they used to be, so I guess it's difficult for teachers to see what steps they'd have to take in order to get to central staff. The department chairs see central staff and the role they play, but regular classroom teachers just don't see that as much. It's very difficult for them to see the instructional [support staff] people or the people that they could go to or should go through. (P-2, pp. 1-2)

I think it's probably very difficult for them [central instructional support staff] to necessarily feel a part of any school's site-based management team. They're just kind of out of the loop unless there's a problem or something... There can be some decisions made by a school that are not necessarily the best and, on occasion, I think we could probably have a better program if our team took the time to get some information from a central staff person; but it's certainly very difficult for a central instructional person to be involved with the planning. There's only so much time, so you end up not necessarily involving them until after the fact. (P-6, pp. 1-2)

Roles Central Instructional Support Staff Currently Has in SBDM

Responding to the question of what roles central instructional support staff members currently have in SBDM, principals serving as key informants expressed two primary themes, as opposed to the
three themes contained in responses from central instructional support staff informants. While central instructional support staff informants perceived their current role in SBDM as (a) providing support to schools, (b) addressing staff development and professional growth needs, and (c) responding to crises, complaints, or concerns, principals described the instructional support staff role in SBDM as either (a) providing support for the schools, or (b) no role in the schools' site-based decision making process. Interestingly, staff development opportunities being provided by central instructional support staff was specifically mentioned by only one principal and, although principals mentioned that central instructional support staff might be called upon to answer questions, no principal commented on crisis intervention.

The following are examples of the principals' comments concerning central instructional support staff providing support for schools:

I definitely think that the instructional support staff, the central instructional support staff, have a role and I've used some of those people with a lot of the site-based things we are trying to do. An example of that would be that one of our school goals is to improve reading comprehension skills. I've talked with people in instruction to get information from them about what we needed to have. It might be particular strategies or it might be more information about the testing process itself. We did have [a curriculum specialist] come in and talk with us about the new specs for the social studies and science tests, even though I knew they [the teachers] had heard it at their district meetings. But, in order to raise everybody's awareness, I really thought we needed to hear more detail and to hear it from her. That was really helpful. Those are some
examples of some ways that they have helped us meet our site-based goals. When we need various specific information, expertise, or just additional support in carrying something off, they're a source we can go to. (P-3, p. 1-2)

They [central instructional support staff] are the ones who look at parameters, especially in terms of curriculum and content, and can give us the guidance we need about that. Even though with site-based I think, at times, we are somewhat viewed as a bunch of little independent school districts, we still have to have those parameters—as building level people we still need those. I think we need to feel that parachute underneath us. I also see them facilitating and helping give support to see that things are done. You know, because the decisions are being made closer to where the problems are, I see them being support people to see that these things get done. (P-5, pp. 2-3)

I think when they get calls from principals it's probably because of a question about a particular curriculum issue or something like that, but that's really always been their role. I think principals still see them as people who are really knowledgeable and can give us some support when we need help with things like the new reading adoption or the [state-mandated test]. (P-6, p. 12)

Other principals very directly stated that, in their opinion, members of central instructional support staff currently have no role in site-based decision making. Their views are clearly expressed in the following statements:

I don't really see that central [instructional support] staff has a role in my school. Years ago, we tried to align some of our action plans with some of the things that were going on centrally in the district, and it just didn't work. No one seemed to want to try to look at it from our perspective, but just wanted to tell us how things had to be done. I think one of the reasons that asking them for help with site-based stuff doesn't work is that central staff members feel no allegiance to a particular school. They're just not invested in what we've done
or what we plan to do, so we don't call them anymore. (P-4, p. 2)

I don't see that they [central instructional support staff] really have any input as far as site-based is concerned. (P-7, p. 6)

Well, they're really not involved in planning to any great extent; in fact, I guess, really not at all. (P-6, p. 3)

I don't think I could really tell you what their role is in site-based until I have a specific need... If their goal is to make a difference in the individual schools, then they probably aren't going about it in the right way because they are so global. (P-2, pp. 4 & 5)

One principal described a type of supportive role played by central instructional support staff but then went on to say that they have no particular role in site-based decision making:

I think currently, as far as site-based decision making is concerned, they are a resource mainly. If there is a question in a particular area, or if we have questions about some sort of in-house staff development we're planning, I think they are serving as a resource from their office because they don't come out to the buildings any more at all. So, therefore, it's really put upon the school to be the instigator of the contact. We get memos and things but, I think as far as serving in site-based decision making, they don't really have a role. (P-1, p. 4)

Only one principal specifically mentioned the role of providing staff development which was expressed by a number of central instructional support staff informants. It seems noteworthy that this is the same principal who was able to describe particular examples of ways in which central instructional support staff had provided assistance in helping the school meet its site-based goals. She stated:
I wanted our Local School Council to come together more as a team, so we took advantage of [a central instructional support staff member's] expertise in working with groups as a team to try to build that trust within the group. We basically have two groups of people on the council, the school people and the parent or community people, and there is definitely a division in thought at times, but it's just because of where we're coming from. That's OK, but we need to know it's OK, and we need maybe to try to anticipate the kinds of conflicts we might have. [The central instructional support staff member] provided a couple of inservices for us on working as a team, and it's really been helpful. In the future, I see needing to call upon central people again for the same kinds of things. They do lots for all of us in terms of staff development, you know, but I expect I'll be calling on them again for specific things for our building. I just think that they're in a position to have information we don't have because of the nature of their jobs and, since they have some information about the district as a whole or a picture of the district that we might not have, they can really be a great help to us. If they can just put us in touch with other schools that have similar needs or goals, that can always be a great source of information. (P-3, pp. 2-3)

Roles Central Instructional Support Staff Should Have in SBDM

The key informants from central instructional support staff stated that their role in SBDM should be to (a) serve as a resource and advisor for schools, particularly regarding curricular issues and current research, (b) be involved early in the development of school plans, and (c) assist in the development of teachers as leaders. In the view of principals who served as key informants, the two roles which central instructional support staff should have in SBDM are (a) serving as an advisor and support for local school site-based teams, and (b) providing consistency throughout the district. None of the principals interviewed mentioned the development of teachers as
leaders as a role which central instructional support staff should have in site-based decision making.

Although central instructional support staff made a distinction between serving as a resource and/or advisor to schools and being involved early in the development of school plans, principals seemed to see these as one role. Often when a principal spoke of a central instructional staff member providing assistance to a school's site-based team, it had to do with providing help in planning. The desired role of central instructional support staff in SBDM is contained in statements such as:

I think in a lot of ways it could be useful to actually assign a central staff person to be on your site-based team, maybe not actually as a member of your Local School Council but more as someone who could help. You know, if questions come up at a meeting, they could be answered right then and there. If you're looking at options to do things a certain way, then someone could be there to help you with the options. They [the central instructional support staff] could bring in the content expertise. So I think if they could come not as a voting member but more as an advisory person that would be a good role for them. Plus it would get a lot of central people out into the schools, and I think that would be good for them and I know it would be good for us... I think most everyone would certainly be glad to have their expertise especially when we're working on plans and developing objectives. (P-1, pp. 5-6 & 14)

If they [central instructional support staff] had a role in site-based decision making, first of all, they would need to become part of the site. If they have a role I think that role would be the same as mine, and that's to set parameters for the group. There are limits to what schools can do, even with site-based, and the school council and the action teams sometimes have to be reminded of that. Central staff people are ones who could
help us when we're making plans by helping us see why and where our limits are. (P-2, p. 9)

I've wondered about actually having them [central instructional support staff] as part of our committee, maybe as an ad hoc member. I really don't know enough about what their time commitment could be as far as actually serving on the Local School Council or one of the committees in the school actually working on some particular aspect of our goals. I've really thought about it and I think maybe it would be good to have someone serve on our Local School Council who could meet with us monthly. Or at least I can see it happening at certain periods of time that we would have different people come in and update us or talk to us, either as a committee, as a Local School Council, or as a total faculty. I think it would be a big help. I definitely think that we could use their help and their expertise in the planning stages. Committees sometimes find out as they get started that what they really needed was somebody here from special education or reading or math who could have given their input into the planning to help us come up with a better plan. (P-3, pp. 4-5)

I just think central [instructional support] staff's role should be one of providing service to the schools. They should be resources and should provide resources for the schools to pull in. Ideally, if they were able to be in on our planning and meetings, they would be able to anticipate our needs and could help before anyone got in a bind. I really do think it would be advantageous to have an instructional specialist on a school site-based team. Mostly, I just think it would be great if they could come to us—come to our Local School Council meetings—so they'd know what kind of support we need, rather than someone in a school having to call and leave them a voice mail message that may or may not ever be returned. (P-4, p. 5)

Certainly they should support us with research things and they should coordinate the resources that are on the district level so that we will be able to have access to those types of things that we can't ordinarily spend the time to go get. They should also
help us with setting parameters on what we can do before we get too far into things. (P-5, p. 3)

I think, ideally, it would be great to assign an instructional staff member to a school and then they could certainly be involved with site-based. They would be a part of it and be a regular part of any of the business of the Local School Council or he action teams... Ideally, that would be how it was done, so that they could be in on developing a plan and then they could be more supportive of us... It would be great if, let's say a school is trying to do something about improving math achievement, it would be great to get that math specialist involved in the planning phase so that they could kind of help people in the school see what's possible and what's not. (P-6, pp. 2, 4, & 12)

I think it would be good if we had some of them [from central instructional support staff] on our action teams or even on the Local School Council. I think there's a lot of miscommunication between school staff and central. I think teachers tend to think that people on central [instructional support staff] don't really have much to do, so it might also improve PR for the district at large. Those folks in curriculum have a lot of information and resources available to them that we don't always know about so I think it would be important to site-based to have them as part of our teams. (P-7, p. 7)

Another theme expressed by principals regarding the role that central instructional support staff should have in site-based decision making is that of providing consistency throughout the district. Comments which illustrate this theme include:

I think it's really important for this district to always have a central [instructional support] staff. I think there's a real need to have some things decided at the central office level that then come to the buildings. I don't think all decisions can or should be made at the building level and when we're talking about instructional expertise we need to be able to have someone who is very well-qualified, who attends state and national conferences, who is up-to-date, who has the exposure to the
information that is out there. It's just important for some things to be consistent throughout the district. There are some standards or parameters that this district stands for that need to be in place in every building and I think central staff people are the ones who can ensure that. (P-3, p. 13)

Central [instructional support] staff are the ones who need to be there to help us on setting parameters for what we can and can't do in the buildings. If a school goes off in too many directions, we create problems for other people. We don't all have to be alike, but we don't need to be totally different either. I just think it causes problems on down the line if there isn't someone at the central staff level who can help us see just how far we can go, whether it's about a content area or testing or whatever. (P-5, p. 4)

I guess I think maybe we are at a point in this district where we need to be a little more specific about where some of the parameters are. It seems like we have quite a number of waivers, and maybe that's OK, but you also have to be careful that you don't go too far out on some of these things. I suppose that is, or at least it should be, the role of the central instructional person. (P-6, p. 12)

**Impacts of SBDM on Services Provided to Schools**

When asked what impacts SBDM has had on the services which central instructional support staff provides to schools, two themes were expressed by the principals, as opposed to only one recurring theme from central instructional staff key informants. Principals cited (a) less support for schools from central instructional support staff, and (b) the continuation of standard types of support from central instructional support staff.

The common thread in the responses of both groups is a lessening of services, but there is a subtle difference in the way this
While central instructional support staff key informants described less contact with school personnel than they have had in the past, principals simply said that schools now have less support. It is of further note that, as with many of the key informants from central instructional support staff, several principals also expressed the view that the decrease in contact, while likely related to SBDM, was also attributable to the reduction in staff which has occurred over the last five years.

