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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A significant event of the 1960's was that many school systems responded to demands for improved educational performance by developing and/or implementing school decentralization plans. Cronin and Haller describe the situation as follows:

In response to demands that public institutions reflect the diversity of contemporary urban society, many large school systems have decentralized their decision making structures. These systems are establishing structures that bring professional responsibility as close as possible to the educational consumer. At the same time they are working out procedures for preserving accountability and coordination to permit systematic educational development.¹

Ornstein surveyed school systems in the United States enrolling 50,000 or more students and found that forty-one systems had been decentralized and eight were considering it. The majority of these school systems started the decentralized process since 1967.² Not all decentralization plans were alike, however. Decentralization meant different things to different people. There are numerous definitions for school decentralization and each definition usually reflects
the philosophy supported by some school decentralization advocate.

The two forms of decentralization found most frequently in the literature are administrative decentralization and political decentralization. Administrative decentralization usually provides a structure whereby a school district is sub-divided for administrative purposes. Administrative offices are set up within these sub-divisions in an effort to give better educational services. The administrators within the sub-division offices are given the authority by their administrative supervisors to make many decisions that were formerly made at the central administrative offices. Political decentralization usually includes the administrative sub-divisional structure in addition to providing for some degree of community involvement or control. This commonly takes the form of advisory boards or boards of education at the community, district, or regional level. The boards of education are given some policy-making authority over the schools of a specific area by the central board of education and/or the legislature. According to LaNoue and Smith, the basic concept of decentralization may be defined as,

the transfer of legitimate decision-making authority in the areas of personnel (recruitment and discipline), curriculum, and budget from central
boards and bureaucracies to local areas within the city.3

Chicago, St. Louis and Washington, D.C. are examples of school systems that have implemented administrative school decentralization plans which chiefly involve internal administrative reorganization. In 1977, Detroit and New York were the only school systems which were implementing state-mandated school decentralization plans which included elements of community control. In these school districts some of the important decisions about school programs and staff leadership have been turned over to community and regional school boards. Board members and administrators within local districts or regions of these school systems are sharing the growing load of dealing with community frustrations about the schools. The new local boards of education offer additional outlets for testing ideas and absorbing hostility. These boards also provide a structure for public accountability for professional performance—primarily through the authority to hire and fire the community or regional superintendent.4

A recent study conducted by The American Association of School Administrators reveals that in those systems which have moved toward some form of decentralized organizational structure, the administrator in
charge of a particular geographical jurisdiction is usually a district or area executive—often holding a rank a notch or two below that of the general superintendent. These administrators have various titles: area superintendent, district superintendent, regional superintendent, community superintendent, district administrator, field administrator, field executive, and principal. The duties and responsibilities of these administrators are as multiple and varied as are the organizational structures, definitions and objectives of school decentralization. This suggests that the role of the area administrator as well as the goals of school decentralization need clarification. A characteristic of most changes in social organizations, such as school systems is the reordering of duties and responsibilities of certain personnel in order to facilitate new policies and objectives. However, the relationship between the area administrator's duties and the achievement of school decentralization goals is not clear.

Both administrative and political school decentralization plans were designed and/or implemented in response to demands for improved academic achievement by students, for increased accountability by professionals and for greater participation in educational decision-making by laymen. These demands were largely pressed by the parents of poor minority children who had lost
faith in the ability of the schools to educate their children. A response was demanded and a response was given. Logic, however, suggests an assessment of the educational goals and purposes should be made before any reorganization is attempted within a school system. The governance and administrative structure of a school system should be designed to accomplish desired objectives.

Cunningham agrees that goal setting is important and places the question of goals and priorities high on his list of current issues which have structural implications for communities and organizations. He recognizes the complexity of the goal setting process, however, when he describes goal specification and priority determination as "the most puzzling issue facing most institutions today."7

Careful planning, thorough assessing, and goal setting prior to the implementation of most school decentralization plans were sorely lacking. For instance, Smith reported that the central board of education of Detroit had not adopted a set of goals for decentralization which became a school policy in 1970.8 Cawelti's study of school decentralization also gives evidence to support the conclusion that the new level of administrative organization between the central office and
building level often comes into being with minimum guidance as to its role or function.9 Because of varying philosophies, interests and concerns, plus a scarcity of goal statements, there is much uncertainty within communities about what school decentralization should accomplish. A clarification of decentralization goals coupled with the delineation of important duties of key personnel in a decentralized school setting can provide greater insight into the school decentralization process.

Given the critical issues of education in general and school decentralization in particular, the purpose of this study is not only to define the perceptions of important actors in a decentralized system relative to goal related activities and goal achievement; but also, to provide a more cogent understanding of how school decentralization contributes to effective educational outcomes for children and youth.

Detroit has been selected for the study site to determine how the activities of regional superintendents relate to the achievement of important goals of school decentralization. Detroit has had long experience with this organizational innovation, having adopted decentralization in 1956. The perceptions of key actors in Detroit will therefore be based on familiarity with the position of regional superintendent.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine the relationship between the activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization as perceived by key actors in a decentralized school system. Because of the paucity of research concerning decentralization, there is a need to define operationally both the goals of school decentralization and the duties of area administrators in decentralized school systems.

Smith suggests that, since the designers of the decentralization guidelines for Detroit did not address the goal issue, community persons developed their own goals for school decentralization. Community persons were surveyed in a study conducted by Smith and identified goals which were organized into the following four categories: having community control, sharing responsibility and accountability, having improved quality of education and dividing and conquering the black community. Smith's study also revealed conflict in perceptions both within and between the groups of community persons who addressed the issue of school decentralization goals. The present study is a continuing effort to identify important goals of school decentralization as perceived by key actors within the Detroit school system.
The position of regional superintendent is a new, emerging, not well-established role which is evolving under conditions of uncertainty, ambiguity and change. In order to understand more fully the nature and complexity of school decentralization, it will be useful to study this key component of school decentralization in some depth. The regional superintendent is the chief executive officer of the region and is also the link between the region and the total school system. The position of regional superintendent is unique, existing only in a decentralized school setting. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume this position was created for the purpose of facilitating the achievement of school decentralization goals. However, there is need of research to show whether the position of regional superintendent does, indeed, serve to achieve decentralization goals.

Perceptions are perhaps more important than facts, particularly in a situation where "facts" are either unknown or ambiguous. Although perceptions are inaccurate or distorted, they are real to those who hold them and the consequences of the actions of those who operate on inaccurate perceptions are real and have far-reaching implications for others. Presently, little is known about the perceptions regional superintendents have of their role in the decentralization
process. The same is true regarding the perceptions that others have about the role of the regional superintendent.

The following questions were formulated as a focus for this investigation:

1. What are some important goals of school decentralization?
2. What are some important activities of the regional superintendent in relationship to these goals?
3. What do key actors perceive to be the relationship between activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization?
4. Is there agreement within and/or between groups of key actors regarding the perceived relationship between activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization?
5. What are the implications of the agreement or lack of agreement in perceptions?

Definition of Terms

There are several terms to be defined; not because of their uniqueness, but because of their
ambiguity within the profession. These definitions are offered to provide understanding within the context of this study.

1. **School decentralization** - the transfer of decision-making authority in the areas of personnel, curriculum and budget from central boards of education and/or central office administrators to administrators and/or boards of education within a geographical area of a school district. Decentralization may evolve for either political or administrative reasons.

2. **Decentralized school district** - a school district which has transferred the decision-making authority in the areas of personnel, curriculum and budget from central boards of education and/or central office administrators to administrators and/or boards of education within a geographical area of a school district.

3. **Central board of education** - the agency designated by the state to represent all of the people of a school district which has responsibility for translating the educational needs and desires of the people into policies and programs.
4. **A regional area of a school district** - a geographical subdivision of a school district.

5. **Regional board members** - members of regional boards of education responsible for translating into policies and programs the educational needs and desires of the people within a regional area of a school district.

6. **Central board members** - members of the central board of education.

7. **Regional superintendent** - the chief executive officer of a board of education within a regional area of a school district.

8. **Goals of school decentralization** - the purposes and objectives to be achieved as a result of the actions and decisions of educational practitioners in a decentralized school system.

9. **Duties of regional superintendents** - the acts or operations in which regional superintendents engage that are required by the job.

10. **Goal related activities** - the duties and activities or regional superintendents which facilitate the achievement of school decentralization goals.
11. **Perception** - the meaning assigned by an individual to a situation or event.

**Significance of the Study**

LaNoue and Smith have stated that the theoretical assumptions of decentralization proponents were untested and the practical effects of them remain unknown. They further report that systematic research on the effects of decentralization were just beginning to be undertaken in 1970, so little definitive evidence about decentralization is available.12

Ornstein agrees that few empirical data are available regarding school decentralization and his adamant objection to this lack of research is indicated in the following statement:

"... research is expensive but lack of research on administrative decentralization and community control may be more expensive in the long run to students and society in general. Until the evidence is clear, we should proceed with caution. The point is, the so-called 'solutions'—administrative decentralization, community control, even community participation—are mainly slogans, rather than closely worked-out concepts with consequences understood and accounted for in the rhetoric.13"

This study will serve to fill part of the void created by inaccurate or insufficient knowledge about decentralization.
Some authors have indicated the need for clarification of goals of school decentralization and the division of responsibilities between central and local administrators and board members. Fantini and Gittell, who have made several extensive studies of the school decentralization process in New York City, concluded that the lack of clear guidelines clarifying the division of power between central and local authority was the primary cause of conflict situations associated with school decentralization in New York. In a study of decentralization in Detroit, Smith concluded that there was an absence of clearly-defined goals for decentralization. These studies also document the confusion of school boards about where the authority to make certain kinds of decisions lies and the confusion among administrators as to who is responsible for implementing various policy decisions. Such confusion suggests that a problem of this study, to define operationally the goals of school decentralization and duties of sub-unit administrators of decentralized school systems, will provide information which will be useful to participants in the school decentralization process.

Parsons has suggested that organizational structures may be analyzed either from the point of view of the organization culture and its institutionalized manifestations or from the point of view of the total
organization.16 The latter approach was chosen for this investigation. An analysis was made of the perceptions of key actors in administrative and policy making roles whose collective decisions and behavior impact upon the functioning of the Detroit school system.

The following statement of Biddle and Thomas suggests that the approach taken in this study is sound:

Individuals in society occupy positions and their role performance in these positions is determined by social norms, demands and rules; by the role performance of others in their respective positions; by those who observe and react to the performance; and by the individual's particular capabilities and personality.17

The implementation of specific guidelines or implied objectives of decentralization is the responsibility of the regional superintendent and the professional personnel under his authority. He is generally responsible for the operation of the schools and for the success of educational programs within a designated geographical area. Thus, a knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of this position is a vital requirement for successful performance and consequently successful achievement of purposes and goals.

The data generated provide a basis for a more comprehensive study of the goals and objectives of school decentralization and the extent to which these have been achieved. The school decentralization process
In large urban school districts could be strengthened to the extent that purposes and roles are clarified and agreement is reached among decision-makers regarding goals for the schools and functions of school personnel. Results of this inquiry could also serve to clarify further the role of the regional superintendent which will be helpful in developing more realistic job descriptions to be used in recruiting, selecting and/or evaluating regional superintendents.

More specifically this research has significance to the field of educational administration for these reasons:

1. it adds new knowledge to what has been found regarding school decentralization;
2. it identifies important goals of school decentralization;
3. it identifies activities of regional superintendents which are related to the achievement of important goals of school decentralization;
4. it documents differences between superintendents' and board members' perceptions of the relationship between activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of school decentralization goals; and
5. It documents agreement between superintendents' and board members' perceptions of the relationship between activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of school decentralization goals.

In summary, the results of this exploratory work help to clarify the relationship between key components of school decentralization, i.e., decentralization goals and duties of the regional superintendent. The procedures used and type of data gathered may be generalizable to other decentralized school systems; however, generalizations beyond the particular district studied are not intended. Only after a number of exploratory studies of this nature have been conducted can a comprehensive set of guidelines be developed by boards of education in decentralized districts for effective working relationships between regional superintendents, educational personnel and community representatives.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study. It is exploratory, conducted within one system (the Detroit school system) and, therefore, generalizing to other school districts may not be appropriate. At the present time only two school systems in the United States are operating under state mandated school
decentralization plans which provide for community or regional school boards—New York and Detroit. New York was rejected as the focus of this investigation because of its size and because the school decentralization plans for New York did not include high schools.

As defined previously, the central research focus is upon perceptions about decentralization of the general superintendent, regional superintendents, central board members and regional school board members. Thus, findings are limited to the perceptions of these key actors and will reflect their "subjective reality" rather than an "objective reality." These respondents were asked to base their responses on their perceptions of what should exist (subjective reality). These perceptions may or may not reflect what does exist in fact (objective reality).

It is also important to point out that individual perceptions may be influenced by many non-related factors. Lindzey and Aronson caution that:

One of the major limitations on control which concerns us is the extent to which unmeasured individual differences may obscure results . . . . Our subjects differ from each other genetically, in learned personality characteristics, in values and attitudes, and in immediate past experiences. Any and all of these differences may have a large impact on the way in which subjects respond.
Since this is an exploratory study, no attempt was made to determine the impact of individual differences. This could be a problem for future investigators.