In citing less support from central instructional support staff, typical responses from principals included:

There is so little one-on-one or face-to-face contact between central instructional staff and teachers, not to mention between central instructional staff and principals. There isn't the scheduled contact we used to have in years past, so we just simply don't get the services that we used to. Because of downsizing and who knows what else, central staff just can't do all the things they used to do. Now I think we tend to rely more on expertise within the building than expecting that we're going to get it from central staff. With the district organization the way it is, there simply is not enough central staff to serve the schools the way they were served in the past. In fact, as far as site-based is concerned, I don't think I've ever called anybody on central staff to help with anything. (P-4, pp. 5-6)

It used to be possible for central staff to be in classrooms more, and that was great. They used to have more of a hands-on approach, more of a feel for what was really going on in schools and individual classrooms. Maybe site-based has tended to put that back more on the principal and maybe the cutbacks have had an effect, but now with central staff it's just more of a global kind of thing. You know, it's sort of like all they can do is say, "Here's the new reading adoption and if you have problems or questions or whatever, call me and I'll get back to
you when I can." So we end up depending a lot on our contact teachers and, even though that works fairly well, it just creates another issue because it means that a teacher has to assume the responsibility for doing a job that used to belong to central staff. (P-6, p. 9)

I don't really know what has caused it, but I feel like there is less support from central [instructional support] staff than in the past. I can see where site-based has affected what they do, but I also know that with downsizing central staff people are not always available to come in and help us like they have in the past. We might still call them, but just not as often... I guess I really don't feel that there's a lack of support but maybe just a lower level of support. Site-based probably has contributed to that, but I still think that if we had all the curriculum people that we used to have then we would make use of them more often. (P-1, pp. 1 & 8)

If we just looked back at the services central [instructional support] staff has provided over the last couple of years, I think our opinion would be very poor about a lot of what's gone on. I'm sure it has to do with site-based and downsizing and the school finance mess and all of that kind of thing, but our central staff, especially in terms of curriculum, is almost non-existent. Five or six years ago, things were going great and schools were getting great services and it really made a nice working atmosphere for all of us. Then came the money crunch and people started getting re-assigned or if someone retired they just weren't replaced and their job was absorbed by someone else. It's crazy! And I do think it's created more than a little tension between central staff and local building people. (P-5, p. 5)

The way things are now, the poor curriculum people are split in so many different directions and wearing so many different hats that I don't think principals really expect to get much support from them. And I do think, too, that site-based has made us tend to think that we have to fix our own problems, anyway. (P-7, p. 5)
A lot of times in the past I think [central instructional] support staff people were able to come to administrators and say, "Did you know this was happening, or this was occurring, or this problem is out there, or I've observed this?" Then the next thing they would do is offer to help. It was another pair of eyes and that helps to have that kind of help available. I've watched that just go away, and I hate it that it's happened like that. I guess the thing that I have the most concern about for our district in terms of moral support is the direct contact and support to new teachers in the district. It basically has fallen to individual schools and mentors to do that... Now, and I do think site-based has created some of this line of thinking, if we have any kind of need or a problem or a concern, the first impulse of the staff is to try to figure our if they can do it in-house. (P-3, pp. 9 & 12)

The other theme contained in principals' responses to this question was that central instructional support staff continues to provide schools with the standard services which that group has historically provided and which, therefore, have come to be expected. The following statements are representative of this perspective:

Two or three weeks ago some of my teachers told me about a meeting they had been to where [one of the curriculum specialists] made a presentation. Apparently, during the presentation, she talked a lot about changes that are being made at the state level and then shared some articles and a bibliography with them, and I think basically just talked with the group about issues in their particular content area. You know, it sounded to me like just the kind of meeting that central staff has always held, but a couple of these teachers had never really met with her before and they acted like it was a really big deal. Maybe those folks [on central instructional support staff] need to do more of that kind of stuff that they've always done to see if they can reach more teachers. (P-2, p. 11)
Of course, central [instructional support] staff still does things like providing materials, articles, notices of conventions and seminars and events, things like that. They conduct inservices and answer questions just like in the past. (P-4, p. 7)

The [district's] Reading Center training is certainly provided every year for new teachers and that's one of those things that central [instructional support] staff still provides as support that is standard for everybody—well, at least for the elementaries. I suppose new teacher orientation and PETL (Principles of Effective Teaching and Learning) Training would be other examples of some standard type things that they provide. But, as a principal, I don't get involved in those things because if I have a new teacher she automatically gets notified of those things and then goes. Providing inservices and materials and research information are the kinds of things that central staff has always done and that we all still expect them to do. (P-1, p. 8)

Central [instructional support] staff does provide inservice and staff development kinds of things like they have in the past, and we still get notices about meetings and upcoming events that might be of interest about a particular subject. Also, the Reading Center is something they've continued to do, even with fewer people on their staff. Those are the kinds of things that they've been doing for a long time that they still do for all the schools. (P-6, p. 9)

**Impacts of SBDM on Services Requested by Schools**

While the previous question addressed the types of services provided to the schools by central instructional support staff, this question examines the changes in the types of requests which central instructional support staff have received from school personnel since the inception of site-based decision making. As with central instructional support staff, two themes emerged from the responses
of principals. However, while key informants from central instructional support staff outlined (a) requests for staff development opportunities, and (b) a generalized decrease in the number and/or type of requests, principals described (a) fewer requests for assistance from central instructional support staff, and (b) requests which are focused on finding better ways to accomplish school goals. As was evidenced in the responses to the previous question, reduction in staff again appears to play a part in the answers to this question.

Each of the principals interviewed expressed the opinion that schools are now making fewer requests for assistance from central instructional support staff. Comments included:

The long and short of it is that we really consider our department chairs as being our specialists, and we've really tried to nurture that on our campus, especially since site-based came about. We've tried to put them on a level that's sort of above and beyond because they do have additional responsibilities and additional contract days. We try to get things done here [at the building level] because we know best what we're trying to do, and those department chairs are the ones we rely on to get it done. Since we've really given them more responsibilities, don't call on central [instructional support] staff people as much as we used to. Oh, we might call one of them in and ask them to evaluate where we are or to give us some suggestions, but we just don't have as much need to call on them much anymore. (P- 5, p. 11)

Right now, since there's basically very few [central instructional support] people to call on, you tend not to call on them unless it's almost like a last resort... When you've exhausted everything, every resource that you know of, and you've talked with other principals, and you still aren't satisfied with what you've come up with, then finally at that
point you give up and call. The frustrating thing is that when you do call, nine times out of ten you get voice mail. Now, most of the time I would say that eventually you get a return call, but sometimes it's too late. I just think we would certainly utilize central staff people more if there were more of them. (P-1, p. 8 & 11)

My special ed. people are really the only ones who call someone from central staff very often. That's sort of related to our site-based plan, but not totally. I just can't think of any other group or team or committee that's specifically called someone from central staff for help with something they're doing. Most of the time, if there's some kind of problem or question, I think I'll hear about it and then if I think we need to call in someone, I'll do it. We just really don't make many requests. (P-7, p. 5)

I've found them [central instructional support staff] to be pretty responsive when I've requested. The problem is that the services are just not as available, so they're just not requested. Most of the time what seems to happen is that teachers go to the contact teacher in the building if they have a question that's subject related. The only problem is that, even though the contact teachers are very competent people, if they've never been in that role before and they're just learning what their responsibilities are, then there can be things that fall through the cracks—you know, questions that never get answered. The contact teacher plan is a good one on paper, but when you actually look at the comings and goings, resignations, and shifting around that we do, it doesn't always work that smoothly. Maybe you don't get the information to the new people or the people who aren't new to the district but are new to your building, and then that gap gets translated into gaps in classroom instruction. There's always that communication gap that we're trying to fill. (P-3, pp. 10-11)

I don't think there's much requesting done because I think the tendency is to think that central staff people are working on the state issues, the global issues, the textbook issues, the broader themes that go beyond the building level. (P-2, p. 11)
About a year ago I had a group of teachers interested in doing more with integrated curriculum. They called [one of the curriculum specialists] and asked for some information and were told that there was no district stand or philosophy in place regarding integrated curriculum, so they felt like they were just kind of left on their own to create their own thing. [The curriculum specialist] didn't even ask if they needed some help or would like some books or articles to read—nothing. Needless to say, they haven't called back. (P-4, p. 7)

Back when there were more of them [central instructional support staff] and they were each assigned to several schools it was just so much easier to know who to call, and if they didn't know the answer then they could help you find out who did. Now I just don't ever think to call them, and I'm pretty sure my teachers don't either. (P-6, p. 5)

The second theme which principals stated in their responses to this question indicates their view that when requests are made of central instructional support staff by school personnel these requests are focused on finding better ways to accomplish school goals. Although this was not a unanimous opinion among the principals interviewed, several expressed this theme by stating:

There have been times that we've developed a goal which creates an obvious need. For example, if we're really looking at some other ways to assess kids rather than just tests, then what we'll do is determine what the staff as a whole needs in terms of that particular topic and then our next step would likely be to seek out those [central instructional support staff] people who have expertise in that area. Then they could come and do some kind of presentation or staff development to help us get everybody on the same page. Sometimes we have a problem and we get stuck, out of ideas, and all we see are the barriers. Sometimes we need help from somebody who's not so close to it who can ask questions like, "Have you considered this?" or "Why haven't you tried this?" It may be right under
our nose but for some reason we've either chosen to ignore it or we just get buried in the reasons why we can't instead of looking at all the different creative ways we could. And again, people in central staff have seen more of that and can say, "Yeah, this happened over at another school," or "I've seen this work in another situation, maybe it'll work in yours now." It's good if people can come to us from varied practical applications rather than totally theoretical ones. We need that kind of guidance when we're launching something new. (P-3, pp. 6-7)

Sometimes when we've made a decision to do something or find something that we really want to incorporate into our school goals, that's when you realize that the school can't do all of this ourselves and what we really need is somebody else to help us. That's when you want to know there's somebody on central [instructional support staff] who you can call and ask for help. I would think they probably get lots of requests for assistance with school plans but, since there aren't very many of them, maybe not. (P-6, p. 5)

As a result of the kind of brainstorming and creative thinking that we've done in trying to determine what goals are really right for this campus I think that, when we have made requests, we've asked central [instructional support] staff for better things, more appropriate things, than we have in the past. You know, better ways to deliver curriculum, better ways to bring about real changes in the classrooms, and those types of things to meet the needs of all our kids... But I think what we really need isn't so much somebody to tell us whether we're doing things right or not, but somebody who can help us see if the outcomes we're looking at are realistic. We need to know if something we're getting ready to put in place will help us achieve these outcomes. That's when we'll bring in people like [central instructional support staff]. They can examine a plan and tell us whether or not we can achieve what we are trying to achieve by doing this and this and this. Sometimes we need that kind of help to see if we should try to change our course or whether or not we really are on target. (P-5, pp. 6 & 12)
I guess we could all develop better school plans and goals if there were more central [instructional support staff] people to help. I'm always looking for better ways to do things and I think my teachers are, too. I'm sure that I do ask for help sometimes, but maybe I don't really think of it as making a request because all I do is call one of my friends who's still on central staff and we just talk through whatever it is. (p-7, p. 8)

Comparison of the Themes Expressed by Key Informants

In analyzing the data, categories were developed from repeated regularities in the responses of the informants. These categories were then developed into broad themes. Sections one and two above noted the differing themes which emerged from the responses of the two groups of key informants. A summary of these themes is presented below. Following each summary, a table is provided as a representation of the themes expressed by the two groups of key informants in their responses to the five core interview questions.

Effect of SBDM on Roles of Central Instructional Staff

When asked to describe what effects the district's move to site-based decision making has had on the roles of central instructional support staff, both the principals and the informants from central instructional support staff mentioned that there has been a decrease in central staff's control within the district's organizational structure. The principals commented about central support staff's loss of control or power, while central instructional support staff informants discussed not only a loss of control and/or effectiveness, but also a
loss of prestige. It is noteworthy that none of the responses from principals contained any reference to a loss of prestige or personal standing within the school district community. Perhaps examining the effects of SBDM on their roles caused some of the central instructional support staff key informants to respond to this question from a more personal standpoint than the principals.

The second theme which emerged from the opinions of central instructional support staff was one of frustration resulting from lack of, or "after the fact," involvement in school planning. The second theme from principals' responses was quite similar, noting that there has been less involvement of central instructional support staff in school planning and activities. The tone of frustration which was quite apparent in the comments of central instructional support staff was not present in the responses of principals.

Table 3
Themes Emerging from Responses to Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Central Staff</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How has the district's move to SBDM affected the roles of CS?</td>
<td>Loss of control/ effectiveness/ and/or prestige</td>
<td>Loss of power/ control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;After the fact&quot; involvement in school planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Less CS involvement in school planning &amp; activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Themes Emerging from Responses to Question 1
Roles Central Instructional Support Staff Currently Has in SBDM

Responding to the question of what roles central instructional support staff members currently have in SBDM, central staff key informants expressed three primary themes. These themes had to do with (a) providing support to schools, (b) addressing staff development and professional growth needs, and (c) responding to crises, complaints, or concerns.

In contrast, principals described the central instructional support staff role in SBDM as either (a) providing support for the schools, or (b) no role in the schools' site-based decision making process. The topic of staff development was not discussed by principals in answering this question and, even though the principals included responding to their problems or concerns as part of providing support for schools, no mention was made of central instructional support staff providing crisis intervention or crisis management.

On the following page, Table 4 outlines the themes derived from the responses of the two groups when discussing the role(s) currently held by central instructional support staff in site-based decision making.
Table 4
Themes Emerging from Responses to Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Central Staff</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What roles do CS members currently have in SBDM?</td>
<td>Support for schools</td>
<td>Support for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing staff development/ professional growth needs</td>
<td>No role in SBDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responding to crises/complaints/concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roles Central Instructional Support Staff Should Have in SBDM

During the course of the interviews, respondents were asked to describe the role or roles which they believe central instructional support staff should have in site-based decision making. Three themes emerged from the responses of key informants from central instructional support staff, but only two recurring themes were discerned from principals' responses.

Central instructional staff informants expressed a desire to (a) serve as a resource and advisor for schools, particularly regarding curricular issues and current research, (b) be involved early in the development of school plans, and (c) assist in the development of teachers as leaders. Principals agreed that a role for central instructional support staff in SBDM should be one of serving as an advisor and support for local school site-based teams.
However, the only other theme found in principals' responses to this question dealt with central instructional support staff being the group which provides consistency throughout the district. While some principals, in answering other of the core interview questions, did comment on the advisability of involving central instructional support staff in developing school plans, that role did not emerge as a persistent theme in their responses to this question. Also, none of the key informant principals mentioned the role of developing teachers as leaders as one which central instructional support staff should have in site-based decision making.

Table 5
Themes Emerging from Responses to Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Central Staff</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What roles do you think CS members should have in SBDM?</td>
<td>Resource/advisor to schools</td>
<td>Advisor/support to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early involvement in development of school plans</td>
<td>Provide district consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in development of teachers as leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impacts of SBDM on Services Provided to Schools

When asked what impacts SBDM has had on the services which are provided to schools, only one recurring theme was expressed by all of the central instructional support staff key informants. All
commented they now have less contact with school personnel than they have had in previous years.

Again, principals apparently agreed with the theme cited by central instructional support staff, even though the two groups' perceptions of the situation appears to be somewhat different. Principals consistently commented on the problem of less support for schools from central instructional support staff rather than stating that the issue is one of less contact with school personnel.

Both groups of informants commented that, in addition to the implementation of site-based decision making, the decline in support for, or contact with, school personnel could also be attributed to the decrease in the numbers of central instructional support staff which has occurred over the past several years.

The second theme emerging from principals' answers to this question indicated that they believe that, even with the advent of SBDM, central instructional support staff continues to provide schools with the standard types of services which that group has historically provided in the district and which principals and other school personnel have come to expect.

Table 6 displays the themes expressed by the two groups of key informants when asked about the impact of site-based decision making on services provided to schools.
Table 6

Themes Emerging from Responses to Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Central Staff</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What impacts has SBDM had on the services provided to schools by CS?</td>
<td>Less contact with school personnel</td>
<td>Less support for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to provide standard (expected) services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impacts of SBDM on Services Requested by Schools

In response to this question, both groups of key informants agreed that there has been a decrease in the number of requests made by school personnel for assistance from central instructional support staff. As evidenced in responses to the previous question, the district's reduction in support staff again appears to play a part in the answers to this question.

The second theme derived from replies by central instructional support staff indicated that requests from schools for staff development opportunities are frequent. Principals, on the other hand, did not cite requests for staff development as a recurring theme. Rather, the second theme which emerged from the principals' responses dealt with requests which are focused on finding better ways to accomplish school goals.
### Table 7
Themes Emerging from Responses to Question 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Central Staff</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What impacts has SBDM had on the services requested by schools?</td>
<td>Decrease in requests</td>
<td>Decrease in requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Better ways to accomplish school goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Categories of the Roles Derived from Key Informant Interviews**

This section lists (a) the 25 roles which key informants noted as actual or possible roles for central instructional support staff in site-based decision making, and (b) the five categories into which these roles were then divided. Each of the 25 suggested roles was included in the questionnaires which were completed by 22 principals from Attendance Area II and 33 respondents from central instructional support staff. The 25 roles were then grouped into five broad categories which were utilized in the quantitative analysis of the questionnaire data.

The ongoing data analysis which occurred throughout the interview portion of the study revealed that the various key informants repeatedly mentioned a number of roles which were deemed to be appropriate, necessary, and/or desirable for central instructional support staff to have in the implementation of site-
based decision making. Roles which were described by informants from both the principal group and the central staff group were extracted from the interview transcripts. These roles were then incorporated into the questionnaires which were completed by 33 respondents from the central instructional support staff and 22 principals from Attendance Area II.

A total of 25 roles were recurrent in the interview data. Roles were considered to be recurrent if one of the following criteria was met: (a) at least five of the seven key informants from central instructional support staff described the role, (b) at least five of the seven principals who served as key informants described the role, or (c) a total of seven of the fourteen key informants described the role.

These roles are displayed in Table 8 along with the number of key informants from central instructional support staff and the number of key informant principals who mentioned each role during the course of the interviews.

Table 8
Central Instructional Support Staff Roles Noted in Interview Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Noted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide support for curriculum</td>
<td>6CS / 5P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support for teachers</td>
<td>7CS / 6P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support for principals</td>
<td>7CS / 5P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate instructional programs</td>
<td>6CS / 4P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Noted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist in the development of teachers in leadership roles</td>
<td>7CS / 0P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate campus improvement plans</td>
<td>5CS / 2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns</td>
<td>5CS / 2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide input and/or assistance as part of the campus SBDM cycle</td>
<td>5CS / 2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write waivers for schools</td>
<td>4CS / 3P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate waivers for schools</td>
<td>5CS / 2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct or re-write waivers for schools</td>
<td>4CS / 3P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify duplication of effort between/among schools</td>
<td>5CS / 3P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide crisis management/intervention</td>
<td>6CS / 0P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address concerns/questions from parents</td>
<td>5CS / 0P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address concerns/questions from other members of the community</td>
<td>5CS / 0P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information to teachers and/or principals about available resources</td>
<td>6CS / 1P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons</td>
<td>7CS / 5P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate communication between/among schools</td>
<td>5CS / 3P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan districtwide staff development programs</td>
<td>6CS / 4P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Noted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present districtwide staff development programs</td>
<td>6CS / 2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with schools to tailor staff development to specific school needs</td>
<td>6CS / 4P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay informed of current research and educational trends</td>
<td>7CS / 4P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in research</td>
<td>5CS / 1P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate information/articles to principals</td>
<td>5CS / 1P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate information/articles to teachers</td>
<td>5CS / 2P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 25 roles displayed in Table 8 were grouped into five categories. These broad categories are: (a) support for school staff and programs, (b) interaction with campus SBDM teams, (c) communication, (d) staff development, and (e) research. On the following pages, Table 9 lists the five categories and the roles which were included in each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1 - Support for School Staff and Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide support for curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide support for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide support for principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist in the development of teachers in leadership roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 2 - Interaction with Campus SBDM Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate campus improvement plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide input and/or assistance as part of the campus SBDM cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correct or re-write waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 3 - Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identify duplication of effort between/among schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide crisis management/intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Address concerns/questions from parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Address concerns/questions from other members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide information to teachers and/or principals about resources which are available in the district and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate with contact teachers/department chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate communication between/among schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Obtained from Questionnaires

A questionnaire (Appendix C) was distributed to 38 members of central instructional support staff, and completed by a total of 33 support staff members, for a return rate of 86.84%. Twenty-five principals in Attendance Area II also received a questionnaire (Appendix D), and 22 of the 25, or 88%, returned a completed questionnaire. None of the questionnaire respondents served as key informants.

Questionnaire Responses - Section A

Quantitative methodology was employed in the analysis of data obtained from the questionnaires. Section A of the questionnaires was composed of eight statements related to site-based decision making. Participants were instructed to use a Likert scale to mark
their responses to each of the eight items, labeled 1A through 8A. The scale ranged from a rating of 1, indicating strong disagreement with the statement, to a rating of 5, indicating strong agreement with the statement.

Responses from the 33 central instructional support staff members were compared with responses from the 22 principals through the use of the CROSSTABS procedure in SPSS®. This procedure yielded a measure of chi square which indicates the magnitude of the difference between the responses of the two groups. A significance level of 0.05 was used in the analysis of this data.

Tables 10 through 17 summarize participants’ responses to each of the items in Section A of the questionnaire.
Table 10

Responses to Questionnaire Statement 1A

Statement 1A
I believe in the principle of SBDM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Central Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Undecided</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Agree</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 9.79323

Significance = 0.00747

For question 1A, the value of 0.00747 is less than 0.05, indicating a significant difference in the responses of the two groups.
Table 11

Responses to Questionnaire Statement 2A

Statement 2A
I would like more information about SBDM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Central Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Disagree</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Undecided</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Agree</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.36690
Significance = 0.66862

The value of 0.66862 exceeds the 0.05 level of significance, indicating no significant difference in the responses of the two groups to question 2A.
Table 12

Responses to Questionnaire Statement 3A

Statement 3A
I have been actively involved in the development of SBDM in this school district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Central Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Disagree</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Undecided</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Agree</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 28.29282
Significance = 0.00001

For question 3A, the value of 0.00001 is less than 0.05, indicating a significant difference in the responses of the two groups.
Table 13

Responses to Questionnaire Statement 4A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Central Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Undecided</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Agree</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 6.60256

Significance = 0.03684

The value of 0.03684 is less than 0.05, indicating a significant difference in the responses of the two groups to question 4A.
Table 14

Responses to Questionnaire Statement 5A

**Statement 5A**
Most of the principals demonstrate support for SBDM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Central Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Disagree</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Undecided</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Agree</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.06061

Significance = 0.78659

The significance value of 0.78659 exceeds the 0.05 level of significance, indicating no significant difference in the responses of the two groups to question 5A.
Table 15
Responses to Questionnaire Statement 6A

Statement 6A
Most central instructional staff members demonstrate support for SBDM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Central Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Disagree</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Undecided</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Agree</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.23873
Significance = 0.35626

The value of 0.35626 exceeds the 0.05 level of significance, indicating no significant difference in the responses of the two groups to question 6A.
Table 16

Responses to Questionnaire Statement 7A

Statement 7A
SBDM has had a positive impact on the way I do my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Central Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Disagree</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Undecided</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Agree</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 25.77373
Significance = 0.00004

For question 7A, the value of 0.00004 is less than 0.05, indicating a significant difference in the responses of the two groups.
Table 17

Responses to Questionnaire Statement 8A

Statement 8A
I believe that principals can do their jobs more effectively with SBDM than with centralized school governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Central Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Disagree</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Undecided</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Agree</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 10.08617

Significance = 0.01785

For question 8A, the value of 0.01785 is less than 0.05, indicating a significant difference in the responses of the two groups.
For Section 1 of the questionnaire, responses from principals were consistently more positive than responses from central instructional support staff. Data analysis revealed that the two groups gave significantly different responses to five of the eight statements presented.

Respondents expressed dissimilar views with regard to their belief in the principle of site-based decision making (statement 1A), demonstration of support for SBDM by the superintendent (statement 4A), and their belief that principals can do their job more effectively with SBDM than with centralized school governance (statement 8A). Statements which revealed the greatest difference between principals and central instructional staff members were those addressing respondents' involvement in the development of SBDM in the district (statement 3A), and the impact SBDM has had on the way respondents do their job (statement 7A).

Responses from the two groups did not differ significantly on the item dealing with their desire for more information about SBDM (statement 2A), or on items regarding principals' support for SBDM (statement 5A) and central instructional staff's support for SBDM (statement 6A).

**Questionnaire Responses - Section B, Questions 1 and 2**

Section B, questions 1 and 2, of the questionnaires presented the twenty-five roles which were recurrent in the key informant interview data. Question 1B was worded slightly differently for the two groups of respondents. This item on the questionnaire for
central instructional support staff members asked each respondent to indicate all of the roles which are part of his/her job. Question 1B on the questionnaire for principals asked each respondent to indicate all of the roles which he/she believes to be included in the role of central instructional support staff.