The persons included in this study were chosen because the decentralization guidelines for the Detroit Public Schools recognize them as key actors by listing some of their relationships and responsibilities. No attempt will be made to measure the perceptions of other administrators or laymen who may have impact within the community because of limitations of time, monetary and other resources.

Respondents reacted to a set of goals and activities selected by the investigator after an extensive review of the literature. Therefore, this study includes neither the entire universe of possible goals of school decentralization nor the entire universe of possible activities of regional superintendents. However, the use of a panel of judges to assist in the selection process should reduce the impact of a limited set of goals and activities.

No attempt was made to measure the effectiveness of the decentralized organizational structure or to evaluate the performance of the administrators and board members in the Detroit school district. However,
data have been collected which could be useful to future investigators in these and other areas.

Chapter Organization

In Chapter I an overview of the problem is presented. The purpose and general direction of the study is indicated and a brief historical background of the problem is presented.

A review of the literature and research related to school decentralization is presented in Chapter II. Literature was selected to illustrate and clarify relationships examined in the study.

Chapter III details the design of the study, the procedures employed in the development of the research instrument and the data gathering procedures.

Chapter IV contains a presentation and analysis of the data collected.

The interpretation of the findings as they relate to the research questions provide the focus for Chapter V. In addition, this chapter contains implications and recommendations.
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CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

School decentralization takes many forms, has many definitions and has gone through at least two historical phases—the early 1900's and the 1960's. In the early 1900's there was a movement begun to reform the educational system. At this time, the dissatisfaction came from those who wanted to end the political decentralization of schools which existed at that time. This decentralization was characterized by either large school board membership with members being elected by wards or by large numbers of school districts within one city. Many politicians in the 1900's regarded the schools as a useful support for the spoils system and awarded jobs and contracts as political favors. A decentralized, ward-based committee system for administering public schools provided opportunities for this form of political influence. The reformers were a coalition of "elites," university presidents, school superintendents and lay allies from the business world and other professional groups. The stated aim of this
"progressive" group was to take education out of politics and to make education more efficient. However, it has been suggested that the financial and professional leaders deplored the decentralized ward system because it empowered members of the lower and middle classes many of whom were recent immigrants.\(^1\)

Cronin believes that the decentralization movement of the 1960's differed from that of the early 1900's in two important ways:

1. The advocates of community control or participation were so very often social welfare professionals dismayed at their own failures, or those of their colleagues, and of the 'system' to adopt social services sufficient to serve the new urban minorities.

2. The nature of the reform called not for substituting of citizen judgment for that of professional in such decisions as teacher recruitment or program development, but mainly for making professional educators accountable for their performance. In blunt terms, this meant professionals would be selected on the basis of their commitment to community aspirations but would be fired if they failed to make measurable progress toward agreed on goals. In effect, this was a heightening rather than a diminution of professionalism as a service-oriented, idealistic calling.\(^2\)

The school decentralization movement which began in the 1960's captured the interest of researchers and writers in education, political science and sociology. There is considerable literature available which concerns itself with this subject. In the following review
Definitions and Descriptions of School Decentralization

There is no generally accepted definition of decentralization. The term is subject to a multitude of interpretations. The three terms that are used most frequently to identify different forms of decentralization are: administrative decentralization, political decentralization and community control.

Yates examined seven decentralization experiments which included the community school boards of New York. As a result of this examination of the politics and impacts of decentralization experiments in urban government, Yates considered administrative decentralization, political decentralization and
community control as three alternatives for the distribution of power. His preliminary definition of decentralization is "the delegation of administrative and/or political power from the city government to neighborhood units."³

According to Yates, political decentralization emphasizes citizen participation but neighborhood participants do not control local administrators and employees. Administrative decentralization increases the power of existing neighborhood officials and administrators but usually does not involve citizen participation. Community control gives neighborhood residents both political control in policy making and administrative control of employees.

In a study of school decentralization in Detroit, Smith uses the terms: administrative decentralization, political decentralization, community control and community involvement. Smith insists that one must be cognizant of the different nuances surrounding these concepts in order to understand the historical saga in Detroit in relation to decentralization.

The following definitions are given by Smith:

Administrative decentralization involves a central decision-making body with administrative units moved closer to the place where the decision will have the greatest impact. These units
generally have autonomy in school matters and may attempt to respond to local board and advisory groups, among others, but with definite limits to local decision-making power.

Political decentralization deals with power and school governance. In its purest form, it shifts the authority to a local or community school board. It seeks to create both the mechanism for participatory democracy and the environment for more responsive school policies to be developed.

Community control in addition to dealing with power and school governance, also deals with authority and ultimate responsibility. Under minimum conditions, community control is a process which vests power in a local school board and protects its exercise from veto by the Central Board.

In his study of the effects of the 1969 Decentralization Law on a community school district in New York, Zimet maintains that there are two different concepts of decentralization. One is administrative decentralization and the other is political decentralization. Zimet considers community control to be a form of political decentralization. In his opinion, administrative decentralization involves the delegation of authority from superior to subordinate in a bureaucracy. The subordinate, however, continues to remain dependent on his superior in varying degrees depending upon the extent of the delegations. Political decentralization, on the other hand, involves the transfer of authority to officials who have been selected and who are dependent upon a sub-jurisdictional electorate or clientele. It is assumed that the elected official exercising his authority can no
longer be manipulated by the former possessor of that authority.5

A study conducted by The Educational Research Service identified twenty-nine school systems which were operating under some plan of decentralization and/or community control. These systems of decentralization and/or community control were then divided into the following descriptive categories:

1. Systems with decentralized decision-making but with centralized administration.

2. Systems with administrative decentralization but with centralized instructional and supporting services.

3. Systems with administrative decentralization and decentralization of instructional and supporting services.

4. Systems which are in the process of decentralization and providing for community participation, i.e., systems in which only a few areas have been placed under a local administrator.

5. Systems with decentralized administration and with community participation in some or all of the sub-districts.

6. Systems with decentralized administration and services and with community participation in some or all of the local districts.

7. A system with some local districts controlled by a locally-elected community school board, while the remainder of the system remains under centralized administration.

8. A system which is completely subdivided into local school districts, each
governed by a locally-elected community school board, i.e., a system with city wide commitment to community control.

These categories, which provide a continuum for school decentralization, confirm a statement by Ornstein that, "There are no typical cities, no typical communities, no typical administrative decentralization plans, no typical community control plans."  

Ornstein collected data on the decentralization of seven large school systems in the United States and found that there were three alternatives for governing metropolitan school systems: (1) administrative decentralization, (2) community participation, and (3) community control. Ornstein gives the following definitions of these alternatives:

Administrative decentralization is a process whereby the school system is divided into smaller units; the laws of power and authority remain with a single, central administration and board of education. Although decentralization need not necessarily lead to increased community participation, it often happens.

Community participation connotes the formation of advisory committees or groups beyond the usual parent/teacher associations. The committees that are formed may operate at various levels within the system - the local school, decentralized unit, or central level. The main function of these groups is to make recommendations (not policy) and to serve as a liaison between the schools and community.
Community control connotes a legal provision for an elected school board functioning under specific guidelines and in conjunction with the central school board. It means a sharing of decision making authority and power between the local and central school boards.7

Upon further examination of the school decentralization phenomenon, Ornstein finally collapses these three alternative models of decentralization into two options: administrative decentralization and community participation versus administrative decentralization and community control. Of the 68 school systems surveyed by Ornstein only two school systems had combined administrative decentralization with community control. These were New York and Detroit.

Many studies seem to reflect the thinking of Ornstein that all school decentralization plans include the characteristics of administrative decentralization and that political decentralization takes the form of either citizen participation or community control. The reports of the following writers support this position.

In the status report released by Educational Research Services regarding administrative decentralization and community involvement in school administration the following definitions are given:

Decentralization is a managerial technique whereby a central authority delegates functional responsibility and some decision making to officials of subunits
of the local school system, each of whom administers schools in a particular geographic area.

Community control denotes decision-making and responsibility regarding the expenditure of money, by an elected group representative of the community served by a school or group of schools.

Community participation encompasses any systematic and structured method for enlisting community assistance and advice in the decision-making process.9

Carderelli9 conducted a national survey of school systems to determine the extent to which decentralization and community control was being tried across the nation. He found that nine systems were decentralized in some way and grouped these systems into three groups or approaches to decentralization: administrative decentralization, local or community control and citizen's advisory or participation groups.

In administrative decentralization Carderelli sees various decision-making powers being delegated to administrators in the field. The administrators must operate within a policy framework established by the board of education. There is no formal framework to involve citizens in policy or decision making.

Carderelli believes that local or community control involves the exercise of authority over a school system or a sub-area of a school system by a local school board. Where community control exists,
parents are provided the opportunity to engage in policy-making activities which affect the schools directly.

The citizens advisory or participation groups approach to school decentralization described by Carderelli involves parents in various aspects of school operation in an advisory capacity. These advisory groups normally do not participate in policy making decisions nor do they have powers in the areas of hiring, placement and promotion of personnel.

The following studies emphasize the community control aspect of school decentralization. In reporting the results of their study of the politics of school decentralization, LaNoue and Smith classify school decentralization into two principal forms: administrative delegation and community control. They reached the conclusion that

In the first system, administrative authority in defined areas is transferred from the top of the bureaucracy to field units. Selection of local administrators and determination of basic policies remain central prerogatives. In community-control systems, local units assume not only administrative but also legislative power. The administrators are selected by and are legally responsible to the neighborhood groups or boards which legislate policy for the local units.10

Pantini and Gittell view school decentralization as a means of achieving educational reform
and their investigation of school decentralization revealed that from 1967 to the present, the urban school-reform movement has concentrated on greater community control of the schools.

These writers define administrative decentralization as

A process that refers to the granting by the central board of decision-making powers to its officers in the field, perhaps district superintendents, without any concessions being made to demands for community involvement in the decision-making.11

According to Fantini and Gittell, community control exists to the extent that policy-making powers have been granted to local communities and the control of basic resources of power within the local community distinguishes the decentralization-community control concept from administrative decentralization.12

In their description of the community control movement within the three experimental school districts of New York, Berube and Gittell concluded that community control advocates reject pure administrative reform and demand a redistribution of power or a restructuring of control. They define decentralization as a delegation of decision-making power to local districts within the city.13

Hagwood also emphasizes that there is a major difference between decentralization with community
participation and community control in this statement:

It must be understood that decentralization of schools with community involvement or participation is not the same thing as community control of schools. Community control of schools includes a board duly elected by the local community, one having the power to make and enforce the following conditions:

a) expenditure of funds—local, state and federal
b) hiring and firing of all staff
c) site selection and naming of school
d) design and construction of schools, arranging and supervision of contracts
e) purchasing power—for books, supplies, equipment, food, service, etc.
f) arranging for the supervision of contracts
g) school policy and curriculum design

Summary

A very fundamental issue in school decentralization is the balance of power between central and local authorities. The resolution of this issue determines the character of the school decentralization process. Administrative decentralization leaves the power and control in the hands of school officials. Political decentralization provides for the sharing of power with parent and/or advisory groups within the local communities. Community control requires that
Community school boards have control over such matters as budget, curriculum, and the hiring and firing of personnel.

**Goals and Objectives of School Decentralization**

Since very little is known about the reasons school boards, state legislatures or other policy-making bodies adopt any particular decentralization plan, reports of research conducted in this area are extremely helpful in identifying goals of school decentralization.

From his extensive study of school systems with 50,000 or more students, Ornstein has concluded that the reasons (goals and objectives) for decentralization can be synthesized as follows:

1. to reduce the administrative span of control;
2. to provide greater staff sensitivity to local populations;
3. to enhance school-community relations;
4. to provide greater articulation and continuity in the K-12 program;
5. to provide more efficient maintenance and support of the school unit, and
6. to reduce bureaucratic overlap and waste.\(^{15}\)

In 1974, a study of school decentralization was made by Cawelti for the Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development. He collected data from a mail survey of 50 of the nation's largest school districts (generally those in cities with populations in excess of 250,000). Respondents were asked about the purposes of decentralization in their city with the following results being reported:

1. to promote community involvement
2. to promote administrative effectiveness
3. to promote administrative efficiency
4. to provide for greater curriculum and instructional improvement

In addition, Cawelti reported that responsiveness was the concept that appeared most often when the respondents were asked about the purpose of decentralization in their city.  

Stewart developed a series of eighty-eight long-range goal statements for a decentralized area of an urban school system and found that consensus was achieved on all 88 goals among the subgroups involved. These subgroups consisted of parents, teachers, administrators and political leaders from the same decentralized area. The three goals which received the greatest percentage of number one rankings with 96 percent each were:

1. Provide a school organization which provides an atmosphere conducive to learning.
2. Work to stabilize and to improve faculty morale.