The tables on the following pages provide a summary of responses to question 1B of the questionnaires. Table 18, entitled Roles of Central Staff as Perceived by Central Staff, lists each of the twenty-five roles and the percentage of central instructional support staff respondents who indicated that the role is part of his or her job. Table 19, entitled Roles of Central Staff as Perceived by Principals, also lists each of the twenty-five roles and shows the percentage of principals who indicated that the role is part of the job done by central instructional support staff. Table 20 lists the twenty-five roles and displays the percentage of principals and the percentage of central instructional support staff members who indicated that the role is one which is included in the job of central instructional support staff.
Table 18

Roles of Central Staff as Perceived by Central Staff

Responses to Question 1B:
Roles Which Are Currently Included
in the Role of Central Instructional Support Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>Providing support for principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.969</td>
<td>Providing support for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.939</td>
<td>Staying informed of current research and educational trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.939</td>
<td>Providing information to principals/teachers about resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.909</td>
<td>Planning districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.878</td>
<td>Providing support for curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.878</td>
<td>Presenting districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.878</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.818</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.878</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.878</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.878</td>
<td>Communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.727</td>
<td>Evaluating instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.636</td>
<td>Facilitating communication between schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.606</td>
<td>Working with schools to tailor staff development to specific school needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.545</td>
<td>Participating in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.545</td>
<td>Assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.484</td>
<td>Providing crisis management/intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.363</td>
<td>Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.303</td>
<td>Providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus SBDM cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.151</td>
<td>Writing waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.151</td>
<td>Correcting or rewriting waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.090</td>
<td>Evaluating waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.060</td>
<td>Working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.030</td>
<td>Evaluating campus improvement plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

**Roles of Central Staff as Perceived by Principals**

Responses to Question 1B:

*Roles Which Are Currently Included in the Role of Central Instructional Support Staff*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>Providing support for curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>Providing support for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.909</td>
<td>Providing information to principals/teachers about resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.363</td>
<td>Providing support for principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.363</td>
<td>Evaluating instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.363</td>
<td>Writing waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.363</td>
<td>Planning districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.363</td>
<td>Presenting districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.818</td>
<td>Staying informed of current research and educational trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.818</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.818</td>
<td>Communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.272</td>
<td>Providing crisis management/intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.727</td>
<td>Providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus SBDM cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.727</td>
<td>Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.727</td>
<td>Assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.727</td>
<td>Correcting or rewriting waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.727</td>
<td>Working with schools to tailor staff development to specific school needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.727</td>
<td>Facilitating communication between schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.181</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.636</td>
<td>Working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.090</td>
<td>Evaluating waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.090</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.545</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>Participating in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.545</td>
<td>Evaluating campus improvement plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Central Staff</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>87.88</td>
<td>Providing support for curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>96.97</td>
<td>Providing support for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Providing support for principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>Evaluating instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.77</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>Assisting in the development of teachers as leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.55</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Evaluating campus improvement plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.66</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>Working with campus SBDM teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.77</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>Providing input/assistance as part of campus SBDM cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>Writing waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.09</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>Evaluating waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.77</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>Correcting or rewriting waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.77</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.27</td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td>Providing crisis management/intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.09</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.90</td>
<td>93.94</td>
<td>Providing information to teachers/principals re: resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>Communicating with contact teachers/department chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>Facilitating communication between schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td>Planning districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>87.88</td>
<td>Presenting districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.77</td>
<td>60.61</td>
<td>Working with schools to tailor staff development to needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>93.94</td>
<td>Staying informed of current research/educational trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>Participating in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>91.82</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.18</td>
<td>87.88</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2B on both of the questionnaires asked each respondent to indicate all of the central instructional support staff roles which have changed significantly since the district's move toward site-based decision making. The tables which follow summarize the responses to question 2B of the questionnaires.

Table 21, entitled Roles Which Have Changed Significantly as Perceived by Central Staff, lists each of the twenty-five roles and the percentage of central instructional support staff respondents who indicated that the role has changed significantly since the district's move toward site-based decision making. Table 22, entitled Roles Which Have Changed Significantly as Perceived by Principals, also lists each of the twenty-five roles and shows the percentage of principals who indicated their opinion that the role has changed significantly since the district's move toward SBDM. Table 23 lists the twenty-five roles and, for each of the roles, displays the percentage of principals and the percentage of central instructional support staff members who believe that the role is one which has changed significantly since the district initiated site-based decision making.
Table 21

Roles Which Have Changed Significantly as Perceived by Central Staff

Responses to Question 2B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.515</td>
<td>Planning districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.515</td>
<td>Working with schools to tailor staff development to school needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.454</td>
<td>Writing waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.454</td>
<td>Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.454</td>
<td>Evaluating instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.424</td>
<td>Providing support for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.393</td>
<td>Providing support for curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.393</td>
<td>Presenting districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.363</td>
<td>Evaluating campus improvement plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.363</td>
<td>Providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus SBDM cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.363</td>
<td>Facilitating communication between schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.333</td>
<td>Providing support for principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.272</td>
<td>Working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.272</td>
<td>Evaluating waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.272</td>
<td>Correcting or rewriting waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.272</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.242</td>
<td>Assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.212</td>
<td>Providing information to teachers/principals about resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.181</td>
<td>Communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.181</td>
<td>Providing crisis management/intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.151</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.151</td>
<td>Staying informed of current research and educational trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.151</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.121</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.121</td>
<td>Participating in research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

**Roles Which Have Changed Significantly as Perceived by Principals**

 Responses to Question 2B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.545</td>
<td>Assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.545</td>
<td>Presenting districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>Facilitating communication between schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>Working with schools to tailor staff development to school needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>Writing waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>Providing support for curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>Providing support for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>Providing support for principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.454</td>
<td>Evaluating campus improvement plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.454</td>
<td>Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.454</td>
<td>Planning districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.909</td>
<td>Evaluating waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.909</td>
<td>Evaluating instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.363</td>
<td>Correcting or rewriting waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.818</td>
<td>Working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.272</td>
<td>Providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus SBDM cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.272</td>
<td>Staying informed of current research and educational trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.272</td>
<td>Providing information to teachers/principals about resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.727</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.727</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.727</td>
<td>Providing crisis management/intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.727</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.181</td>
<td>Communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.181</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.181</td>
<td>Participating in research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

Percentage of Principal and Central Staff Responses to Question 2B:
Central Staff Roles Which Have Changed Significantly Since the District's Move Toward SBDM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Central Staff</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>Providing support for curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>Providing support for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>Providing support for principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.90</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>Evaluating instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>Assisting in the development of teachers as leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>Evaluating campus improvement plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>Working with campus SBDM teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>Providing input/assistance as part of campus SBDM cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>Writing waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>Evaluating waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>Correcting or rewriting waivers for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>Providing crisis management/intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>Addressing concerns/questions from the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>Providing information to teachers/principals re: resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>Communicating with contact teachers/department chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>Facilitating communication between schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>51.52</td>
<td>Planning districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>Presenting districtwide staff development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>51.52</td>
<td>Working with schools to tailor staff development to needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>Staying informed of current research/educational trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>Participating in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>Disseminating information/articles to teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted in section four of this chapter, the twenty-five roles which were derived from interviews with key informants were grouped into five categories. Question 1 asked respondents to indicate all of the roles which are currently included in the role of central instructional support staff. On question 2, respondents checked all of the central instructional support staff roles which, in their opinion, have changed significantly since the district's move toward site-based decision making. The graphs which follow illustrate the questionnaire responses from central instructional support staff and principals for each of the five categories.

Category 1, Support for Staff and Programs, includes five roles: (role 1) providing support for curriculum, (role 2) providing support for teachers, (role 3) providing support for principals, (role 4) evaluating instructional programs, and (role 5) assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles. It is interesting to note that a majority of both groups of key informants described roles 1 through 4. However, while all seven of the key informants from central staff described their role in the development of teachers as leaders (role 5), none of the principals interviewed mentioned this as a significant role for central instructional support staff.

Figure 4-1 provides a graphic representation of responses from the two groups on Section B, question 1, roles 1 through 5, of the questionnaires and Figure 4-2 illustrates the responses of the two groups on Section B, question 2, roles 1 through 5 of the questionnaires.
Figure 4-1
Section B, Question 1 - Support for Staff and Programs

Figure 4-2
Section B, Question 2 - Support for Staff and Programs
Although all twenty-five roles are related to assisting school personnel and improving school efficiency or effectiveness, Category 2, Interaction with SBDM Teams, is comprised of six roles specifically related to ways in which members of central instructional support staff work with campus level site-based decision making teams. These six roles involve both the processes employed by campus site-based teams and the products of a team's work, such as campus improvement plans and waivers.

Roles included in Category 2 are: (role 6) evaluating campus improvement plans, (role 7) working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns, (role 8) providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus site-based decision-making cycle, (role 9) writing waivers for schools, (role 10) evaluating waivers for schools, and (role 11) correcting or re-writing waivers for schools. Figure 4-3 represents the responses from the principals and central instructional support staff on Section B, question 1, roles 6 through 11, of the questionnaires and Figure 4-4 illustrates the opinions of the respondents on Section B, question 2, roles 6 through 11.
Section B, Question 1 - Interaction with SBDM Teams

Figure 4-3

Section B, Question 2 - Interaction with SBDM Teams

Figure 4-4
Category 3, Communication, includes seven roles which were recurrent in the interview data. These roles, involving both communication and problem solving, were all noted more frequently by key informants from central instructional support staff than by principals, but were included in the list because each was mentioned during the course of the interviews by no fewer than five of the seven central instructional support staff informants.

The seven roles included in Category 3 are: (role 12) identifying duplication of effort between/among schools, (role 13) providing crisis management/intervention, (role 14) addressing concerns/questions from parents, (role 15) addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community, (role 16) providing information to teachers and/or principals about resources which are available in the district and elsewhere, (role 17) communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons, and (role 18) facilitating communication between/among schools. On the following page, Figure 4-5 provides a graphic representation of responses from the two groups on Section B, question 1, roles 12 through 18, of the questionnaires and Figure 4-6 illustrates the responses of the two groups on Section B, question 2, roles 12 through 18, of the questionnaires.
Figure 4-5
Section B, Question 1 - Communication

Figure 4-6
Section B, Question 2 - Communication
The three roles included in Category 4, Staff Development, are: (role 19) planning districtwide staff development programs, (role 20) presenting districtwide staff development programs, and (role 21) working with schools to tailor staff development to specific school needs. Each of these three was mentioned by six of the seven key informants from central instructional support staff. Four principals who served as interview informants noted the role of planning districtwide staff development programs and the role of working with schools to tailor staff development to meet specific school needs, but only two principals mentioned central staff's role in presenting districtwide staff development programs.

Figure 4-7 represents the responses from the principals and central instructional support staff on Section B, question 1, roles 19 through 21, of the questionnaires and Figure 4-8 illustrates the opinions of the respondents on Section B, question 2, roles 19 through 21 of the questionnaires.
Figure 4-7
Section B, Question 1 - Staff Development

Figure 4-8
Section B, Question 2 - Staff Development
The fifth category of roles derived from key informant interviews concerns the role played by central instructional support staff in research. Three of the four roles in this category were described by at least five central instructional support staff key informants, and the role of staying informed of current research and educational trends was noted by all seven of the central staff informants. Only four of the seven principals who were key informants mentioned the need for central staff to stay informed of current research and educational trends. Each of the other three roles in this category was mentioned by only one or two of the principals who served as key informants.

The roles included in Category 5, Research, are: (role 22) staying informed of current research and educational trends, (role 23) participating in research, (role 24) disseminating information/articles to principals, and (role 25) disseminating information/articles to teachers. Figure 4-9 provides a graphic representation of responses from the two groups on Section B, question 1, roles 22 through 25, of the questionnaires and Figure 4-10 illustrates the responses of the two groups on Section B, question 2, roles 22 through 25, of the questionnaires.
Figure 4-9
Section B, Question 1 - Research

Figure 4-10
Section B, Question 2 - Research
Questionnaire Comments - Section B, Question 1

In addition to marking each of the twenty-five roles which they perceive to be included in the job of central instructional support staff, questionnaire respondents were also invited to list any other roles which they believe central staff should have. Although not all respondents chose to comment on this item, several members of both groups did provide comments. Responses are provided below and are identified by their group and a number; e.g., PQ-1 represents the first questionnaire subject from among the group of principals who responded and CSQ-3 represents the third questionnaire subject from among the central instructional support staff respondents.

Principals made the following comments regarding other roles which they believe central instructional support staff should have:

All of the above [25 listed] roles can be roles central staff should have. Not all schools will need all areas of help. (PQ-1)

I believe the above [25 roles] are probably too much. We probably need to prioritize and concentrate on a few areas and do them well. Otherwise, we get too scattered. Central staff will need to restructure. (PQ-2)

What about the role of conflict mediator? (PQ-3)

Central staff should be on the Local School Councils. (PQ-9)

Another role should be securing grants or other sources of funding for instructional programs. (PQ-12)

Instructional staff is never in buildings to offer support or new ideas. (PQ-16)
Central staff should assist with on-site staff development—both with planning and presenting. (PQ-19)

Central staff should assist schools in implementing instructional programs which the school has identified as a priority, and assistance should be in an active, visible, timely, and high profile way. (PQ-21)

Questionnaire respondents from central staff listed the following as roles which central instructional support staff members should have:

We need better coordination between central level and building level staff development offerings. (CSQ-2)

We need to help campuses make instructional decisions—provide input and information about which they may not be aware. (CSQ-7)

Principals have expressed a desire for more of our assistance in one-on-one instructional remediation for teachers with problems. We are spread too thin. (CSQ-12)

Central staff should always be there to provide instructional assistance and help with classroom management for new teachers or for teachers identified as "having problems." (CSQ-14)

Central support staff should be involved in budgeting, facilities planning, purchasing, and writing bid specs. (CSQ-25)

**Questionnaire Comments - Section B, Question 2**

Question 2 also lists the twenty-five roles which were recurrent in the interview data. Questionnaire respondents were asked to check all of the central instructional support staff roles which, in their opinion, had changed significantly since the district's move toward site-based decision making. Following the checklist,
respondents were asked to list any other central instructional support staff roles which they believe have changed significantly since the inception of SBDM.