3. Make all students feel accepted whether they are a part of racial minority or a racial majority.\(^\text{17}\)

A status report of school decentralization and community involvement released by the Educational Research Service identified the following goals of school decentralization:

1. to increase the quality of the instructional program

2. greater responsiveness to the needs of children and desires of parents

3. more time for central office personnel to concentrate on long range planning for educational needs\(^\text{18}\)

In his report of research involving seven experiments in decentralization, Yates uses the term "justification" to explain the reasons for decentralization. He says that there are four justifications for decentralization. The psychological justification is that decentralization will make citizens feel closer to government. The administrative justification is that decentralization will make government more responsive. The economic justification is that the neighborhood government will become more efficient in resource allocation. The political justification is that a decentralized government structure will produce a strong indigenous political leadership.\(^\text{19}\)
Smith studied the decentralization of the Detroit school system and found that the board of education did not officially adopt a set of goals before implementation. He concluded that since there were no official goals, the community created its own set of goals for decentralization. Smith identified four goals which were perceived to be goals of decentralization by community leaders, politicians, journalists and educators. These goals were:

1. to provide community control of schools to the local community;
2. to share responsibility and accountability for decision-making;
3. to improve the quality of education existing in local communities; and
4. to divide and conquer the black community.20

Berkowitz analyzed the relationship between the community control movement and the decentralization of the Detroit Public Schools and concluded that the main goal of the movement was the transference of decision-making powers from central control to local control.21

These studies document the fact that school decentralization was intended to be a means of improving the educational system and making it more responsive to parents and community residents.
Theoretical perspectives on school decentralization also have implications for the development of goal statements. Peterson believes that school policies or goals are designated to solve common problems since social stability and cohesion are major concerns of civic leaders in urban areas. The goal of school decentralization, in his opinion, was to restore the social stability and cohesion that was disrupted by juvenile crime, vandalism, demonstrations, riots and boycotts which were a frequent occurrence in urban schools during the late sixties.22

Boyd and O'Shea support the problem-solving goal theory and suggest that the principal goal of advocates of school decentralization with community control was to solve the problem of chronic minority student underachievement. An equally important problem to be solved, was that of rigid, unresponsive and insensitive professionals. The advocates of community control felt that these problems could be solved by making educators accountable to local area citizens.23

The six design imperatives which Cunningham says are essential to a viable decentralization format suggest some additional goals that school decentralization should achieve. These design imperatives are:

1. It must be responsive to the participation impulse.
2. It must lead to improved education.
3. It must meet the equality of opportunity mandate.
4. It must accommodate lay-professional antagonism.
5. It must be feasible financially.
6. It must be achievable politically.

These theories suggest that school decentralization can be a means of maintaining the educational system. Institutions often prevent their total destruction by providing a means for dissidents to address frustrations within the formal structure of the institutions.

Often goals are explicit or implied in the definitions of decentralization or in the philosophy of an advocate of a particular form of decentralization. Sometimes, however, the goals for one type of school decentralization are the same as those of another. There is much overlapping in goal statements or intentions. Since there are not many types of school decentralization, classification is difficult as LaNoue and Smith discovered. This investigator used the classification suggested by Ornstein as a basis for the following discussion of school decentralization goals. These classifications are: (a) administrative decentralization, (b) administrative decentralization and
community participation, and (c) administrative decentralization and community control.26

**Administrative decentralization**—Administrative delegation of authority into subdivisions within a school district, is the most commonly found form of school decentralization.27 A report from Educational Research Service states that the goal of administrative decentralization is to increase the quality of the instructional program as a result of closer supervision and management.28 The idea of decentralizing school systems for the purpose of debureaucratizing them and increasing their efficiency is also supported by Marcson, who maintains that,

Decentralization could provide an important step toward debureaucratizing the schools. It is widely assumed that decentralization will energize the system by redistributing power to parents so that those with fresh ideas will be able to exert more influence, promote wide participation in the schools, permit communities to supplement the work of competent teachers, reduce the size of the bureaucracy, thus increasing the overall efficiency and reducing the alienation of students and parents, and prompt professionals to improve the academic achievement of children by making them accountable to parents.29

There is hardly any disagreement that school systems in large urban areas have become so bureaucratized that they have ceased to function effectively. The idea of dividing the system into smaller districts
for administrative purposes with the major control
and decision-making authority remaining with a central
administrator and a central board meets little opposi­
tion. Some important goals of school decentralization
are suggested by those who see advantages in this form
of school organization.

The advantages claimed for administrative
decentralization by Elliott include:

(a) the reduction of the decision-making
burden of top executives

(b) better decisions because they could
be based on more complex information
and first-hand knowledge

(c) quicker responses to changes in the
environment

(d) better community relations

(e) improved morale

(f) increased opportunity to develop lower
and middle management personnel

(g) the stimulation of innovation and
adaptation.30

Walker agrees that there are advantages to
administrative decentralization which tend to achieve a
goal of greater efficiency in the operation of an
organization. The advantages identified by Walker are:

(a) leadership development of lower hierar­
chical levels;

(b) greater participation in the decision-
making process by people at lower
hierarchical levels;
The Detroit Public Schools has a long history of administrative decentralization. However, as the population increased, the residential patterns of the city changed, the numbers of minorities in the population increased and the number of minorities in the schools increased, dissatisfaction with the performance of the schools mounted. Administrative decentralization was not successful in meeting the needs of the Detroit population of the 1960's that began to demand a chance to participate in educational decision-making.

**Administrative Decentralization and Community Participation**—Administrative decentralization which includes mechanisms for citizen participation and involvement is recommended in several major studies of large school systems: Boston, Cronin and Hailer; Washington, D.C., Passow; Philadelphia, Odell; Chicago, Havighurst; and New York, Bundy. In general these studies recommended decentralization as a means to
accomplish the ends of increased citizen participation, greater responsiveness on the part of educators, increased integration, greater efficiency in the management of schools and improved educational quality.32

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders recommended the elimination of obstacles to community participation in the educational process and recommended decentralization of schools with the objective of making education more relevant and responsive to the community and to increase support for it in the homes.33

Ornstein examined five decentralized school systems which combined administrative decentralization with community participation and found that these systems have advisory groups for the purpose of improving local school-community relations.34

From the case studies completed for five major cities, including Detroit, which had decentralized their school systems, LaNoue and Smith found:

If there was any single, dominant purpose in the decentralization movement, it was to increase participation in the making of school policy.35

Smith determined that sharing responsibility and accountability was a legitimate goal of school decentralization and stated that this goal included related categories such as having community involvement
or community participation, increasing communication, and bringing educational decisions and the community closer together.  

Participation in an advisory capacity did not satisfy citizens who felt that educational decision makers merely listened and did not seriously consider implementing recommendations made by residents of the community. In some urban centers, however, effective citizen participation prevented the demand for what is considered a more drastic reform, i.e., community control of the schools.

Administrative decentralization and community control—The major difference between administrative decentralization with community participation and administrative decentralization with community control is that the former implies the power to control educational decisions remains with the professionals and is shared with the people. Advocates of community control believe that the people, not bureaucracies or administrators, should control the schools in order to improve the performance of the schools. Some observers believe that the schools must be forced to become more responsive and accountable to the public.

The original purpose of school decentralization according to Clark was not a struggle for power or control but to improve education. However, when the
goal of greater academic achievement by poor and minority youth was not realized, one of the demands that was made by those who wanted meaningful educational reform was that parents and community residents be given control of the schools. The proponents of community control believe that the professional educators have failed to address the needs of minority children, in particular. They feel this failure will not be abated if representatives of the community continue to serve in an advisory capacity under a form of school decentralization which includes citizen participation only.

The advocates of community control such as Fantini, Gittell and Magat, believe that significant changes will not occur within the educational system unless the parents in the local communities have the power to make decisions about school policies and procedures. This concept of community control as a goal is strongly supported by Carmichael, who declared that:

Control of the ghetto schools must be taken out of the hand of 'professionals' most of whom have long since demonstrated their insensitivity to the needs and problems of the black child. . . . Black parents should seek as their goal the actual control of the public schools in their community; hiring and firing of teachers, selection of teacher materials, determination of standards, etc.

Zimet, who examined the decentralization process in one community school district in New York, considers community control to be a form of political decentralization.
Maximum autonomy and self-determination for the local community are the major objectives that he attributes to community control. Rhody McCoy, former administrator of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville demonstration district, agrees that self-determination is a goal of community control. He lists as additional goals the building of a strong self-image, individual and community development, the restoration of confidence in education, economic stability and recognition.

From the results of a case study of decentralization in New York, Ornstein concluded that the goals of the community control movement included greater:

- citizen participation,
- representation for minorities,
- educational innovation,
- community unity and responsibility,
- teacher accountability,
- flexibility in hiring and promoting teachers and administrators,
- relevancy for students, and
- achievement among students.

LaNoue and Smith studied the politics of school decentralization and found that holding school personnel accountable was a goal of community control. This accountability is assured when representatives of the
local community have the power to hire, fire and promote school personnel.\textsuperscript{45}

Fantini and Gittell have continuously monitored the progress of school decentralization and are strong advocates of community control. They view it as a decentralization reform movement with goals of making institutions more responsive to the needs of the community and of placing control of basic sources of power within the local community. They believe that the general goal of providing quality education can be achieved as a result of the sharing of decision-making power by parents.\textsuperscript{46}

LaNoue and Smith summarize the objectives for school decentralization with community control in the following statement:

1. Decentralization will permit more people to participate in educational decision-making than will other forms of school system governance.

2. This participation will increase the influence of minority groups in the system as a whole; and in neighborhoods where minority groups are a majority, they will control the schools.

3. This realignment of political power through decentralization will lead to more (a) relevant curricula, (b) professional accountability, (c) minority group role models, and (d) assurance among students that they can control their own fate—all of which will result in better education than comes from centralized systems with their characteristics of economy of scale, merit standards, and specialized schools.
4. By improving the education of minority groups, decentralization will in the long run outdo centralization in providing such groups, better access to jobs and social benefits and in hastening their integration into a wider society.47

The goal of community control has been achieved in only two school districts: New York and Detroit. In these two cities, however, community control is not absolute. The central boards of education and the superintendents of these city school districts retain ultimate authority over school governance.

The fact that blacks were in the forefront of the community control movement, in New York and Detroit, raises the question of whether or not integration is a goal of this form of school decentralization.

Several writers previously cited have indicated that the goal of school decentralization was to bring the schools closer to the people, to make them more personal and thereby improve education indirectly. However, according to Ornstein, the improvement of education was not the issue. The issue was politics and race— which group would control the schools and in turn finances, and which group would make decisions regarding who would be hired and fired. Because of this conflict in interests, Ornstein feels that school decentralization in Detroit moved from the goal of integration to community control then moved back again
from a goal of community control to integration.\footnote{He cites the following brief historical review which explains this sequence of events.}

In 1965 when the Detroit schools were operating under administrative decentralization the superintendent and school board viewed integration as the primary goal and implemented policies and procedures which promoted integration. By the late 1960's as more blacks became disillusioned about school integration and the concept of black power gained political momentum, the concepts of administrative decentralization and community control acquired growing support and importance until in 1967 a formal demand was presented to the school board for black control of black schools. However, in 1970 the NAACP instituted a suit against the state of Michigan claiming that Public Act 48 which mandated decentralization with community control for the City of Detroit willfully promoted segregation.

One year after the state-mandated decentralization plan was implemented, Goings conducted a survey in one region of the Detroit Public Schools. She found that respondents felt desegregation would contribute to an improvement in the quality of education in their region. Respondents also indicated that too much public attention was being paid to desegregation while too little active support was being given to integration
efforts. These results indicate that the respondents in this region were still committed to a goal of integration at the time this study was made. 49

Zimet in his study of the 1969 Decentralization Law in New York City found that civil rights leaders and others became tired and demoralized from their unsuccessful efforts to attain desegregation of the schools. Parents stopped pressing this issue and moved from a position of trying to achieve quality education for their children through integration to that of attempting to achieve the same end through community participation and control. 50

King made a survey of the attitudes of community leaders in the three experimental school districts in New York. These leaders were asked to indicate their preference for the goal of integration or separation. King found that there was wide intergroup and interdistrict variations but when the results were tabulated slightly more than half of the leaders favored the goal of integration. 51

In their scientific analysis of the revolution in politics and race relations in Detroit, Aberbach and Walker concluded that decentralization is designed to capitalize on social trends toward racial isolation rather than to combat them "in order to promote racial pride and, ultimately, better education." 52 In 1971,
when these researchers asked Detroit residents if they favored decentralization of the schools, they discovered that the idea was particularly appealing to those blacks whose concern with racial integration had been replaced by a desire to promote black culture and racial pride. They also found that decentralization was popular among those whites who wanted control over their schools in order to preserve racial segregation. According to these writers the feelings expressed by the two groups contributed to the creation of the decentralized school system in Detroit during 1971.