Principals made the following comments:

Central staff is not as aware of the changes in demographics and the effects on the schools as they should be. They don't really know what some of us are dealing with—and I'm not sure they really care. (PQ-3)

Changes have occurred but mostly because of downsizing and budget cuts. (PQ-9)

There is less central staff support now than in the 22 years that I've been here. (PQ-15)

Many times they [central staff] do not listen to or support local schools. (PQ-16)

Dual assignments have really had an impact—probably related more to funding than to SBDM. (PQ-19)

Central staff seems to have no time, effort, or energy to support teachers and buildings in their instructional programs/goals. (PQ-21)

We've got lots less support than in years past. (PQ-22)

Questionnaire respondents from central instructional support staff offered these remarks:

There is a lack of awareness of what's going on in some buildings; lack of continuity in programs from one building to another. (CSQ-2)

It is difficult to get special groups for inservice—groups like special ed. need to have their people for inservices. But some teachers won't come to an inservice for a special group because
they stay with site-based inservice programs in their schools. (CSQ-4)

I have been removed from part of the chain of both staff development and personnel placement. Schools have made far-reaching decisions on what courses or programs not to offer that are creating terminal prognoses for whole departments. (CSQ-12)

It [SBDM] has caused a loss in allocated staff and caused teachers to have larger classes with fewer resources. (CSQ-14)

Special area teachers attend staff development within their building rather than in their field to learn new trends, goals, and changes in curriculum. (CSQ-16)

Central staff has been forced to be reactive rather than proactive. (CSQ-23)

Central staff people who have been forced to take dual assignments can't be doubly effective in two jobs. (CSQ-26)

**Questionnaire Responses - Section B, Questions 3, 4, and 5**

The three remaining items on the questionnaire asked principals and central instructional support staff to write brief responses to questions dealing with (a) expectations of principals regarding the role(s) of central instructional support staff in SBDM, (b) the impact of SBDM on the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff, and (c) the impact of SBDM on central instructional support staff services requested by schools. Although not every participant who completed a questionnaire chose to answer each of these three questions, a number of respondents did reply. Responses to each of the questions are provided below and, as previously, are identified by their group and a number.
Questionnaire Responses - Section B, Question 3

Question 3 of the questionnaires asked: What expectations do you think principals have regarding the role(s) of central instructional support staff in SBDM? Responses from principals included the following:

Troubleshooting and help provide direction and framework. (PQ-1)

Principals expect central staff to support our efforts, but I think we have a long way to go in this area. I think central staff will have to be restructured and priorities decided. Then leave them alone and let them do their job—possibly a team approach might work. (PQ-2)

Support for principals—especially in the at-risk schools. (PQ-3)

Schools with diverse needs have need for input about changes to be made for school improvement. Central staff should be a great source, but their accessibility is often limited. Individual job descriptions do not allow for them to be in schools often enough. (PQ-4)

Keeping them informed of building level needs. (PQ-6)

Guidance with teacher training and research. (PQ-8)

Principals have very few expectations of central staff. (PQ-9)

Be more supportive. (PQ-10)

More direct time in buildings—more visibility. (PQ-11)

Identification of clearly defined roles of divisions appropriate for SBDM. (PQ-12)

Support when needed—usually when we're hurting or need staff development. (PQ-14)
We need more ongoing, timely support and not just response only in a crisis. (PQ-15)

Not much at this point. (PQ-16)

We want full support from all levels of central administration. (PQ-17)

Most principals believe that their schools can function much better without interference from central staff. (PQ-18)

My expectations are that central staff could be available to work with individual schools on an as needed basis. Many times they are not available because of districtwide responsibilities. (PQ-19)

Give advice and be a resource. (PQ-20)

Central staff ought to be visible and actively supportive in assisting schools as we implement and work toward instructional goals. (PQ-21)

Central instructional support staff respondents provided the following comments concerning principals' expectations about the role(s) of central instructional support staff in SBDM:

I think principals expect central staff to bail them out when they get in trouble or when they have some kind of a problem or concern. (CSQ-2)

For the most part, I don't think principals are aware of the staff cuts that have taken place in the past two or three years. I believe they still think there are a lot of people on central staff and a lot of services available to them on a moment's notice. (CSQ-3)
Principals want their teachers to stay in their buildings for staff development, but some principals don't plan adequately for specialized groups. (CSQ-4)

Principals want immediate, hands-on, on-site support for problems. (CSQ-5)

After campus decisions are made, then principals want central staff to provide support which will help them carry out plans—like staff development, etc. (CSQ-7)

They call for assistance in crisis. I'm a fire fighter. (CSQ-8)

I think we're expected to be all things to all people. (CSQ-10)

I get mixed signals. There's the "Don't call us, we'll call you," versus the desire for strong, ongoing curricular support. (CSQ-12)

Principals want central staff in the buildings on a regular basis and they want assistance with new teachers. I also think they want to have a central staff person who knows them, their school, and their teachers. (CSQ-14)

I personally feel most principals would rather handle everything within their building with no help from the "outside." (CSQ-16)

It seems like principals either have a wide range of expectations—or none. (CSQ-17)

Apparently not much, as many view us as doing nothing while the schools are taking on more responsibility. (CSQ-18)

I think principals have very few—if any—expectations about central staff's role in site-based. (CSQ-20)

I think principals continue to view central staff as support for curriculum issues, information givers, and providers of staff development. (CSQ-22)
Principals continue to want additional support but don't always identify their needs until the school is into a project. Support staff has to respond after the fact. (CSQ-23)

Principals only want us to serve in a support/advisory capacity. (CSQ-25)

Depends on the principal—some want us in their buildings and some don't. (CSQ-26)

I don't have a clue. (CSQ-27)

Principals want us to be available to help solve local school concerns—especially discipline and staff development. (CSQ-28)

None whatsoever. (CSQ-33)

Questionnaire Responses - Section B, Question 4

The fourth question on the questionnaires asked respondents to comment on the impact SBDM has had on the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff. Principals provided the following information:

We get more personal, individualized help. (PQ-1)

None. (PQ-2, PQ-6, and PQ-11)

Most instructional support comes from the principal and specific site-based committees. Central instructional support is stretched so that their support is not always there when needed. (PQ-3)

Less use of services—maybe because of less availability, dual assignments, etc.—but the need is still there and even greater for some schools. (PQ-4)

We get less support than we used to. (PQ-8)
Decreased support because we get told that "it's a site-based decision." (PQ-9)

Site-based has possibly caused a re-examination of the delivery of services and support. (PQ-10)

Needs have been created that haven't been fully met by central staff. They're just too involved with ad. building activity to bother with what's going on out in the schools. (PQ-14)

It makes coordination and support less structured and more fragmented. (PQ-15)

Instructional support is not all that supportive anymore. (PQ-16)

We don't seem to have many services from central staff anymore. (PQ-18)

I have not seen a great impact. This may be a result of increased work loads due to downsizing. I rarely see central staff other than people from special ed. (PQ-19)

We had more support services prior to SBDM. (PQ-20)

I do not think SBDM has been the problem or caused the impact but there are very, very few services provided and usually not by those in direct instructional roles but in support roles. (PQ-21)

Regarding the impact SBDM has had on the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff, respondents from central staff noted the following:

There's a lack of continuity; little knowledge of what's going on in some buildings. (CSQ-2)

Very little. (CSQ-3 and CSQ-26)
Schools sometimes are too fragmented. They are trying too many new and innovative things at once. There is not enough time to "move slow and let it grow." Some schools are doing inclusion, accelerated schools, and collaboration all at the same time—teachers are exhausted. (CSQ-4)

Little or none. (CSQ-5)

I believe the schools feel we are less needed except for fighting fires. (CSQ-8)

It has increased diversification among schools and that makes it difficult to coordinate districtwide programs. (CSQ-10)

SBDM has lessened the need for our services. (CSQ-11)

One main frustration is trying to schedule districtwide meetings (like staff development and curriculum meetings) around 50 different individual building plans. (CSQ-12)

Schools have made decisions without checking with a curriculum area specialist, and they fail to realize that those decisions have impact beyond their own campus. (CSQ-13)

Site-based has negatively affected my contact with the teachers in my curriculum area—especially with relation to the time we have together for staff development. (CSQ-14)

I'm still called in when a situation calls for my expertise, but I feel less needed as a specialist by the district as a whole. (CSQ-16)

In some ways it [SBDM] has created a barrier. We're not as involved in local campus planning as we once were. (CSQ-17)

The schools are better at knowing their needs but are unable to tap our resources. There has been no change in what I do for the buildings. (CSQ-18)
We are in the schools less and there are fewer of us. Sometimes they call if there's a problem or if they're in a bind. We do more reacting than we used to. (CSQ-20)

Schools are providing more of their own staff development. Also, they are making more of their own choices and decisions concerning curriculum and use of materials. (CSQ-22)

It's difficult to prioritize and meet the many needs. Because of downsizing and limited time it's difficult to meet the varied demands at each school. (CSQ-23)

Minimal impact. (CSQ-25)

I don't feel site-based has had any impact on my services. (CSQ-27)

Questionnaire Responses - Section B, Question 5

While question 4 concerned the services which are provided to schools by central instructional support staff, question 5 asked respondents to note the impact SBDM has had on the central staff services requested by schools. Answers from principals included the following:

None yet, but I believe it will increase as time goes on. (PQ-1)

None. (PQ-2, PQ-11, and PQ-20)

I think that the support staff is "out of the loop." They help when they "are able" but sometimes it's difficult because of the reduced staff at central. (PQ-3)

[State-mandated test] scores reflect the need for new or better or alternate instructional strategies. Schools have a great need for objective, outside input. (PQ-4)

More types of inservice are available for the asking. (PQ-6)
More requests for research-based information. (PQ-8)

Decreased services. (PQ-9)

Services requested are the ones that have always been provided. (PQ-10)

More supporting data (test scores, etc.) for action plans and evaluation of program and activities. (PQ-12)

We've stopped trying to get any help from central—if we call we have to "take a number." (PQ-15)

They generally don't listen, so we don't call. (PQ-16)

Positive. (PQ-17)

I haven't observed any change or impact. (PQ-18)

Honestly, I haven't made many requests because I just assume that central staff people are too busy. (PQ-19)

When requesting task-specific, short-term assistance, the assistance would be provided—otherwise it's not likely to happen. (PQ-21)

With regard to the impact SBDM has had on the central staff services requested by schools, central instructional support staff questionnaire respondents made the following comments:

They don't request services until after a problem or concern has escalated. (CSQ-2)

I think principals and schools still think there are a lot of central staff people and services available to them when the fact of the matter is that staff reductions have made it impossible to serve schools the way they used to be served. (CSQ-3)
They still ask for help with behavior problems and parent problems at ARDs. (CSQ-4)

There's a much greater variance in the kinds of requests we get from schools now than there used to be. (CSQ-5)

The main requests I get have to do with money, personnel, and crises. (CSQ-8)

Depending on the school, it has both broadened and lessened the services requested. (CSQ-10)

Schools seem to center their emphasis on specific problems and plans, swinging even more need for far-reaching, wide-ranging support from Basic Instruction in all the other areas. (CSQ-12)

They (schools) have negatively impacted our curriculum delivery through multi-age grouping and reduction of staff. (CSQ-14)

I think a lot of schools have forgotten how beneficial central staff can be. It's almost as if we no longer exist. I think central staff needs to be in the buildings working with teachers rather than attending meetings and doing so much paperwork and other duties. (CSQ-16)

Not much change. (CSQ-17)

There appears to be a duplication of services, especially in staff development. Each school wants its own presentation, thus creating more work. Schools are not always aware of what we have to offer. (CSQ-18)

Everyone wants something very specific to meet their own needs, but no school seems to know if another school is doing, or has done, something similar. No one school knows if what they plan to do has been successful—or unsuccessful somewhere else. Each school seems to be trying to find something new to do—something that no one else in the district has tried before. (CSQ-20)
Many services are still requested. (CSQ-22)

Site-based has created more diverse needs. More communication is needed between schools and central staff. (CSQ-23)

Minimal impact, although it may have helped schools be better able to articulate their requests. (CSQ-25)

Very little. (CSQ-26)

Not sure. (CSQ-27)

Summary

The findings of this study of perceptions of the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making are presented in this chapter. Research was conducted in a suburban school district which has implemented site-based decision making for approximately six years. Data sources for the study included: (a) a search of current and historical documents, (b) interviews with seven key informants from central instructional support staff, (c) interviews with seven principals from Attendance Area I who also served as key informants, (d) informal interviews with key informants, (e) questionnaires completed by 33 members of central instructional support staff, and (f) questionnaires completed by 22 principals from Attendance Area II. None of the questionnaire respondents from central instructional support staff or the group of principals served as key informants.
In one phase of the research, pertinent documents, both current and historical, were collected and analyzed. These documents, relating either to the development of site-based decision making in the district or to the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making, were examined in order to: (a) determine the extent of the involvement of central instructional support staff in the development of site-based decision making in the district, (b) find references to the role(s) of central instructional support staff members in site-based decision making processes, and (c) investigate the downsizing of central instructional support staff which was referred to by many of the key informants when discussing the roles of, or expectations for, instructional support staff personnel.