Ornstein agrees that in Detroit blacks had mixed feelings about integration versus community control. He explains that integration as a viable goal was waning, while the goal of community control was gaining in popularity among blacks. At the same time, the majority of whites began to embrace decentralization and community control as a protection from integration.53

There does not seem to be a clear-cut answer to the question of whether integration is a goal of school decentralization with community control or not. The conclusion reached by LaNoue and Smith as a result of their investigation into this subject provides a good summation. They found that a pragmatic attitude appears to be emerging toward integration among minority group political strategists. Where integration appears
realistically attainable, or where white allies are essential to a political coalition, integrationist appeals and tactics will remain important. The integration issue will be ignored in cases where conditions make integration unrealistic and where white support is either unavailable or unnecessary.54

In 1973 the Central Board of Education of Detroit adopted the policy statement, *Goals of Education in Detroit*. It is significant to note that this statement was adopted two years after the implementation of state-mandated school decentralization and three years after the adoption of the decentralization guidelines for the district. These goals, which are basically concerned with the improvement of instruction and pupil achievement, are divided into three categories:

1. **Student Goals for Learning**
   - A. Basic Thinking and Learning Skills
   - B. Personal Qualities
   - C. Social and Physical Relations

2. **School Goals to Aid Learning**
   - A. Equal Educational Opportunity
   - B. School Management
   - C. Teaching and Learning Methods
   - D. Educational Improvement

3. **Community Goals for Sustaining Schools**
   - A. Community Involvement55

Since the Detroit Public Schools are operating under administrative decentralization with community
control, it is reasonable to assume that the goals adopted by the Central Board of Education are goals of decentralization. These goals imply a cooperative educational venture involving the student, the school and the community.

Education performs the elementary function of perpetuating the social institutions and value structure of a culture. Since social institutions and values are in a constant state of change it is impossible to establish the purposes and goals of education in absolute terms. Purposes change with the needs and desires of society. However, from the conclusions, hypotheses and/or theories of the writers previously cited the investigator developed the following list of important goals of school decentralization:

1. To improve the educational programs and raise the achievement level of pupils.

2. To provide more efficient and economical management of schools.

3. To reduce bureaucratic overlap and waste through smaller more viable units of school government and administration.

4. To provide greater articulation and continuity in the instructional program for grades K-12.

5. To provide for more effective management of schools.

6. To improve the delivery of educational services and materials to the classroom teacher.
7. To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society.

8. To enable various ethnic, racial and religious groups to control the schools in neighborhoods where such groups are in the majority.

9. To make educators more accountable to the community for the academic achievement of pupils.

10. To give citizens of the local school community greater control over the curriculum, personnel and finances of the schools.

11. To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making.

12. To improve school-community relations.

13. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community.

14. To provide more relevant curricula.

15. To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools.

16. To provide for increased school integration.

17. To enable a local teacher and administrator to have a greater voice in decisions that directly affect them.

18. To improve the quality of education.

19. To bring the educational decision-making process as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved.

20. To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program.
If one is interested in gaining a knowledge of educational administration under a decentralized organizational structure, it is important to look at the duties and responsibilities of area superintendents. In order to develop a list of the duties and responsibilities of regional superintendents this investigator examined literature which concerned itself with the duties of superintendents generally and those of area superintendents in decentralized districts in particular.

The position of area superintendent is a hybrid position. It is the same as a superintendent in terms of its relationship to the district school board and yet it is a subordinate position to that of the general superintendent in the administrative hierarchy of the city-wide school system. Zimet's study of the effects of the Decentralization Law of 1969 in New York City confirmed the fact that the responsibilities of the district or community superintendent are multifaceted. He found that, as the professional head of the district, the community superintendent has the responsibility for guiding his board's selection of educational goals and its ranking of priorities. The board relies on his professional expertise in the development of curriculum and for educational innovation. As administrator of the
In the district, the superintendent works closely with the board in the preparation of the budget and is responsible for implementing the policies and decisions of the board. He is responsible for the allocation of funds, for the supervision of the professional staff and, ultimately, for the performance of the students in the district.\(^{56}\)

One of the assumptions of this research is that the position of area superintendent was created for the purpose of facilitating the achievement of school decentralization goals. Campbell and others agree that the purpose of the administration of any organization is to coordinate the effort of people to the achievement of organizational goals.\(^{57}\)

Griffiths and others also maintain that the purpose of an organization is to clarify and distribute responsibilities and authority among individuals and groups in an orderly fashion consistent with the purposes of the institution. These authors believe that certain administrative functions must be carried out to achieve the purposes of a school system. These functions may vary depending upon the purposes defined by the board of education. The fifty-four administrative functions identified by Griffiths and others were placed in the following categories:
Griffiths and others define function as that which must be done to accomplish the purposes of the organization. Thus, if one accepts this definition, it is necessary for a school system to develop a set of purposes before it can effectively develop a set of functions to be performed by individual staff members.

Whether a school system has clearly defined purposes or not, it has expectations that the superintendent will successfully fulfill certain functions. Research conducted by Evans shows that a superintendent's tenure in office depends upon his successful performance of key activities. Evans identified some reasons why school district superintendents in California were not reemployed. He found that the most common reason school board members gave for not reemploying school superintendents was a weakness in community relations. A second important reason involved the failure of the superintendent to execute the policies and wishes of the board.59

The discovery by Smith of the significant concepts related to characterizing the role of school
superintendents of schools in Iowa are also useful in identifying important activities in which superintendents are expected to engage. These concepts were:

1. directs important board decisions
2. responds to public demands for reform
3. establishes administrative teamwork
4. advises board on important decisions and policies
5. recommends dismissal of ineffective personnel, and
6. facilitates cooperative decision-making.60

In 1968, the results of a two-year study of the six urban school districts of Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, New York, Philadelphia and St. Louis, conducted by Marilyn Gittell and T. Edward Hollander, were published. These authors found that each of the six school systems had some form of decentralization which included a sub-unit administrator. In order to identify the extent of decentralization in each of the cities, certain key powers of the district superintendents were examined, such as: budgetary power, personnel power and participation in general policy formulation. One of the conclusions reached by the authors was that the district superintendents were powerless. Their chief function seemed to be to serve as liaison between the central administration on the one hand and the schools,
parents, and other community groups on the other. They tended to act as a buffer protecting the central staff from parental dissatisfaction.  

Two additional studies which attempted to determine the authority and responsibility exercised by area superintendents in a decentralized school setting were conducted by Morgan and Bertolaet. They provide further insight into the role of the district superintendent. Bertolaet investigated the administrative functions of district superintendents in Chicago in order to determine the authority and responsibility that was either exercised by district superintendents or was shared by these superintendents with central office personnel. He reached the following conclusions:

1. District superintendents play a very active part in the development and implementation of the instructional program.

2. The function of supervision was performed primarily by district superintendents.

3. The district superintendent is responsible for the interpretation of the district educational program to the local patrons.

4. District superintendents have only participatory involvement in the performance and supervision of tasks of personnel administration.

5. District superintendents supervise the utilization of staff and classrooms in the district schools.
6. District superintendents participate in determining the need for building facilities, make recommendations for improvement of existing buildings and requisition needed equipment and supplies for new buildings.

7. District superintendents perform the tasks of collecting, reviewing, and placing priorities on budget requests.  

Morgan's research was designed to determine the administrative responsibilities that were totally or partially delegated to area superintendents in four administratively decentralized school systems. He found that responsibilities in the pupil personnel area, staff personnel, and instruction and curriculum responsibility was frequently listed as partially delegated to the area superintendents. School building and plant management as well as business and financial affairs responsibilities were frequently listed as non-delegated. Morgan concluded that controlling was a primary responsibility of area superintendents; whereas, planning and organizing were secondary responsibilities.

The study published by the American Association of School Administrators, in 1971, also has some important implications for this investigation. In developing a profile of cabinet-level administrative positions, those members of the cabinet were included who were district or area executives in school systems which had adopted some form of school decentralization. One
phase of the report indicated the scope and duties of these administrative positions. An examination of the
duties and responsibilities assigned these administrators indicated that they are held responsible for
functioning in four broad areas: improvement of the educational program, selection and development of personnel, management of the schools, and working with the community.  

In making recommendations for the reorganization of the Boston Public Schools, a decentralized system, Cronin and Hailer suggested that the responsibilities of the area superintendent include:

1. Participation in the central policy-making, goal-setting process for the entire system.

2. Developing detailed educational plans for their areas, consistent with the system's goals.

3. Conducting regular planning meetings with their principals to discuss and resolve area problems and to develop closer communication among the schools in each area.

4. Reviewing individual building program plans with each principal.

The responsibilities of the area superintendents as outlined in the decentralization guidelines developed for Detroit are quite similar to those recommended by Cronin and Hailer. According to these guidelines the regional superintendent as the executive officer of the
regional board of education has the responsibility of:

1. Carrying out Region Board policies on matters under Region Board jurisdiction.

2. Preparing the agenda for Region Board meetings in concert with the Board Chairman and attending all meetings of the Board and its committee unless excused.

3. Participating in all discussions and activities of the Region Board except voting.

4. Presenting items of information about educational processes in the region for the Board's study and review.

5. Presenting to the Board all matters requiring a policy decision; and

6. Retaining full authority and accountability for actions of subordinates to whom authority is designated.

Smith's study of decentralization in Detroit reveals that the specific responsibilities assigned to the regional superintendents were to:

1. Assign duties to region staff.

2. Schedule work for region staff.

3. Work on long range housing plans.

4. Coordinate activities and concerns of building principals.

5. Handle staff relations.

6. Evaluate performances of staff.

7. Provide staff development for region administrators.
8. Coordinate administrative directives and information of the region.

The Detroit Public Schools were administratively and politically decentralized by state legislative mandate in 1970. The school district was divided into eight regions and guidelines were developed for the election of regional school board members in each of the eight regions. Each regional board has the authority to hire and fire a regional superintendent. The regional superintendent working with regional and central administrators is primarily responsible for the operation of regional schools.

A status report of school decentralization conducted by the Educational Research Service also provided details regarding the activities of area superintendents. These activities are incorporated in the goal-related activity statements developed for the research instruments used in this study. In general the duties reported for area administrators suggest that these positions exist to make administrative services more accessible and less remote from the various school communities and to facilitate and monitor progress toward the achievement of broad educational goals and objectives. The most comprehensive statement of an area superintendent's responsibilities under
administrative decentralization was given for Dade County, Florida. These responsibilities are:

1. Establishes close, effective contact with principals in his district in order to keep informed of their needs and to make available to them his advice and leadership.

2. Develops a district budget sufficient for the purpose of the educational program.

3. Supervises the activities of the district staff to make certain that communications are effective among the schools and that they are receiving the services they require.

4. Meets with other district superintendents to exchange information which has system-wide value.

5. Encourages his principals to develop programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools.

6. Brings to the attention of the Deputy Superintendent matters which require action by the Associate Superintendents for Information and Operations.

7. Assists principals in the selection of personnel.

8. Makes final decisions regarding school attendance lines within his district.

9. Develops projections and plans for changes in population which require increase or decrease in available classroom space.

10. Carries on evaluation of performance of principals and district staff in a manner which will increase the professional effectiveness of these individuals, and makes recommendations for such positions within established salary ranges.68
The responsibilities of an area superintendent in a school system which has administrative decentralization with community participation may include most of those listed above, plus responsibilities in the area of improving school-community relations. The following report given of the duties assumed by area superintendents in Los Angeles illustrates this point:

The Area Assistant Superintendents, . . . are responsible for the operation of the schools in their area and for the educational program provided by the schools. They must also deal directly with parents, represent the district at meetings of community organizations, and work with ad hoc community committees concerned with such matters as tax and bond elections.

In the same report, the area superintendents of Chicago are described as local educational leaders who "anticipate major problems and needs, encourage school and community dialogue, and have mobility which allows them an effective exercise of authority."

A handbook for community school boards developed by a management consultant firm was used to identify the activities and responsibilities of area superintendents in school systems having administrative decentralization with community control.

In New York and Detroit the area superintendent is selected and hired by an elected area school board. This administrator is responsible directly to the area board, is obliged to carry out its decisions,
accountable to the area board for successes and failures, and his/her services may be terminated by the area board.

The basic functions, major responsibilities and key relationship of area superintendents outlined in the handbook for community school boards provided a rich source of goal related activities. Some basic functions were:

1. serves as chief administrative officer
2. develops plans and policies concerning educational programs, management, finance and facilities
3. provides the board with leadership in the professional aspects of education
4. provides leadership and directs the management of the school system within the policies of the board
5. builds effective relationships with the staff, students, parents and community
6. ensures that plans and action of the sub-district school system are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern the schools.

In order to develop a list of goal related activities of regional superintendents, the literature in which goals and objectives were discussed was examined as well as that literature which discussed the duties and responsibilities of area superintendents in decentralized school systems. From the common thread of agreement found among the authors and researchers, this investigator developed the following list of sixty goal related activities:
1. Works to improve planning and problem solving ability of the local school board.

2. Reviews student performances on standardized tests as a part of the general evaluation of the instruction of the regional schools.

3. Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools.

4. Establishes close effective contact with principals in order to keep informed of their needs and to make available to them his advice and leadership.

5. Provides a program for use of volunteers in the regional schools.

6. Assists the regional board in interpreting the objectives and policies of the central board of education.

7. Provides educational programs within the regional schools which provide graduating students with the assistance needed for job placement, technical training and/or higher education.

8. Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays.

9. Provides a program for the diagnosing of learning difficulties of regional students and providing effective remedial instruction.

10. Evaluates the effectiveness of the instructional program in regional schools and recommends activities to strengthen weaknesses.

11. Provides opportunities for minority students to participate in decision-making groups within the regional schools.

12. Interprets regional board policies and procedures to regional school employees, pupils and citizens.
13. Secures and provides supplemental services and resources to aid the instructional program.