Five core questions were posed to the 14 key informants during the course of the interviews. In analyzing the data obtained from interviews, categories were developed from repeated regularities in the responses of the informants. These categories were then developed into broad themes. These themes are summarized and tables are provided to illustrate the themes expressed by the two groups of key informants in their responses to the five core interview questions.

The ongoing data analysis which occurred throughout the interview portion of the study revealed that the various key informants repeatedly mentioned a number of roles which were deemed to be appropriate, necessary, and/or desirable for central
instructional support staff to have in the implementation of site-based decision making. Roles which were described by informants from both the principal group and the central staff group were extracted from the interview transcripts. These roles were then incorporated into the questionnaires which were completed by 33 respondents from the central instructional support staff and 22 principals.

A total of 25 roles were recurrent in the interview data. These roles, which were grouped into five categories, are displayed in a table, along with the number of key informants from central instructional support staff and the number of key informant principals who mentioned each role during the course of the interviews.

Quantitative methodology was employed in the analysis of data obtained from the questionnaires. The first section of the questionnaires was composed of eight statements related to site-based decision making. Participants were instructed to use a Likert scale to mark their responses to each of the eight items. Data analysis revealed that the two groups gave significantly different responses to five of the eight statements presented. Tables which summarize participants' responses to each of the items in the first section of the questionnaire are included in this chapter.

Two of the five questions in the second section of the questionnaire listed the 25 roles which were derived from interviews with key informants. Question 1 asked respondents to
indicate all of the roles which are currently included in the role of central instructional support staff. On question 2, respondents checked all of the central instructional support staff roles which, in their opinion, have changed significantly since the district's move toward site-based decision making. Graphs illustrate the questionnaire responses from central instructional support staff and principals for each of the five categories: (a) support for staff and programs, (b) interaction with SBDM teams, (c) communication, (d) staff development, and (e) research.

The three remaining items on the questionnaire asked principals and central instructional support staff to write brief responses to questions dealing with (a) expectations of principals regarding the role(s) of central instructional support staff in SBDM, (b) the impact of SBDM on the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff, and (c) the impact of SBDM on central instructional support staff services requested by schools. Although not every participant who completed a questionnaire chose to answer each of these three questions, responses to each of the questions are provided.

The results of this research are discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to analyze how the roles of central instructional support staff as perceived by principals and central instructional support staff members in one school district have been affected by the implementation of site-based decision making. Data for this research were collected through key informant interviews with seven principals and seven members of central instructional support staff, questionnaire responses from 22 principals and 33 instructional support staff members who did not serve as key informants, and a search of current and historical documents.

This study describes the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making from two points of view. The perceptions of the principals and members of central instructional support staff who participated in this research are presented and analyzed. A significant limitation of this study is that data were collected in only one school district and are representative of the perceptions of the individual subjects. However, as more school districts move toward decentralization, it is anticipated that the
results of this study will add to the limited research focused on the role of instructional support staff in site-based decision making.

Overview of the Study

This study focused on and was guided by five research questions: (a) what changes have occurred in the role or roles of central instructional support staff members since the school district implemented site-based decision making, (b) what roles do central instructional support staff members believe that they have in site-based decision making in the schools, (c) what changes have occurred in the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff members since the implementation of site-based decision making, (d) what are the perceptions of school principals regarding the roles of central instructional support staff members in site-based decision making, and (e) how do the views of central instructional support staff members compare with the views of the principals regarding the district's implementation of site-based decision making? Data for the study were gathered through: (a) a search of current and historical documents, (b) interviews with seven key informants from central instructional support staff, (c) interviews with seven principals from one of the district's two attendance areas, (d) informal interviews with key informants, (e) questionnaires completed by 33 members of central instructional support staff, and (f) questionnaires completed by 22 principals from Attendance Area II.
The purposes of the document search were: (a) to determine the extent of the involvement of central instructional support staff in the development of site-based decision making in the district, (b) to find references to the role(s) of central instructional support staff members in site-based decision making processes, and (c) to investigate the downsizing of central instructional support staff. Data obtained from the document search was then augmented by information gathered from interviews and the questionnaires.

In analyzing the data obtained from interviews, categories were developed from repeated regularities in the responses of the informants. These categories were then developed into broad themes to describe the responses of the key informants. Tables provided in chapter four illustrate the themes expressed by the 14 key informants in the responses to the five core questions.

The ongoing data analysis which occurred throughout the interview phase revealed that the key informants repeatedly mentioned a number of roles which were considered to be necessary, appropriate, and/or desirable for central instructional support staff to have in the implementation of site-based decision making. These 25 roles were incorporated into the second section of the questionnaire which was completed by 33 members of central instructional support staff and 22 principals.

The first section of the questionnaire consisted of eight statements related to site-based decision making. Respondents used a Likert scale to indicate their responses to each of the eight items.
Information obtained from these eight items was analyzed using the CROSSTABS procedure in SPSS® in order to determine if the two groups, principals and central instructional support staff, differed significantly in their responses. The analysis revealed that participants' responses were significantly different for five of the eight statements.

The 25 roles which were recurrent in the interview data were grouped into five categories: (a) support for staff and programs, (b) interaction with SBDM teams, (c) communication, (d) staff development, and (e) research. Two of the five questions in the second part of the questionnaire listed the 25 roles. Question 1 asked respondents to indicate all of the roles which are currently included in the role of central instructional support staff. On question 2, questionnaire respondents checked all of the central instructional support staff roles which they believe have changed significantly since the district's implementation of site-based decision making.

Graphs provided in Chapter IV illustrate the responses of central instructional support staff and principals regarding each of the 25 roles. The graphs are grouped in pairs according to the five categories into which the 25 roles were divided.

For example, Figure 4-1 illustrates participant’s responses to section B, question 1 of the questionnaire with regard to the 5 roles which were included in the category entitled "Support for Staff and Programs." The number of central staff respondents who indicated
that these roles are currently included in the role of central instructional support staff is compared to the number of principals who indicated that these roles are currently a part of the central staff role. Figure 4-2 then displays the responses to section B, question 2 of the questionnaire. For this question, the graph illustrates a comparison of the views held by the two groups of respondents regarding which of the five roles in this category they believe have changed significantly since the district's implementation of site-based decision making.

Figures 4-3 and 4-4 illustrate responses to section B, questions 1 and 2 for the six roles included in the category "Interaction with SBDM Teams," and figures 4-5 and 4-6 show a comparison of the responses to the seven roles listed under the heading "Communication." Figures 4-7 and 4-8 display responses of the two groups to the three roles included in the category entitled "Staff Development," and Figures 4-9 and 4-10 compare respondents' answers to the four roles included in the category labeled "Research."

The three remaining items on the questionnaire asked principals and central instructional support staff members to write brief responses to questions dealing with: (a) expectations of principals regarding the role(s) of central instructional support staff in SBDM, (b) the impact of SBDM on the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff, and (c) the impact of SBDM on central instructional support staff services requested by schools.
These responses, reported in their entirety, supplemented the interview data.

This study of the perceptions of principals and central instructional support staff members with regard to the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making combines the thick description of qualitative methodology in the presentation of data obtained from interviews and the document search with the specificity of quantitative methodology which was used in the analysis of data gathered from questionnaires. As prescribed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), data from all sources were analyzed in order to develop grounded theory. Triangulation of the information obtained from all sources served to verify the representativeness and accuracy of the data.

Addressing Research Questions

The following sections address the five research questions which provided the focus of this study.

Changes in Central Instructional Support Staff Roles Since SBDM

In describing the effects of the district's move toward site-based decision making on the roles of central instructional support staff, both the principals and the informants from central instructional support staff mentioned that there has been a decrease in central staff's control within the district's organizational structure. As noted in the literature (Caldwell & Wood, 1988; Clune & White, 1988), such shifts in authority and changes in the roles of central
office personnel are to be expected when site-based decision making is implemented.

Principals commented about the loss of control or power by central instructional support staff, while central instructional support staff participants reported not only a loss of control and/or effectiveness but also a loss of prestige within the school district community. One central staff key informant stated very simply, "It is for certain that site-based decision making has caused difficulties for central instruction. It's caused a loss of prestige for central instruction. It has become less desirable to seek a career path in central instruction, and site-based decision making played a part in that."

Members of central instructional support staff also expressed frustration resulting from lack of, or "after the fact," involvement in school planning. Principals reported that there has been less involvement of central instructional support staff in school planning and activities. However, the tone of frustration expressed by central staff members in comments such as, "... but we're not able to perform [our] role very effectively because the decisions that are being made at the sites are so fragmented," was not present in the responses of principals.

Both central instructional support staff members and principals noted a decrease in instructional support for schools. However, while most principals simply stated that the schools are receiving less support than in years past, central staff members attempted to
provide reasons for the decreased support. The decrease in support was linked not only to site-based decision making, but also to downsizing, budget cuts, dual assignments, and an unwillingness on the part of some principals to include someone from "the outside" in school planning and activities.

A number of comments indicate that central instructional support staff, in many instances, seems to be in a more passive role since the implementation of site-based decision making. Members of central staff apparently feel that they are in a reactive mode rather than a proactive mode in dealing with the schools. An illustration of this perception is the following statement from one of the key informants from central instructional support staff: "I guess a lot of times they don't really think to call us until they're already into something and it's beginning to look like they may have bitten off more than they can chew. Then they decide they need help." It seems that many central instructional support staff members are reluctant to approach schools without a specific request for their services, yet they are reasonably certain that when a request does come it will be to "clean up a mess" or provide intervention which may already be "too late."

Participants in the study who completed a questionnaire were asked to respond to this statement: SBDM has had a positive impact on the way I do my job. Responses from principals and central instructional support staff were significantly different. More than 77% of the principals indicated that they either strongly agreed or
agreed with this statement. None of the central instructional support staff respondents indicated strong agreement, and only 12.1% agreed with the statement.

Fifty percent or more of the central staff members who responded to the questionnaire indicated eight roles which have changed significantly since the implementation of site-based decision making. These roles are: (a) assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles, (b) presenting districtwide staff development programs, (c) facilitating communication between schools, (d) working with schools to tailor staff development to fit school needs, (e) writing waivers for schools, (f) providing support for curriculum, (g) providing support for teachers, and (h) providing support for principals.

Only two central instructional staff roles were noted to have changed significantly by more than fifty percent of the principals who responded to the questionnaire. These two roles are: (a) planning districtwide staff development programs, and (b) working with schools to tailor staff development to fit school needs.

This study suggests that changes which have occurred in the roles of central instructional support staff since the implementation of site-based decision making, while perceived differently by principals and members of central instructional support staff, are generally perceived as negative changes by both groups. Although it is not possible to say that the district's move toward site-based decision making caused these changes, this research indicates that
site-based decision making was a catalyst for the changes which have occurred.

**Roles Which Central Instructional Support Staff Have in SBDM**

Central instructional staff members who served as key informants indicated that the roles they currently have in site-based decision making include: (a) providing support to schools, (b) addressing staff development and professional growth needs, and (c) responding to crises, complaints, and concerns. In contrast, principals described the central instructional support staff role in SBDM as either (a) providing support for the schools, or (b) no role in the schools' site-based decision making process.

A number of key informants from central staff and several of the central staff questionnaire respondents indicated that they often find themselves in the role of crisis manager or "fire fighter." Among the principals who served as interview informants, none mentioned crisis management or crisis intervention as a role of central instructional support staff.

Each of the 22 principals who responded to the questionnaire indicated that providing support for curriculum and providing assistance for teachers are roles which central staff currently have. Interestingly, the only role which 100% of central instructional support staff respondents indicated as a role which they currently have is that of providing support for principals.

Other roles which more than 85% of the principals listed as roles which central instructional support staff currently have are: (a)
providing information to principals and teachers about resources which are available in the district and elsewhere, (b) providing support for principals, (c) evaluating instructional programs, (d) writing waivers for schools, (e) planning districtwide staff development programs, and (f) presenting districtwide staff development programs.