14. Develops strategies which facilitate the achievement of educational objectives approved by the regional board.

15. Encourages principals to develop programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools.


17. Makes policy recommendations to the regional board for review, modification and/or approval.

18. Attends and participates in community meetings and functions.

19. Works with students and their organizations to improve the educational programs and atmosphere within the regional schools.

20. Works to involve parents in the selection of regional personnel.

21. Works with recognized employee representatives to improve the performance and morale of regional employees.

22. Works with local groups to determine bases for student evaluation.

23. Maintains an effective working relationship with central office staff.

24. Ensures that plans and actions of the regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools.

25. Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools.

26. Establishes operating procedures for implementing the policies of the regional board.
27. Meets with other regional superintendents to exchange information which has system-wide value.

28. Responds to the need for social services within the region.

29. Conducts a continuous evaluation of the instructional program and the academic achievement of students in the regional schools.

30. Provides programs to assist teachers in their adjustment to schools where another racial or ethnic group is in the majority.

31. Measures the performance of regional personnel on a systematic basis and recommends to the regional board the appointment, advancement, reassignment, and dismissal of personnel within the region.

32. Develops and recommends a comprehensive system of planning in all areas of school operation.

33. Presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the region and the progress made by regional schools in achieving educational objectives.

34. Provides effective human-relation programs and experiences for students and personnel of regional schools.

35. Works with the citizens of the region to determine expectations for the schools and evaluations of the schools.

36. Serves as an interpreter of regional school policy and as arbiter of regional school problems.

37. Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs.

38. Builds an effective relationship with staff, students, parents and citizens of the regional community.
39. Develops and recommends an annual budget for regional board revision and/or approval.

40. Attends professional meetings and seminars for the purpose of personal improvement.

41. Gains the support of the regional board for the educational programs of the regional schools.

42. Encourages innovative and creative approaches to improving student performances.

43. Seeks to understand the political factors within the region which affect the regional schools.

44. Directs and coordinates in-service education and professional growth experiences for regional personnel.

45. Allocates funds among the schools and departments within the region.

46. Encourages the use of community-based resources to enrich the curriculum in the regional schools.

47. Develops and maintains effective reciprocal relationships with parents and various community groups within the region.

48. Develops strategies to help integrate the world of the culturally different student into the life of the regional schools.

49. Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region.

50. Develops effective staff evaluation procedures which promote improvement.

51. Directs a program for obtaining funds and assistance from governmental agencies, private, business and non-profit organizations.
52. Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational programs.

53. Engages personnel in the regional schools in priority setting and resources allocation.

54. Utilizes varied forms of communication to inform the people of the region about school problems, activities and achievements.

55. Develops a program for monitoring and evaluating behavior of regional personnel in dealing with members of different racial and ethnic groups within the regional schools.

56. Provides an educational program within the regional schools which develops skills, training or knowledge required for jobs and/or professions.

57. Meets frequently with parents, citizens, and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.

58. Develops policies and criteria to be used in the recruitment, selection and orientation of regional personnel.

59. Develops desegregation and/or integration plans for regional schools involving both students and personnel.

60. Provides for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to fit the needs of students.

A Historical Review of School Decentralization in Detroit

The Detroit Board of Education was established February 17, 1842, by the Michigan legislature to administer the Detroit Public Schools. A bill passed by the
legislature provided free public schools for the children of Detroit. It also provided for a board of education composed of the mayor, a recorder and two inspectors from each of six wards. Cronin reports that the ward system of representation on the school board was a form of school decentralization which existed in Detroit during the 1800's. Committees approved by the board selected texts, appointed teachers and principals and developed courses of study.  

As the city grew in population the membership on the board of education increased until the new ward membership rose to twenty-six in 1876. A reform group which felt that such a large membership made the school board unmanageable and inefficient was successful in 1881 in getting a smaller board of twelve persons elected at-large. However, in 1889 Detroit citizens made the decision to revert to the ward method of election because of dissatisfaction with the behavior of members elected in at-large elections. The ward system of electing representatives to the school board continued until 1916 when an amendment to elect seven members-at-large passed by an overwhelming vote. The new board increased the authority of the superintendent significantly and transferred the function of selecting texts, appointing teachers and principals, and developing courses of study to educators. In Cronin's opinion,
ward representation on school boards in Detroit and other large cities was abandoned as a result of "a shift in emphasis from widespread participation of neighborhood spokesmen in decision-making to centralization and a decrease in the total numbers of city school board members."  

The following discussion of the evolution of decentralization in Detroit is in part paraphrased from a report by LaNoue and Smith. The schools of Detroit continued to operate under a centralized system of school governance from 1916 until 1956, when the elementary schools were first divided into districts. Then in 1957, the superintendent recommended that two administrators be appointed to run unified districts which included high schools, junior high schools and elementary schools. Acting on a report of the Citizen Advisory Committee on School Needs, the school system created nine districts for administrative purposes in 1958. Each district had its own district administrator, with the title of field executive. This arrangement was designed to expedite central office decisions and to provide liaison with the community but little power was transferred.

In March, 1967, school decentralization in Detroit was expanded when Superintendent Norman Drachler proposed that the district be divided into nine regions,
each staffed with a regional superintendent and two assistants. Their responsibilities included staff supervision, community relations, and monitoring of maintenance and school requisitions. In 1969 these regional superintendents were retitled deputy superintendents. This change of title suggested an elevation of status and the right of the superintendents to exercise more autonomy, but their power did not increase.

In addition to changing the administrative organization, district boundary lines were redrawn so that predominately white areas were paired with black areas within the same district. However, this pattern did not achieve much functional decentralization because the deputy superintendents had little or no staff and they did not encourage community participation which might generate demands that they could not fulfill. This administrative decentralization of schools was acceptable to the liberal-labor-black coalition that governed the school system at the time and was committed to integrationist goals.

Administrative decentralization with community participation was operative in Detroit during the 1960's in an informal way. The regional advisory commissions recommended by the Citizens Advisory Committee on School Needs in 1958 were never instituted but community persons had access to the deputy superintendents and the general
superintendent maintained an open door policy for community groups. Administrative decentralization with citizen participation was not successful in solving the major problems which faced the Detroit Public Schools in the 1960's, i.e., integration of schools, improved academic achievement and adequate financing. After the 1967 riots, advocates of administrative decentralization with community control received support from blacks and whites, liberals and conservatives, politicians and educators and integrationists and segregationists.

Reverend Albert Cleage, Jr. was one of the first advocates of the community-control version of decentralization. He formed the Inner-City Parents Council in 1967 and made the first demand of the school board for black control of black schools in June of that year. The school board was committed to integration, so the demands of Reverend Cleage and his group fell on deaf ears. Then in 1968 two "community-control" bills were introduced in the Michigan legislature. The bill introduced by a white legislator, Jack Faxon, would have created new regions, each with its own elected school board, which would operate within the policies determined by an enlarged central board of education. The bill introduced by a black legislator, James Del Rio, would have divided the school system into sixteen districts, each with its own tax base, being as independent as the other 650 school
systems in the state. The Faxon bill was killed in committee. The Del Rio bill was given a favorable report by the House Education Committee, but failed to survive a floor vote. The fact that two such bills were introduced at the legislative level "signaled a change in the politics of school decentralization. The arena for decision-making had shifted from the Detroit school system to the Lansing legislature, and the community control concept had found surprising support."77

In 1969 a city-wide group called Citizens for Community Control was organized and held a series of conferences during which persons participated who had been involved in community control experiments in other cities, such as Rhody McCoy of New York. On April 8, 1969, the Detroit chapter of the NAACP presented a community-centered decentralization proposal to the Detroit school board. This was a three-tier plan which provided for a separate elected board of education for each of the elementary and intermediate schools in the system, a constellation school board composed of delegates of the individual school boards to govern each high school and its feeder schools, and a central board of education to exercise authority in certain areas for all the system schools. This NAACP proposal would have substantially redistributed power from the central board to boards within the school neighborhood. Since there was not
enough consensus on the board of education to approve
the NAACP proposal, the board continued to experiment
with strengthening its administrative decentralization
by giving district administrators more authority, setting
up a task force to advise on further decentralization,
and by negotiating with some local elected school councils
on personnel changes.

In the 1969 session of the Michigan Legislature
the Del Rio and Faxon bills were reintroduced but a decen­
tralization bill sponsored by Senator Coleman Young was
the focus of attention. Although Young's bill provided
for locally elected boards for each of eleven regions,
the policy developed by each regional board was subject
to central board review. This bill also provided repre­
sentation from each regional board on the central board.
In addition, the Young bill, which became Public Act 244,
stipulated that:

(1) The central school board would retain
all the powers and duties then possessed
except for those given to the regional
school boards under the provision of the
Act or subsequently delegated by the
central board.

(2) The central school board would perform
all functions related to purchasing,
payroll, contract negotiation, property
maintenance, bonding, special education,
and allocation of funds to regional
school boards and schools.

(3) The regional school boards were granted
the authority to (a) employ a superinten­
tendent from a list of candidates submitted
by the central school board, (b) employ discharge, and promote employees sub- ject to review, if necessary, of the central board, (c) determine the curricu- lum and testing programs, (d) determine the budget based upon the allocation of funds received from the central school board, and (e) were required to respect the rights of retirement, tenure, and seniority of all employees transferred within and among the regions.

Public Act 244 was signed into law by Governor Milliken on August 11, 1969. LaNoue and Smith suggest that "because there was no political mobilization and little legislative struggle, the major policy questions were decided after the law was enacted." This supports the conclusion reached by Smith, mentioned previously, that there was an absence of clearly defined goals for the decentralization of the Detroit Public Schools.

The Detroit Board of Education was left to make the decision regarding the shape and character of the eleven new regional districts of 25,000 to 50,000 students required by Public Act 244. Since the state provided no funds to finance the planning that was necessary to prepare for the decentralization of the Detroit schools, the board asked the Ford Foundation for financial assistance. The Foundation responded with a $360,000 grant. These funds made it possible to set up an Office of School Decentralization which began its work in January, 1970 and developed guidelines that allocated power between the central board and the regional boards as required by both Public Act 244
and subsequent Public Act 48. These monies were also used to support a team, working under the leadership of a Wayne State University professor, that developed several plans for decentralizing the school system.

When the alternative plans for redrawing the district lines were completed, they were published and a series of public meetings were held to discuss them. These plans varied greatly "in the amount of integration likely to occur and in the probability of black control over regional school boards and black representation on the central school board." During the public hearings that were held on the redistricting plans, both blacks and whites argued for the plans with the most compact, racially homogeneous districts, i.e., the plan which would allow blacks to control black schools and whites to control white schools. Finally a redistricting plan, with a feeder pattern change which would increase integration and also increase busing, was adopted by the board on April 7, 1970. This decision changed the issue from decentralization to integration because it mapped out seven decentralized racially integrated regional districts and required, for the first time in Detroit, that whites travel to black schools and vice versa. The plan was opposed by both blacks and whites. Whites held demonstrations, conducted letter-writing campaigns and boycotted schools in protest. They also formed the Citizens
Committee for Better Education to fight the integration plan and to recall members of the board. Separatist blacks did not support the board's integration policy either, and their spokesman, Albert Cleage, declared:

The black community will not accept any integration scheme as a substitute for community control of schools. We do not object to white parents controlling predominately white schools and we intend to control predominately black schools. 83

The mounting opposition and controversy generated by the redistricting plan adopted by the board which would have resulted in increased school integration, echoed toward Lansing where legislators began talking about referendum and appeal of Public Act 244. The racial issue was quite prominent in discussions held in both Lansing and Detroit. Within a few days after the board's action on April 7, 1970, Public Act 244 was repealed. It was replaced by Public Act 48 which was signed by the governor on July 7, 1970.

The two acts were quite similar, the major difference being that Public Act 48 provided for eight regional school districts, each governed by a five-member elective board. The highest vote-getter in each district would become chairperson as well as a member of the central school board. Eight regional chairpersons and five at-large members would make up the central board of education.
Public Act 48 also had the effect of nullifying the integration policy of the board. It mandated that the school system be divided into eight regions and gave the authority to draw the new district lines to a commission appointed by the governor which became known as The Governor's Boundary Commission. The Commission was restricted by the Act to drawing boundaries which would enable students to attend the school of their preference and give preference to students who resided nearest the school when a problem of insufficient school capacity existed. Carefully following the mandates of the law, the Commission agreed at the outset that integration would not be a goal of the new plan and in theory divided political control of the schools equally between blacks and whites, giving four districts to each group. The Commission's plan which was completed in August 1970, avoided changing feeder patterns and adhered closely to existing school boundaries. After the boundaries set by the Commission became known, the NAACP filed a suit in the federal court claiming that the boundary lines required by Public Act 48 promoted segregation. The suit asked that the redistricting under the plan adopted by the board in April, 1970 be implemented. The Court of Appeals agreed that the state legislature could not overturn a local school board's integration efforts and remanded the case to Judge Roth for hearings on an
appropriate integration plan. After examining three plans which the board submitted, the judge ordered a magnet school program implemented for the 1971 fall term. When this program was reviewed to determine its integrative effect, it was found to be unsatisfactory. Judge Roth then ordered cross-busing between the white suburbs and Detroit in order to achieve greater integration. This decision was overturned by the Supreme Court in 1974. As LaNoue and Smith predicted neither the central board nor the regional boards had any final discretion in the pupil integration policy of Detroit. The issue was decided in the courts and the legislature.