In addition to providing support for principals, other roles which more than 85% of central instructional support staff respondents indicated they currently have are: (a) providing support for teachers, (b) staying informed of current research and educational trends, (c) providing information to principals and teachers about resources which are available in the district and elsewhere, (d) planning districtwide staff development programs, (e) providing support for curriculum, (f) presenting districtwide staff development programs, and (g) disseminating information/articles to teachers.

Principals and central instructional support staff members who completed questionnaires differed significantly in their responses to several statements related to support for SBDM. One hundred percent of the principals answered that they either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement: I believe in the principle of SBDM. While a majority of central instructional support staff also either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, nearly one-fourth indicated that they were undecided.
The range of responses was even greater for the item stating: I have been actively involved in the development of SBDM in this school district. Slightly more than 90% of the principals indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement but fewer than 25% of central instructional support staff members indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed. In fact, one-third of the respondents from central staff indicated that they strongly disagreed with the statement.

Another area of significant difference was revealed in responses to this statement: I believe that principals can do their jobs more effectively with SBDM than with centralized school governance. More than 86% of the principals indicated either agreement or strong agreement while slightly more than 51% of central instructional support staff agreed or strongly agreed. More than 39% of the central staff respondents indicated that they were undecided about this statement.

The document search revealed that initially there was an effort to involve all members of central instructional support staff in the development of site-based decision making. However, this effort was not sustained and members of central instructional support staff were replaced by campus based staff as facilitators for site-based planning teams.

Although central instructional support staff serve as members of district level councils and committees dealing with site-based decision making, their representation is minimal compared to the
number of principals who serve on these same committees. While staff reduction in the division of instruction has undoubtedly contributed to the lack of involvement of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making, it seems that central staff members were never really brought "into the loop." The initial involvement of instructional support staff in SBDM did not develop into a commitment.

Perhaps since principals and teachers are more directly affected by site-based decision making, their commitment to, and understanding of, the processes involved in SBDM were seen as critical to successful implementation, while the role played by central instructional support staff in SBDM seemed more peripheral and therefore not so critical. However, the literature points out that the involvement and understanding of central instructional support personnel are critical to the successful implementation of site-based decision making (Cavender, 1992; Cunningham, 1992; Delahant, 1990; Fullan, 1990; Hill & Bonan, 1991). Asayesh (1994) quotes Fred Wood, dean of the College of Education at the University of Oklahoma, who notes that, "When you're going to decentralizing, don't forget to do as much preparation at central office as you do at the schools. If you really want collaboration and shared decision-making in the schools, you have to start in the central office because the more you model it, the more successful you are" (p. 3).

Central instructional support staff in this district has been affected by SBDM but, for the most part, their involvement in its
development and implementation has been limited. It is not surprising then that this group seems to express not only a lack of commitment to SBDM but also a resentment or animosity toward the processes involved in site-based decision making.

Changes in Services Provided to Schools

All of the key informants from central instructional support staff reported that they now have less contact with school personnel than they have had in previous years. Principals serving as key informants also consistently commented on the problem of less support for schools than in the past, yet added that, even with the implementation of SBDM, central instructional support staff continues to provide schools with the standard kinds of services which that group has historically provided in the district. As noted in Chapter I, these services have included: (a) curriculum writing, (b) providing staff development for teachers and principals regarding issues related to curriculum and instruction, (c) setting district instructional priorities, (d) planning and providing appropriate staff development programs for new teachers, (e) participating in program evaluation, (f) facilitating the effective implementation of federal and state mandates as well as district policies, (g) being available on an "on call" basis to assist principals and teachers with problems related to curriculum or instruction, and (h) promoting the use of research in decision-making.

Questionnaire respondents who commented on this question were in general agreement with the interview informants. Although
the downsizing of central instructional support staff was cited by 
some as the cause of a decrease in support services for schools, 
others indicated that SBDM has created a barrier between schools 
and central staff or has served to encourage schools to provide their 
own support rather than requesting services from central staff.

However, not all of the questionnaire respondents agreed that 
there has been a decrease in support for schools. One principal 
indicated that with site-based decision making "we get more 
personal, individualized help" and several respondents from central 
instructional support staff commented that SBDM has had little or no 
impact on the services which they provide to schools.

Nevertheless, based on the data collected during this study, it 
seems evident that the role of central instructional support staff in 
this school district is not yet at the level described by Duttweiler and 
Mutchler (1990). These authors, reporting on a survey conducted by 
the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, note that, "Sites 
that have been engaged in school-based management for some time 
tend to describe central office as a flexible department that responds 
to needs emerging from below, that is, from the individual schools" 
(p. 67).

Principals' Perceptions of Central Staff Roles in SBDM

Throughout the study, the majority of responses from 
principals regarding the roles of central instructional support staff in 
site-based decision making focused on the need for central staff to 
support schools and school goals while also providing consistency and
setting parameters for the district. However, many of the statements from principals made it clear that while they want support, advice, and guidance from central instructional support staff, they want it only when the request for assistance is initiated by the school. Principals seemed generally willing to acknowledge and accept the input of central instructional support staff on districtwide projects and activities, but seemed less likely to want or expect central staff to interface with campus staff without a specified reason.

Responses from central instructional support staff about principals' perceptions indicate the belief that, in addition to wanting support, principals expect immediate assistance in a crisis and very little else. Several of the questionnaire respondents from central instructional support staff noted that they feel that principals have very few, if any, expectations about the role of central staff in site-based decision making. One central staff member expressed the opinion that principals expect them "to be all things to all people," and another commented on the ambiguity of the relationship between principals and central instructional support staff by remarking: "I get mixed signals. There's the 'Don't call us, we'll call you,' versus the desire for strong, ongoing curricular support."

In general, comments from both groups indicate that principals perceive that the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making is, at most, limited. Principals want support without interference, and although central instructional support staff
members seem willing to provide support there seems to be a feeling of resentment that their skills are not put to better use.

**Views on the District's Implementation of SBDM**

A comparison of responses to the eight questions in the first section of the questionnaire provides a summary of the views of both groups regarding the district's implementation of site-based decision making. Principals and central instructional support staff respondents expressed significantly different views on five of the eight items.

Principals indicate a stronger belief in the principle of SBDM than do central instructional support staff members and, while the principals consider that they have been actively involved in the development of SBDM in the school district, the majority of central staff members do not feel a sense of involvement. Also, responses from principals show that they believe that SBDM has had a positive impact on the way they do their job, but central instructional support staff members do not perceive a positive impact from SBDM on the way they do their job.

Neither group indicated a particular interest in receiving more information about SBDM, and there was not a significant difference between the groups in their perceptions of the support for SBDM as demonstrated by either the principals or the central instructional support staff. However, in assessing the superintendent's support for SBDM, the difference between the two groups was significant. Nearly 70% of central instructional support staff respondents either agreed
or strongly agreed that the superintendent demonstrates support for SBDM, but only 55% of the principals indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Responding to the item stating that principals can do their jobs more effectively with SBDM than with centralized school governance, more than 86% of the principals indicated either agreement or strong agreement. Fewer than 52% of central staff respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

In general, principals seem to have a more positive view of the district's implementation of site-based decision making than do members of central instructional support staff. While central instructional staff members expressed concerns about the fragmentation and increased diversification among schools which make coordination of districtwide programs more difficult, many principals focused on the individual school's ability to develop plans which are specifically tailored to meet the needs of that school's community. Although some respondents from central instructional staff refer to SBDM as a barrier to progress, principals seem to feel that it is a vehicle for improvement.

Factors such as the lack of ongoing involvement and limited training in the processes of site-based decision making, coupled with the reduction in force of central instructional support staff and the advent of dual assignments for some, have apparently had a significant negative impact on the attitude of central staff members. One of the key informants from central staff expressed the opinion
that site-based decision making actually allowed for the downsizing of instructional support staff because SBDM "forced everyone to concentrate their efforts on what's going on in buildings." If that is indeed the case, it is not surprising that principals would feel more positive than central instructional support staff members about SBDM.

Discussion of Findings

The results of this research have led to a number of conclusions about the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making. The experiences described by staff members from this school district may prove to be valuable lessons for other districts as site-based decision making is implemented.

This study reveals that, in this particular school district, there are striking differences in the perceptions of principals and members of central instructional support staff regarding the role of instructional support staff in site-based decision making. While principals generally feel positive about site-based decision making and seem to have a clear understanding of their own role in SBDM, central instructional support staff tend to view site-based decision making with skepticism and express confusion about their roles in SBDM. Principals have varying notions of what instructional support staff can do to assist schools, but none seem to consider central instructional staff as significant contributors to site-based decision making. While instructional support staff perceive that they have
been relegated to the sidelines, called in only when there is a specified purpose, principals appear to feel more "in charge" of what is occurring in the schools.

Many of the principals were rather vague in defining the kinds of assistance which they expect central instructional staff to provide, other than saying they "...want the kinds of services we've always had," or "Services requested are the ones that have always been provided." Other principals expressed specific needs with comments such as, "Central staff should assist schools in implementing instructional programs which the school has identified as a priority, and assistance should be in an active, visible, timely, and high profile way," and "Central staff should be on the local school councils." Still other principals were quite derogatory in their description of the role of central instructional support staff with remarks such as, "Central staff seems to have no time, effort or energy to support teachers and buildings in their instructional programs/goals," or "They don't really know what some of us are dealing with—and I'm not sure they really care," or "Many times they do not listen to or support local schools."

Members of central instructional support staff seem to feel misunderstood, under-appreciated, and rather confused about what is expected of them. Comments such as, "I believe they still think there are a lot of people on central staff and a lot of services available to them on a moment's notice," and "I think a lot of schools have forgotten how beneficial central staff can be. It's almost as if we no longer exist," or "I think principals have very few—if any—
expectations about central staff’s role in site-based," are indicative of the perceptions of a majority of the central instructional support staff.

It is the hypothesis of this researcher that the two primary factors in the differing perceptions of central instructional support staff and principals regarding the roles of instructional support staff in site-based decision making in this district are: (a) the lack of continuing involvement of central instructional support staff in the development of SBDM resulted in a feeling of disenfranchisement among members of that group, and (b) the shift from district to campus decision making caused a resultant shift in power from central instructional support staff to principals and school SBDM teams. Further, the downsizing of central instructional support staff which began to occur after the inception of SBDM seems to have contributed to the creation of an "us against them" attitude among many on central instructional staff.

Feeling that they are "spread too thin" and that they are "expected to be all things to all people," some central instructional support staff members have opted to wait for schools to ask for assistance rather than actively seeking ways to be of service to schools. Consequently, principals tend to view many of the people on central instructional support staff as out of touch with what schools are doing, more involved with district level concerns than building level concerns, and/or unwilling to provide assistance except in a crisis.
From the outset, principals, campus staff, and central instructional support staff should understand that the purpose of moving to site-based decision making is to improve student achievement. A comprehensive, ongoing staff development program is necessary to build this philosophical foundation.

The move toward a more decentralized system of making decisions which directly impact student achievement will undoubtedly impact the way in which campus based staff and central support staff work together. The need for the special contributions which central staff can bring to a campus should be even more apparent as SBDM teams search for research based, data driven instructional strategies in order to achieve their goals.

Both principals and central instructional support staff are in general agreement that this district's move toward site-based decision making has had a negative impact on the type and extent of services provided to the schools by central staff. Although the downsizing of central instructional support staff cannot be ignored as a factor, neither principals nor central staff seem to feel that the central instructional support staff is making consistent, meaningful contributions to the effective implementation of SBDM at the campus level.

Campus staff should have the authority to determine their school's priorities and goals. However, the district should communicate to principals and site-based teams that their responsibility includes utilizing the best available resources, which
would include instructional support staff. This also requires a willingness on the part of central instructional support staff to serve as a resource rather than as an authority figure.

Schools need to focus on ways in which central instructional support staff can be active participants in their efforts to improve, rather than simply asking, "What can you do for us?" Effective instructional support is more likely to occur if instructional specialists are involved in campus planning and can share in the commitment to school improvement.

In the school district which was the site of this study it seems evident that, as a group, central instructional support staff members are not reaching their potential as effective contributors to instructional improvement at the campus level. Even though the majority of central instructional support staff express a willingness to provide assistance to schools, they appear to have a reluctance to approach schools unless invited to do so. While expressing confidence in their skills and level of expertise, central instructional support staff members seem to need validation in the form of requests from principals and teachers for assistance.

Opportunities which enable central instructional support staff to feel valuable to, and valued by, principals and campus teams will provide a basis for future success. Rather than waiting for schools to request assistance, central staff members must take the initiative to be more visible in the schools and more aggressive in their efforts to identify opportunities to provide assistance.
Many barriers, some real and some perceived, exist which limit the contributions which can be made by central instructional support staff in the successful implementation of site-based decision making. However, none of the barriers appears to be insurmountable.

Suggestions for Further Research

Since the mid-1980s, the shift in focus from central bureaucracies to individual schools has garnered widespread acceptance throughout the United States. Whether it is referred to as decentralization, restructuring, school-based management, or site-based decision making, this practice has brought significant changes in the roles of central office administrators.

Much of the literature pertaining to the role of central administrators in site-based decision making is focused on the superintendent. Without question, the support and encouragement of the superintendent is necessary for the success of broad based change efforts. Considerably less has been written about the role played by curriculum specialists and instructional support staff in the successful implementation of school reform, and commitment from this group must also be part of the school improvement equation.

Wood, quoted in Asayesh (1994), notes that with decentralization, "The central office's role becomes one of facilitating and supporting and making sure there is implementation of change out there... Instead of dictating the kinds of changes that will take
place, their role is to help people find the right programs, the right kind of improvements, so they can address the major needs and concerns of the students and teachers and the parents and the community that they serve at their site" (pp. 2-3).

In examining the role of central instructional support staff in site-based decision making as it has been implemented in one school district, this study has raised a number of questions for further research. Possible questions to be answered by future studies include:

1. What has been the experience of other districts of similar size during the same transition period?

2. What are the expectations of superintendents in districts of similar size with regard to the emerging and changing roles of central instructional support staff as districts move toward site-based decision making?

3. What interpersonal skills of central instructional support staff are valued by principals who actively seek to involve central staff in campus planning and decision making?

4. What is the experience of site-based decision making teams which have actively involved central instructional support staff in campus planning?

5. What is the experience of central instructional support staff members who have been extensively involved in campus planning?
6. What staff development programs are required to assist central instructional support staff make an effective transition to site-based decision making?

7. Does the implementation of site-based decision making have implications for the criteria used in the selection of central instructional support staff?

8. Does the implementation of site-based decision making have implications for the number of central instructional support staff positions required by a school district?

9. Does the implementation of site-based decision making have implications for the organizational structure of central instructional support staff?

10. Do principals who have previously served a members of central instructional support staff view the role of support staff differently than other principals?

11. Do central instructional support staff members who have previously served as principals view their role differently than other central staff members?

12. What implications does the move toward decentralization have for administrator preparation programs?

Conclusion

As changes occur in local school governance and schools take on greater responsibility for themselves, Glickman (1993) notes that, although it may seem paradoxical, the role and work of the central
office staff increases. While there are likely to be fewer bureaucratic functions of the central office in terms of chain of command and decisions made for schools, and there may be fewer central staff members, "personnel who do remain will have a threefold job: keeping local school work focused on education, coordinating information across schools, and helping schools do the work that they cannot do themselves. It is easier to sit in a central office and make decisions about what schools should do than to sit with schools and figure out how to help coordinate and implement their work" (p.123).

Central instructional support staff should play a key role in the successful implementation of site-based decision making. However, without ongoing involvement and significant commitment from this group, the changing relationship between central staff and school staffs may become uneasy and perhaps even adversarial. Districts which are encouraging principals and teachers to chart their own course must not allow central instructional support staff to become lost in a sea of uncertainty about their role in the site-based decision making process.
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SECTION 21.931
of the
TEXAS EDUCATION CODE

(a) Each school district shall develop and implement a plan for site-based decision making not later than September 1, 1992. Each district shall submit its plan to the Commissioner of Education for approval.

(b) Each district's plan: 1.) shall establish school committees; 2.) may expand the process established under Section 21.7532 of this code for the establishment of campus performance objectives; and 3.) shall outline the role of the school committees regarding decision making related to goal setting, curriculum, budgeting, staffing patterns, and school organization.

(c) A school committee established under this section shall include community representatives. The community representatives may include business representatives.

(d) The commissioner may not approve a plan that the commissioner determines contains one or more provisions that may be construed as limiting or affecting the power of the board of trustees of the school district to govern and manage the district or as limiting the responsibilities of the trustees.

(e) The commissioner shall identify or make available to school districts various models for implementing site-based decision making under this section not later than January 1, 1992. The commissioner shall arrange for training in site-based decision making through one or more sources for school board trustees, superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, and other members of school committees.
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INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following questions provided the common core for interviews with both the central instructional staff members and the principals who served as key informants.

1. How has the school district's move to site-based decision making affected the roles of central instructional support staff members?

2. What roles do central instructional support staff members currently have in site-based decision making in the schools?

3. What roles do you think central instructional staff members should have in site-based decision making?

4. What impacts has site-based decision making had on the services provided to schools by central instructional support staff members?

5. What impacts has site-based decision making had on the services requested of central instructional support staff members by personnel in the schools?
APPENDIX C
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QUESTIONNAIRE for CENTRAL STAFF

The state of Texas defines site-based decision making (SBDM) as follows:

"Site-based decision making is a process for decentralizing decisions to improve the educational outcomes at every school campus through a collaborative effort by which principals, teachers, campus staff, district staff, parents, and community representatives assess educational outcomes of all students, determine goals and strategies, and ensure that strategies are implemented and adjusted to improve student achievement."


Please use the following scale to mark your responses to the items below:

1  Strongly Disagree
2  Disagree
3  Undecided
4  Agree
5  Strongly Agree

A. SBDM IN THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT

1A. I believe in the principle of SBDM. 1 2 3 4 5
2A. I would like more information about SBDM. 1 2 3 4 5
3A. I have been actively involved in the development of SBDM in this district. 1 2 3 4 5
4A. The superintendent demonstrates support for SBDM. 1 2 3 4 5
5A. Most of the principals demonstrate support for SBDM. 1 2 3 4 5
6A. Most central instructional staff members demonstrate support for SBDM. 1 2 3 4 5
7A. SBDM has had a positive impact on the way I do my job. 1 2 3 4 5
8A. I believe that principals can do their jobs more effectively with SBDM than with centralized school governance. 1 2 3 4 5
Several principals and members of the Basic Instruction staff were interviewed regarding site-based decision making and the roles of central instructional support staff. Questions 1B and 2B indicate the various roles which interviewees discussed during the course of the interviews. Please complete this questionnaire from your own perspective.

1B. Put a check beside all of the roles which are currently part of your job:

1.)________Providing support for curriculum
2.)________Providing support for teachers
3.)________Providing support for principals
4.)________Evaluating instructional programs
5.)________Assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles
6.)________Evaluating campus improvement plans
7.)________Working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns
8.)________Providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus site-based decision-making cycle
9.)________Writing waivers for schools
10.)_______Evaluating waivers for schools
11.)_______Correcting or re-writing waivers for schools
12.)_______Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools
13.)_______Providing crisis management/intervention
14.)_______Addressing concerns/questions from parents
15.)_______Addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community
16.) Providing information to teachers and/or principals about resources which are available in the district and elsewhere

17.) Communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons

18.) Facilitating communication between/among schools

19.) Planning districtwide staff development programs

20.) Presenting districtwide staff development programs

21.) Working with schools to tailor staff development to specific school needs

22.) Staying informed of current research and educational trends

23.) Participating in research

24.) Disseminating information/articles to principals

25.) Disseminating information/articles to teachers

Please list any other roles which you believe central instructional support staff should have:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2B. Put a check beside all of the central instructional support staff roles which you believe have changed significantly since the district's move toward site-based decision making:

1.) Providing support for curriculum

2.) Providing support for teachers

3.) Providing support for principals

4.) Evaluating instructional programs

5.) Assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles
6.)________ Evaluating campus improvement plans

7.)________ Working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns

8.)________ Providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus site-based decision-making cycle

9.)________ Writing waivers for schools

10.)_______ Evaluating waivers for schools

11.)_______ Correcting or re-writing waivers for schools

12.)_______ Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools

13.)_______ Providing crisis management/intervention

14.)_______ Addressing concerns/questions from parents

15.)_______ Addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community

16.)_______ Providing information to teachers and/or principals about resources which are available in the district and elsewhere

17.)_______ Communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons

18.)_______ Facilitating communication between/among schools

19.)_______ Planning districtwide staff development programs

20.)_______ Presenting districtwide staff development programs

21.)_______ Working with schools to tailor staff development to specific school needs

22.)_______ Staying informed of current research and educational trends

23.)_______ Participating in research
24.) Disseminating information/articles to principals

25.) Disseminating information/articles to teachers

Please list any other central instructional staff roles which you believe have changed significantly since the inception of site-based decision making:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3B. What expectations do you think principals have regarding the role(s) of central instructional support staff in SBDM?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4B. What impact do you think SBDM has had on the services you provide to schools?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5B. What impact do you think SBDM has had on the services requested by schools?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS
QUESTIONNAIRE for PRINCIPALS

The state of Texas defines site-based decision making (SBDM) as follows:

"Site-based decision making is a process for decentralizing decisions to improve the educational outcomes at every school campus through a collaborative effort by which principals, teachers, campus staff, district staff, parents, and community representatives assess educational outcomes of all students, determine goals and strategies, and ensure that strategies are implemented and adjusted to improve student achievement."


Please use the following scale to mark your responses to the items below:

1  Strongly Disagree
2  Disagree
3  Undecided
4  Agree
5  Strongly Agree

A. SBDM IN THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT

1A. I believe in the principle of SBDM.

2A. I would like more information about SBDM.

3A. I have been actively involved in the development of SBDM in this district.

4A. The superintendent demonstrates support for SBDM.

5A. Most of the principals demonstrate support for SBDM.

6A. Most central instructional staff members demonstrate support for SBDM.

7A. SBDM has had a positive impact on the way I do my job.

8A. I believe that principals can do their jobs more effectively with SBDM than with centralized school governance.
B. THE ROLE OF CENTRAL STAFF IN SBDM

Several principals and members of the Basic Instruction staff were interviewed regarding site-based decision making and the roles of central instructional support staff. Questions 1B and 2B indicate the various roles which interviewees discussed during the course of the interviews. Please complete this questionnaire from your own perspective.

1B. Put a check beside all of the roles which you believe are currently included in the role of central instructional support staff:

1.) _______ Providing support for curriculum
2.) _______ Providing support for teachers
3.) _______ Providing support for principals
4.) _______ Evaluating instructional programs
5.) _______ Assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles
6.) _______ Evaluating campus improvement plans
7.) _______ Working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns
8.) _______ Providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus site-based decision-making cycle
9.) _______ Writing waivers for schools
10.) _______ Evaluating waivers for schools
11.) _______ Correcting or re-writing waivers for schools
12.) _______ Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools
13.) _______ Providing crisis management/intervention
14.) _______ Addressing concerns/questions from parents
15.) _______ Addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community
16.)_______Providing information to teachers and/or principals about resources which are available in the district and elsewhere

17.)_______Communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons

18.)_______Facilitating communication between/among schools

19.)_______Planning districtwide staff development programs

20.)_______Presenting districtwide staff development programs

21.)_______Working with schools to tailor staff development to specific school needs

22.)_______Staying informed of current research and educational trends

23.)_______Participating in research

24.)_______Disseminating information/articles to principals

25.)_______Disseminating information/articles to teachers

Please list any other roles which you believe central instructional support staff should have:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2B.  Put a check beside all of the central instructional support staff roles which you believe have changed significantly since the district's move toward site-based decision making:

1.)_______Providing support for curriculum

2.)_______Providing support for teachers

3.)_______Providing support for principals

4.)_______Evaluating instructional programs

5.)_______Assisting in the development of teachers in leadership roles
6. Evaluating campus improvement plans

7. Working with campus SBDM teams in order to determine their concerns

8. Providing input and/or assistance as part of the campus site-based decision-making cycle

9. Writing waivers for schools

10. Evaluating waivers for schools

11. Correcting or re-writing waivers for schools

12. Identifying duplication of effort between/among schools

13. Providing crisis management/intervention

14. Addressing concerns/questions from parents

15. Addressing concerns/questions from other members of the community

16. Providing information to teachers and/or principals about resources which are available in the district and elsewhere

17. Communicating with contact teachers and/or department chairpersons

18. Facilitating communication between/among schools

19. Planning districtwide staff development programs

20. Presenting districtwide staff development programs

21. Working with schools to tailor staff development to specific school needs

22. Staying informed of current research and educational trends

23. Participating in research
24.) Disseminating information/articles to principals

25.) Disseminating information/articles to teachers

Please list any other central instructional staff roles which you believe have changed significantly since the inception of site-based decision making:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3B. What expectations do you think principals have regarding the role(s) of central instructional support staff in SBDM?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4B. What impact do you think SBDM has had on the services central instructional support staff provides to your school?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5B. What impact do you think SBDM has had on the central instructional support staff services requested by your school?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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