The largely white group which opposed the redistricting plan adopted by the board in April, 1970, was successful in getting enough signatures by June to place a recall provision on the August 4, 1970, primary election ballot. The four members of the board who had voted for the integration plan were recalled by almost a 2-1 margin. They were replaced by gubernatorially appointed members who along with three incumbents constituted the Detroit Board of Education until those elected in November, 1970 general elections took office in January, 1971.

In November, 1970, the voters of Detroit went to the polls to elect five candidates for the central school board and, also for the first time in history, four
candidates for each of eight regional school boards. The results of the 1970 election show that despite the fact that approximately forty-two percent of the population of Detroit was black, only three of the thirteen members elected to the Central Board of Education were black and only twelve of forty regional board members elected were black. Since two of every three students in the Detroit Public Schools were black this meant that white boards controlled the education of black students. The decentralization with community-control advocated by Reverend Cleague in order for blacks to control black schools did not become a reality. However, the new school boards did include more women and more ethnics than before. LaNoue and Smith described these persons as new school activists and explained the political implications of the November elections as follows:

One might have imagined that decentralization elections in Detroit might have produced sharp racially-linked ideological conflict in school politics, but that apparently did not occur. Instead, the conflict is more likely to be between the new school activists of either race and the educational professionals and their allies who have traditionally made school policy.85

Between January and October, 1970, the Office of School Decentralization was busy at the three tasks it had set for itself:

development of guidelines that would allocate power between the central board
and the regional boards; implementation procedures; and long range systems designed to insure good management in the new structure. 86

In developing the decentralization guidelines the personnel of the Office of School Decentralization developed three alternative guidelines for each decentralization issue placing power in the hands of the central board, the regional boards, or on a shared basis. Reactions to these tentative guidelines were sought from representatives of students, parents and school employees. There was consensus among these groups for the shared power alternatives on sixty-four of the ninety-nine decentralization issues and on twenty-seven other issues every group agreed except the students. This supports the conclusion reached by Smith that the sharing of responsibility and accountability was the only legitimate goal of decentralization that was articulated by Detroit residents.87 Although there was considerable overall consensus concerning the decentralization issues identified by the Office of School Decentralization, the board gave the task of redrafting the guidelines to the superintendent's staff liaison on decentralization. A new committee which primarily represented school employees was set up. After this committee submitted its guideline recommendations to 3,800 concerned citizens for comment, The Guidelines for Regional and Central Boards of Education of the
City of Detroit were adopted by the board on October 26, 1970. These guidelines provide the rules for operation of the Detroit Public Schools at the time of the study. In general, the regional school boards have authority over curriculum, personnel, student policy and financing and the central office provides special personnel and services to the regions in order to help the regional school boards in the above areas. The Central Board of Education retains authority over all other matters. In addition, it renders the final decision on all questions related to interpretation of policies, programs and guidelines which may arise between two or more regional boards or between the central board and a regional board.88

As of January 1, 1971, the First Class School District of the City of Detroit came under the administration of an expanded Central Board of Education and also eight Regional Boards of Education, one for each of the eight regions. Administrative decentralization with community control became the organizational and political structure for the nation's seventh largest school system.89 According to Facts and Figures About Detroit Public Schools, the purpose of this decentralization is "to give local communities more involvement in the operation of their schools while maintaining
the underlying unity of the entire Detroit public school system.90

Based on information from the Information Services Department of the Detroit Public Schools, the school system, on October, 1976, consisted of 306 schools, 11,127 professional employees and 235,895 students. The racial composition of the students was 79.2 percent black, 18.7 percent white and 2.1 percent others.

The Central Board of Education has a city-wide responsibility for public education in Detroit and exercises all functions not delegated by law and guidelines to Regional Boards. The Central Board of Education consists of thirteen persons. Each member-at-large serves a four year term. Of the five members elected at-large, three are black males, one is a white male and one is a black female. Of the eight members who are region board chairpersons, three are black males, one is a black female, and four are white females. The general superintendent of schools hired by the Central Board to be the chief administrative officer for the Detroit Public Schools is a black male.

The school district is divided into eight regions. The eight decentralized regions are each headed by a five-member regional board of education. Each Regional Board formulates school policies within its region in accord with the guidelines established by the Central
Board. Regional Boards have major responsibility for curricular programs. Each Regional Board member is elected for a two-year term. The top vote-getter in each region is the chairperson of the Regional Board and is also a member of the Central Board. However, the Region Boards may replace the chairperson after a year, if they so choose. Of the forty members on the Regional Boards, nine are black males, nine are black females, one is a female with a Spanish surname, ten are white females and eleven are white males. Eight regional superintendants have been selected by each of the Regional Boards to serve as the chief administrative officer for the schools in the region. One is presently serving as an acting superintendent. Of these eight regional superintendants, four are black males, three are white males and one is a white female.

Within a period of less than fifteen years the Detroit Public Schools moved from administrative decentralization with citizen participation, in an advisory capacity, in the late 1950's, to administrative decentralization with community control, in the form of elected regional boards, in the early 1970's.

The latter form of school decentralization has been operative in the Detroit Public Schools for six years. It has both supporters and detractors within the Detroit community. The future is unknown. However, a
recent newspaper article in the Detroit Free Press pro-
claimed that decentralization was "an idea whose time
has come and gone." This article suggests that decen-
tralization served as a safety valve by providing a
means for blacks to give voice to their educational and
social frustrations but now that this frustration has
been ventilated, decentralization is too costly and too
inefficient to maintain. The solution suggested is to
replace the present boards with an eleven-member Central
Board of Education having eight members elected from the
voting regions of the city and the other three would be
elected city-wide. If this suggestion is followed,
Detroit Public Schools may well swing full circle and
return once again to the ward system of the past.
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CHAPTER III

THE METHODOLOGY

The primary objective of this study is to determine the perceived relationship between the activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization. A secondary emphasis is to determine whether there is agreement within and/or between groups of respondents regarding the perceived relationship between the activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization.

The methodology and procedures of the investigation are described in this chapter. It includes a discussion of the research design, the study population, the research instruments, the research procedures and the statistical methods used to analyze the data.

Research Design

Since the purpose of this study is to gain greater knowledge of school decentralization and to
achieve new insights into this more recent style of school organization, it falls into the category of an exploratory study.\footnote{1} The descriptive survey approach is the basic design of the study. The following statement suggests such a design is appropriate:

Before much progress can be made in solving problems, men must possess descriptions of the phenomena with which they work. Early developments in educational research, therefore, as in other disciplines, have been concerned with making accurate assessments of the incidence, distribution and relationships of phenomena in the field. To solve problems about children, school administration, curriculum, or the teaching of arithmetic, investigators ask the question: What exists—what is the present status of these phenomena? Determining the nature of prevailing conditions, practices and attitudes—seeking accurate descriptions of activities, objects, processes, and persons—is their objective. But descriptive research is not confined to routine fact gathering. Predicting and identifying relationships among and between variables is the goal of competent investigators.\footnote{2}

Among the methods considered to be especially fruitful in the search for important variables in an exploratory study is a survey of persons who have had practical experience with the problem to be studied.\footnote{3} In this study key actors in a decentralized school system were asked to respond to a questionnaire in an effort to obtain perceptions regarding these variables: activities of regional superintendents and important goals of school decentralization.
Population

The survey population consists of the general superintendent (1), the regional superintendents (8), the at-large central board of education members (5), and the regional board of education members (40). The total number of the study population is fifty-four (54). The survey sample consists of the forty-two (42) persons who responded to the research instrument, namely:

- Superintendents 8
- At-large Central Board Members 4
- Regional Board Chairpersons 6
- Regional Board Members 24
- Total 42

Superintendents and board members were selected because the decentralization guidelines for the Detroit Public Schools recognizes them as the key actors by listing some of their relationships and responsibilities.

Additional evidence that superintendents and board members are key actors in any public school system is provided in the following statement:
By legal definition the school board is the formal policy-making organ of a public school system and the superintendent is its executive officer. The board is superior-dinate to the superintendent. It hires and fires the superintendent, not vice versa. These two positions are located at the top of the formal social hierarchy of a school system. Through the deliberations and actions of their incumbents, decisions are reached that clearly affect the organizational purpose and the manipulation of its human and material resources. The authority and responsibility to make major policy, allocative, and coordinative decisions for the school systems are vested in these positions.

Instrumentation

A critical preliminary to this research was the identification of important goals of school decentralization and the identification of goal-related activities of regional superintendents. These identifications took place during the first and second phases of a three-phased instrument development process. Goals and activities were identified by a panel of judges consisting of five (5) district superintendents of a decentralized school system and six (6) Ohio State University professors who have expertise in problems and issues of decentralization. The members of this panel are listed in Appendix A.

The third phase of the instrument development process was the construction of the School Decentralization Rating Scale which was the research instrument used to collect data germane to the study.
Phase One: The Identification of Important School Decentralization Goals

After an extensive review of the literature, twenty goals of school decentralization were identified. This list of twenty goals was incorporated into a questionnaire. A cover letter was mailed to each member of the panel of judges along with the Identification of Important School Decentralization Goals Questionnaire. A copy of the letter and the questionnaire appear in Appendix B. The panel of judges was asked to identify the ten important goals of school decentralization by rating each of the twenty goals in terms of its importance on a six-point scale as follows:

1. extremely important
2. very important
3. moderately important
4. of some importance
5. of very little importance
6. not at all important

The judges were also asked to rate these twenty school decentralization goals in terms of the degree of difficulty experienced in rating them according to the following scale:

1. extremely hard
2. moderately hard
3. moderately easy
4. extremely easy
The responses of the judges were tabulated and those goals which were rated extremely important or very important by at least eight of the eleven judges (seventy-three percent concurrence) were included in the list of ten important goals of school decentralization used later. These ten goals were also considered to be extremely easy or moderately easy to rate by at least six of the eleven judges, which represented fifty-five percent concurrence.

From the original list of twenty, the following goals were identified as being important goals of school decentralization:

1. To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making.
2. To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society.
3. To improve school-community relations.
4. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community.
5. To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils.
6. To provide more efficient and effective management of schools.
7. To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools.
8. To improve the quality of education.
9. To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved.
10. To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program.
Phase Two: The Identification of Goal Related Activities of Regional Superintendents

After an extensive review of the literature, the investigator developed a list of sixty activities of regional superintendents. A questionnaire was constructed which included these sixty activities and the ten important goals of school decentralization identified by the panel of judges. The questionnaire was designed to identify activity/goal relationships. An activity/goal relationship was established whenever a member of the panel of judges indicated that a goal was supported and/or achieved upon the completion of an activity and assigned a rank of 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 to that goal to indicate the strength of the relationship.

A cover letter was mailed to each member of the panel along with the School Decentralization Goals as Related to Specific Activities of Regional Superintendents questionnaire. A copy of the letter and the questionnaire appear in Appendix C.

In order to identify an activity/goal relationship, the judges were asked to indicate which goals were supported and/or achieved upon the completion of each activity. The judges were asked to place the goals related to each activity in ranked order of importance to a maximum of five. Among the five activity/goal
relationships identified, a 1 was assigned to the goal to which an activity was most strongly related and a 2 was assigned to the goal to which an activity was least strongly related.

Responses were tabulated and goal-related activities were identified on the basis of the frequency with which an activity was related to a goal and the lowest average of the rankings assigned to an activity/goal relationship. However, only activity/goal relationships identified by at least three judges were included. Only six of the eleven members of the panel of judges responded to this phase of the preliminary investigation. This represented a fifty-five percent response.

The forty (40) goal-related activities of regional superintendents which were identified by the panel of judges follow:

1. Involves community persons in the selection of instructional and supplementary materials.

2. Meets frequently with parents, citizens, and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.

3. Works with the citizens of the region to determine expectations for the schools and evaluations of the schools.

4. Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools.
5. Involves parents in the selection of regional personnel.

6. Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools.

7. Develops strategies to help integrate the world of culturally different students into the life of the regional schools.

8. Develops desegregation and/or integration plans for the regional schools involving both students and personnel.

9. Develops and monitors affirmative action programs to insure equal employment opportunity within regional schools.

10. Supports and encourages inter-racial and inter-cultural activities sponsored by community organizations.

11. Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays.

12. Attends and participates in community meetings and functions.

13. Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program.

14. Helps schools and community social agencies coordinate services which identify and respond to the needs of the people in the region.

15. Encourages the development of opportunities for minority students to participate in decision-making groups within the regional schools.

16. Conducts studies and presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools.
17. Encourages the use of community-based resources to enrich the curriculum in the regional schools.

18. Requires each principal and staff, to annually review student performances on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction in the regional schools.

19. Provides a program for diagnosing the learning difficulties of regional students and for providing effective remedial instruction.

20. Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs.

21. Encourages innovative and creative approaches to improving student performance.

22. Conducts continuous evaluations of the instructional program and the academic achievement of students in the regional schools.

23. Ensures that plans and actions of regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools.

24. Establishes operating procedures for implementing the policies of the regional board.

25. Develops and recommends a comprehensive system of planning in all areas of school operation.

26. Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region.

27. Develops policies and criteria to be used in the recruitment, selection and orientation of regional personnel.

28. Gains the support of the regional board for the educational programs of the regional schools.
29. Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools.

30. Utilizes varied forms of communication to inform people of the region about school problems, activities and achievements.

31. Reviews student performances on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction of the regional schools.

32. Works with students and their organizations to improve educational programs and the atmosphere within the regional schools.

33. Develops effective staff planning and evaluation procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region.

34. Provides for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to fit the needs of students.

35. Secures and provides supplemental services and resources to aid the instructional program.

36. Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools.

37. Engages personnel in the regional schools in priority setting and resource allocation.

38. Works with recognized employee representatives to improve the performance of the regional schools.

39. Presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools.

40. Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region, and disseminates the results to the board and the public.
The following activities were identified as being strongly related to more than one goal:

No. 2. Meets frequently with parents, citizens, and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.

No. 3. Works with the citizens of the region to determine expectations for the schools and evaluations of the schools.

No. 4. Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools.

No. 13. Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program.

No. 22. Ensures that plans and actions of regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools.

Phase 3: The Development of the School Decentralization Rating Scale

The important goals of school decentralization and the goal-related activities of regional superintendents identified in the first two phases of the preliminary investigation were used in developing the School Decentralization Rating Scale. This instrument was used to determine whether agreement existed among
the superintendents and board members regarding the relationship between the activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization.

The investigator developed a rating scale after considering the relative ease and speed with which the study population could respond to it. This instrument was designed to secure responses in two areas relative to the relationship between the activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization. These two areas are:

(a) perceived importance of school decentralization goals and

(b) perceived importance of goal-related activities in the achievement of important goals of school decentralization.

The School Decentralization Rating Scale contains sixty items and is divided into three categories: (1) general information; (2) school decentralization goals; and (3) goal-related activities of the regional superintendent. A copy of the complete instrument may be found in Appendix D.

Members of the committee directing the study reviewed this instrument in terms of clarity of item content and the ease or difficulty involved in responding
to items. A former regional superintendent in the Detroit Public Schools and graduate students in the department of Educational Administration of The Ohio State University assisted in this review process. Some minor revisions were made in the instructions and some of the goal-related activity statements were modified as a result of comments and suggestions made by these persons.

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection process was initiated in November 1976, when a letter requesting permission to conduct the study was sent to the Department of Research and Evaluation, Detroit Public Schools. Correspondence related to acquiring approval appears in Appendix E. Approval for the study was not granted until January, 1977. A copy of the official approval form appears in Appendix F.

The School Decentralization Rating Scale, the official approval form and a cover letter were mailed to the general superintendent (1), the regional superintendents (8), the at-large central board members (5), and the regional board members of the Detroit Public Schools (40). A self-addressed, stamped envelope for returning the completed instrument was also included in this mailing. These items were included in each
subsequent mailing. A copy of the cover letter appears in Appendix G.

Because the total number of the population was small (54), the investigator made a maximum effort to obtain one hundred percent response. Twenty-one responses were received after the first mailing.

A follow-up letter was sent to those who did not respond to the first letter and ten responses were received. A copy of this letter appears in Appendix H.

A letter was also sent to some of the early responders asking their assistance in encouraging their colleagues to participate in the study. The investigator does not know whether such intervention occurred. A copy of this letter appears in Appendix I.

A total of forty-two responses were finally received from the fifty-four persons contacted. This represents a seventy-eight (78) percent response. The data collection process extended over a period of four months.

The respondents provided data regarding the relationship between the goal-related activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization by completing the following tasks:

1. Each respondent completed a personal data sheet. This information was requested so
that the investigator could further stratify the groups in interpreting the results of the study. The respondents were asked to identify themselves in order to facilitate follow-up, if necessary, and to ensure total response. However, neither the respondents, their schools nor their regions are identified in the study.

2. Each respondent ranked ten decentralization goals in the order of their perceived importance. The goal ranked 1 was the goal perceived to be the most important. The goal ranked 10 was the goal perceived to be the least important.

3. Each respondent placed goal-related activities listed for each of the ten decentralization goals in ranked order in terms of their importance in the achievement of that goal. The activity ranked 1 was the activity perceived to be most important in the achievement of a goal. The activity ranked 5 was the activity perceived to be the least important in the achievement of a goal.
Treatment of the Data

In analyzing the data, relationships were determined in regard to the following:

1. Is there agreement within and/or between groups of key actors regarding perceived importance of the goals of school decentralization?

2. Is there agreement within and/or between groups of key actors regarding perceived importance of activities of the regional superintendent in the achievement of the goals of school decentralization?

3. What is the perceived relationship between the activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of the goals of school decentralization?

This analysis generated the following data:

1. An importance rating for each goal for each individual respondent.

2. An importance rating for each goal for each group of respondents.

3. A total importance rating for each goal for all respondents.

4. An importance rating for each goal-related activity listed for a school decentralization goal for each individual respondent.
5. An importance rating for each goal-related activity listed for a school decentralization goal for each group of respondents.

6. A total importance rating for each goal-related activity listed for a school decentralization goal for all respondents.

An importance score was computed for each goal and each goal-related activity. A mean was computed for each group of respondents. The deviation of scores was also computed. The scores were compared to determine whether there was correspondence within and between groups.

The following operational definitions of key terms were useful in analyzing data:

1. Agreement was defined as correspondence of raw scores or means. Lack of agreement was defined as non-correspondence of raw scores or means.

2. Key actors were defined as the general superintendent, the regional superintendents, the regional board of education members and the central board of education members.

3. Perceptions of the importance of goals was defined as the ranking given to each goal by the respondents.
4. Goals of school decentralization were defined as the goals selected by this investigator as a result of the literature review, discussions with the members of the committee directing the study and screening by a panel of judges.

5. Activities of the regional superintendents were defined as the goal-related activities extracted from specific tasks of superintendents in decentralized districts identified by investigators in previous reports and studies. The goal-related activities were also selected following a review by members of the committee directing the study and screening by a panel of judges.

6. Perceptions of the importance of goal-related activities were defined as the ranking given to each activity by the respondents.

7. The relationship between an activity and a goal was defined as the summed rank received by the activity for a goal to which the activity is related. This
ranking will indicate the degree to which
the activity is perceived to be important
in the achievement of the goal.

Group importance rankings given to each goal of
school decentralization were tabulated. A group impor-
tance score for each goal was determined for each goal
by summing the rankings. The summed rank for each goal
by each respondent group was determined and became the
measure of the similarities (agreement) within the
group. The deviation of rankings for each group was
determined and became the measure of the differences
(lack of agreement) within the group. The mean and
deviation for each group were used to compare similari-
ties (agreement) and differences (lack of agreement)
between groups.

The data generated determined the extent of
agreement of respondent perceptions of the importance
of school decentralization goals and the importance of
goal-related activities in the achievement of school
decentralization goals. Responses were tabulated and
frequency distributions and measures of central tendency
were determined for each subgroup. The reader will
recall that this is an exploratory study employing a
descriptive survey study design. Since the entire popu-
lation of interest is being surveyed, the reporting of
simple descriptive data is all that is required.
For purposes of comparing and contrasting each sub-group's ratings, the following statistical treatments were applied to the data:

1. For purposes of determining the level of agreement among the subjects within each sub-group, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was applied to all rankings of goals and activities.

2. For purposes of determining the level of agreement between sub-group rankings of goals, the Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance by ranks was applied to group rankings of goals.

3. For purposes of determining the level of agreement between sub-group rankings of goal-related activities, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was applied to group rankings of activities.

Summary

In this chapter the researcher has attempted to identify and describe the steps taken to gather the information used for the purpose of determining the relationship between the activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization.


3 Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Morton, op. cit., p. 53.


CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

A major assumption of this research is that the position of regional superintendent exists for the purpose of facilitating the achievement of the goals of school decentralization.

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to determine the relationship between the activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization as perceived by key actors in a decentralized school system. Information was sought on the basis of perceived importance of activities of the regional superintendent in the achievement of important goals of school decentralization.

The following questions were formulated as the focus for this research:

1. Is there agreement within and/or between groups of key actors in a decentralized school system regarding perceptions of the important goals of school decentralization?
2. Is there agreement within and/or between groups of key actors in a decentralized school system regarding perceptions of activities which are important for the achievement of important goals of school decentralization?

3. Is there more agreement within the groups than between the groups?

4. What are the implications of agreement patterns?

Basically, this is an investigation of the perceptions of those who make policy decisions in a decentralized school system, namely, central and regional board members; and those who implement policy decisions, namely, the general and regional superintendents. This study is designed to determine group perceptions for the system as a whole and does not attempt to analyze perceptions of an individual or region. Therefore, only group responses are presented.

The data and analyses are presented in this chapter. The presentation and analysis are discussed in relation to the School Decentralization Rating Scale, the research instrument. A copy can be found in Appendix D.
Presentation and Analysis of School Decentralization Rating Scale Data

The development of the School Decentralization Rating Scale was discussed in the previous chapter. The data generated from the rating scale are used to determine the perceptions of superintendents and board members regarding the important goals of school decentralization and the important goal-related activities of regional superintendents. These perceptions will be examined to determine within-group and between-group agreement. Within-group and between-group agreement is calculated for the purpose of gaining some insight into the way respondents perceive the position of the regional superintendent facilitates the achievement of important goals of school decentralization, a primary interest of this investigation.

The respondents to the questionnaire items are separated into the following groups:

1. Superintendents
2. At-large Central Board Members
3. Regional Board Chairpersons
4. Regional Board Members

Group responses were classified as follows:

1. Within-Group Agreement on Important Goals of School Decentralization
2. Between-Group Agreement on Important Goals of School Decentralization
3. Within-Group Agreement on the Importance of Goal Related Activities in the Achievement of School Decentralization Goals


Respondents within each group were asked to place goal items in ranked order from one to ten, 1 being most important and 10 being least important. Respondents were also asked to place goal-related activity items in ranked order from one to five, 1 being most important and 5 being least important.

The rankings of individual respondents were summed and placed in ranked order of importance to determine group rankings for all items.

Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used to determine the association between the within-group rankings given to goals and goal related activities. This statistic was also used to determine the association of the between-group rankings given to goal-related activities. The Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance by ranks was used to determine the association of the between-group rankings given to goals. The test of statistical significance is the distribution of critical chi-square values.

The following paragraphs contain presentations and discussions of the collected data from the following
questionnaire items:

**Item I - School Decentralization Goals**

**Item II - Goal Related Activities of the Regional Superintendent**

**Item I -- School Decentralization Goals**

The summed rankings assigned to the ten goals of school decentralization by members of the following groups are presented in Tables 1 through 4:

- Superintendents
- At-large Central Board Members
- Regional Board Chairpersons
- Regional Board Members

The statistical significance of the summed rankings assigned to the ten goals of school decentralization by members of the following comparison groups is presented in Table 5:

- Superintendents and At-large Central Board Members
- Superintendents and Regional Board Chairpersons
- Superintendents and Regional Board Members
- At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons
- At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members
- Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members
TABLE 1
SUPERINTENDENTS WITHIN GROUP
AGREEMENT ON GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank
---
(6)  (10) (8) (5) (4) (9) (7) (3) (1) (2)

Total
---
44  71  53  36  35  63  51  33  24  30

Mean 43.6

Total Deviation² = 2115.44

\( \hat{w} = 0.40065 \)

Level of significance = .001
### TABLE 2

**AT-LARGE CENTRAL BOARD MEMBERS WITHIN GROUP AGREEMENT ON GOALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>(3.5)</th>
<th>(8.5)</th>
<th>(5.5)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(8.5)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(3.5)</th>
<th>(5.5)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deviation$^2 = 442$</td>
<td>$\nu = .3348$</td>
<td>Level of significance = .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
REGIONAL CHAIRPERSONS WITHIN
GROUP AGREEMENT ON GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Chairpersons</th>
<th>RANK ORDERING OF GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(2.5)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2.5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deviation$^2$</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\nu = .3199$

Level of significance = .01
### TABLE 4

REGIONAL BOARD MEMBERS WITHIN
GROUP AGREEMENT ON GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Board Members</th>
<th>Rank Ordering of Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deviation$^2$</td>
<td>12161.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w$</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of significance</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 5

**STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF BETWEEN-GROUP AGREEMENT ON TEN GOALS OF SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents and Regional Board Members (n=18)</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members (n=30)</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members (n=20)</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents and Regional Board Chairpersons (n=14)</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents and At-Large Central Board Members (n=12)</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons (n=10)</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RS indicates that differences between perceptions of the rank ordering of the goals is not significant and the members of the groups in question agree. When .01 or .05 occurs, the differences are significant and the members of the groups in question do not agree.*
The individuals within a group placed the ten goals of school decentralization in ranked order of importance from 1 to 10. The individual rankings for each goal were summed and the summed ranks were placed in rank order from 1 to 10 in order to determine each group's perception of the ranked order of importance for each goal. The sets of summed ranks for each goal were then placed in ranked order to determine the goal that was perceived to be most important by all groups. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used to determine whether there was significant agreement between the members of each group regarding the rankings given to each goal of school decentralization.

The data presented in Table 6 indicate that the ten goals of school decentralization were placed in the following rank order of importance by the superintendents and board members:

1. To improve the quality of education
2. To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved
3. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community
4. To improve the educational programs and raise the achievement level of pupils
5. To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making
### TABLE 6

OVERALL PERCEIVED RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF TEN GOALS OF SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal No. 8</td>
<td>To improve the quality of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goal No. 9</td>
<td>To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal No. 4</td>
<td>To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal No. 5</td>
<td>To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goal No. 1</td>
<td>To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goal No. 10</td>
<td>To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goal No. 3</td>
<td>To improve school community relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Goal No. 7</td>
<td>To regain and retain confidence in and support of schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Goal No. 6</td>
<td>To provide more efficient and effective management of schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Goal No. 2</td>
<td>To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program

7. To improve school-community relations

8. To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools

9. To provide more efficient and effective management of schools

10. To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society

On the basis of the rank order of importance assigned to the ten goals of school decentralization by the groups in question, the goals were divided into high priority goals, those receiving a rank of 1, 2 or 3; medium priority goals, those receiving a rank of 4, 5, 6 or 7; and low priority goals, those receiving a rank of 8, 9 or 10. These data are presented in Table 6.

Within-Group Agreement on Important Goals of School Decentralization

Individuals within the following groups placed the ten goals of school decentralization in ranked order of importance from one to ten:

Superintendents

At-large Central Board Members

Regional Board Chairpersons

Regional Board Members

Each individual within a group placed the ten goals of school decentralization in ranked order of
importance from one to ten. The individual rankings for each goal were summed in order to obtain a summed rank for each goal within each respondent group. These summed ranks were placed in rank order of importance from one to ten in order to determine the ranked order of importance of the ten goals of decentralization as perceived by each group in question. The sets of summed ranks for each goal were placed in ranked order of importance in order to determine the importance of the ten goals of decentralization as perceived by all groups. For each respondent group, the goal receiving the smallest summed rank score is in first place, most important; and the goal receiving the largest summed rank score is in tenth place, least important. These data are presented in Table 7.

Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used to ascertain the level of statistical significance between the rankings given to each goal by the individual members within each group. The Kendall coefficient of concordance is a general non-parametric statistic which tells whether individuals agree on the way they rate items.¹

To determine the coefficient of concordance the individual ranks are summed and that sum is divided by the number of individuals involved to determine the mean
### TABLE 7

**RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF TEN GOALS OF SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>At-Large</th>
<th></th>
<th>Regional Board</th>
<th></th>
<th>Regional Board</th>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>N = 24</td>
<td>N = 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To improve school-community relations.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To provide more efficient and effective management of schools.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To regain and retain confidence in and support of schools.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To improve the quality of education.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served &amp; involved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To provide an opportunity for citizens &amp; educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the ranks. The deviation of each rank from the mean is determined. The larger the deviations, the greater the degree of association among the set of ranks. Finally the sum of the squares of the deviations is found and the value of the coefficient of concordance is computed. Agreement among the individuals in a group is reflected by the degree of variance among the sums of the ranks. The coefficient of concordance is a function of that degree of variance. These data are presented in Table 8. An examination of this table shows that despite the variance in individual rankings assigned to each goal, there was no significant difference between the ranked order in which the ten goals of school decentralization were placed by the members within each of the four respondent groups. Essentially what this means is that the members within each group agree with each other on the rank order of importance in which goals of school decentralization are placed. No statistically significant difference between the rankings within each group was observed at the .01 level of significance.

A detailed description of the data shown in Table 7 which is a composite of Tables 1 through 4, is presented below:

The three goals perceived to be most important by the Superintendents were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Goals 1 thru 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Central Board Members</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Board Chairpersons</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Board Members</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 9 - To bring educational decision making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved;

Goal 10 - To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program; and

Goal 8 - To improve the quality of education

The three goals perceived to be least important by the Superintendents were:

Goal 2 - To promote the integration of minorities into the wide society;

Goal 6 - To provide more efficient and effective management of schools; and

Goal 3 - To improve school-community relations

The three goals perceived to be most important by At-large Central Board Members were:

Goal 5 - To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils;

Goal 4 - To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community; and tied for third place,

Goal 1 - To increase citizen participation in educational decision making;

Goal 8 - To improve the quality of education

The three goals perceived to be least important by the At-large Central Board Members were:

Goal 10 - To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share
responsibility and accountability for the educational program;

Goal 2 - To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society; and

Goal 6 - To provide more efficient and effective management of schools

The three goals perceived to be most important by Regional Board Chairpersons were:

Goal 8 - To improve the quality of education; and tied for second place,

Goal 4 - To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community; and

Goal 9 - To bring educational decision making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved

The three goals perceived to be least important by the Regional Board Chairpersons were:

Goal 2 - To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society;

Goal 7 - To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools; and

Goal 3 - To improve school-community relations

The three goals perceived to be most important by Regional Board Members were:

Goal 8 - To improve the quality of education;

Goal 9 - To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved; and
Goal 4 - To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local community

The three goals perceived to be least important by the Regional Board Members were:

Goal 2 - To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society;

Goal 6 - To provide more efficient and effective management of schools; and

Goal 7 - To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools

The three goals perceived to be most important by all respondents were:

Goal 8 - To improve the quality of education;

Goal 9 - To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved; and

Goal 4 - To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community

The three goals perceived by all groups to be least in importance were:

Goal 2 - To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society;

Goal 6 - To provide more efficient and effective management of schools; and

Goal 7 - To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools
Between-Group Agreement on Important Goals of School Decentralization

The rankings assigned by individuals within the following groups are compared to determine between-group agreement on the rank order of importance of the ten goals of school decentralization:

Superintendents and Regional Board Members
Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members
At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members
Superintendents and Regional Board Chairpersons
Superintendents and At-Large Central Board Members
At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons

The Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance by ranks was used to determine whether differences in rankings assigned to the ten goals of school decentralization by members of the comparison groups were statistically significant. The Kruskal-Wallis technique determines whether or not independent samples come from identical populations with respect to averages.²

In the computation of the Kruskal-Wallis statistic each of the rank scores assigned to a goal by members of a comparison group were combined and ranked in a single series. The smallest score was replaced by rank 1, the
next smallest by rank 2 and the largest by the number representing the total number of rankings assigned by a particular group. The sum of the ranks in each column was then calculated and the sum of the rankings was squared. This number was multiplied by the number representing the total number of rankings in each column. These numbers were summed and the chi-square statistical procedure was utilized to determine significant differences. All tests were performed at the .05 level of significance.

The Kruskal-Wallis statistic determines whether the sums of ranks are so disparate that they are not likely to have come from samples which were all drawn from the same population. If the rankings are identical then $H$, the statistic used in the Kruskal-Wallis test, is distributed as chi-square with $df=k-1$.

These data are presented in Table 5. Generally speaking where differences in the rank order assigned to goals by the members of a comparison group are not significant (NS), the members of that comparison group agree with each other as to the perceived rank order of importance of the goal in question. When a .01, .02 or .05 occurs, this signifies that the groups in question do not agree on the rank ordering of a particular goal.

The data presented in Table 5 reveal that there is between-group agreement for all comparison groups
regarding the perceived rank order of importance of the following goals:

Goal 1 - To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making;

Goal 4 - To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local community; and

Goal 6 - To provide more efficient and effective management of schools

The Superintendents and Regional Board Members Comparison Group

There is agreement between the Superintendents and Regional Board Members regarding the rank order of importance of each goal except Goal 3, "To improve school-community relations"; and Goal 10, "To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program."

The rank for Goal 3 by Superintendents was in eighth place and the rank given to this goal by Regional Board Members was in seventh place. The difference in rank assigned to Goal 3 by individual members of this comparison group was significant at the .05 level. The rank given Goal 10 by Superintendents was in second place and the rank assigned to this goal by Regional Board Members was in fourth place. The difference in
the rank assigned to Goal 10 by individual members of this comparison group was significant at the .01 level.

The Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members Comparison Group

There is agreement between the Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members regarding the rank order of importance of each goal except Goal 2, "To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society." Although the summed ranks given this goal by both groups was in tenth place, the difference between the ranking of Goal 2 by individual members of this comparison group was significant at the .05 level.

The At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members Comparison Group

At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members agreed with each other regarding the rank order of importance of each of the ten goals of school decentralization. Although the rank order of the summed ranks for each goal is different, any difference in ranking by individual members of this comparison group was not statistically significant.

The Superintendents and Regional Chairpersons Comparison Group

There is agreement between Superintendents and Regional Board Chairpersons regarding the rank order of
importance for each goal except Goal 8, "To improve the quality of education"; and Goal 10, "To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program." The rank assigned to Goal 8 by Superintendents was in third place and the rank assigned to this goal by Regional Board Chairpersons was in first place. The difference in the ranking of Goal 8 by individual members of this comparison group was significant at the .05 level. The rank assigned to Goal 10 by Superintendents was in second place. Regional Board Chairpersons ranked this goal in sixth place. The difference between the ranking of Goal 10 by the members of this comparison group was significant at the .01 level.

The Superintendents and At-Large Central Board Members Comparison Group

There was agreement between the Superintendents and At-large Central Board Members on the ranked order of importance of each of the ten goals of school decentralization except Goal 9, "To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved." The Superintendents as a group ranked Goal 9 in first place. The rank that At-large Central Board Members assigned to Goal 9 placed it in a tie for fifth and
sixth places with Goal 3, "To improve school-community relations." The difference between the ranking of Goal 9 by the members of this comparison group was significant at the .01 level.

The At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons Comparison Group

There is agreement between the At-large Central Board Members and the Regional Board Chairpersons on the ranked order of importance of each goal of school decentralization except Goal 5, "To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils"; and Goal 7, "To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools." At-large Central Board Members ranked Goal 5 in first place, while Regional Board Chairpersons ranked this goal in fourth place. The difference in the ranking of Goal 5 by the members of this comparison group was significant at the .05 level. The rank assigned by At-large Central Board Members to Goal 7 was in seventh place, while the Regional Board Chairpersons ranked this goal in ninth place. The difference in the ranking of Goal 7 by the members of this comparison group was significant at the .05 level.

There is a high degree of agreement between all comparison groups regarding the ranked order of importance of the ten goals of school decentralization. No
comparison group failed to agree on the rank ordering of less than eight goals. All comparison groups agreed on the rank ordering of Goals 1, 4 and 6. Only one comparison group failed to agree on the rank ordering of each of the following goals: 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9. Two comparison groups did not agree on the rank ordering of Goal 10. Since there are six comparison groups and ten goals to be ranked, there are sixty possible areas of agreement. There were only eight instances where differences in ranks were statistically significant, and there were fifty-two incidences of agreement.

Item II - Goal-Related Activities of the Regional Superintendent

The summed rankings assigned to goal-related activities of regional superintendents by members within the following groups are presented in Tables 9 through 18:

Superintendents
At-Large Central Board Members
Regional Board Chairpersons
Regional Board Members

The statistical significance of summed rankings assigned to goal-related activities of Regional Superintendents by members within the following comparison group is presented in Table 19:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>AT-LARGE CENTRAL BOARD</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Involves community persons in the selection of instructional and supplementary materials</td>
<td>31/4/44</td>
<td>11/3</td>
<td>20/4</td>
<td>87/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools</td>
<td>15/1</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>56/1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Works with citizens of the region to determine expectations for and evaluations of the schools</td>
<td>17/2.5</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>17/2.5</td>
<td>56/1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools</td>
<td>17/2.5</td>
<td>12/4</td>
<td>17/2.5</td>
<td>66/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Involves parents in the selection of regional personnel</td>
<td>40/5</td>
<td>20/5</td>
<td>25/5</td>
<td>95/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Summed ranks
** Rank order of summed ranks
TABLE 10
THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ACTIVITIES OF REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS AND THE
ACHIEVEMENT OF TEN GOALS OF SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION

Goal 2: To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>AT-LARGE CENTRAL BOARD MEMBERS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD MEMBERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Develop strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools</td>
<td>19/1</td>
<td>13/2.5</td>
<td>16/2</td>
<td>71/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Develop strategies to help integrate the world of the culturally different students into the life of the regional schools</td>
<td>23/3</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>54/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Develop desegregation and/or integration plans for the regional schools involving both students and personnel</td>
<td>20/2</td>
<td>13/2.5</td>
<td>21/4</td>
<td>70/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Develops and monitors affirmative action programs to ensure equal employment opportunity within regional schools</td>
<td>21/3</td>
<td>14/4.5</td>
<td>18/3</td>
<td>79/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Supports and encourages inter-cultural activities sponsored by community organizations</td>
<td>37/5</td>
<td>14/4.5</td>
<td>22/5</td>
<td>86/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>AT-LARGE CENTRAL BOARD</td>
<td>REGIONAL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS</td>
<td>REGIONAL BOARD MEMBERS</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools</td>
<td>17/1</td>
<td>15/4.5</td>
<td>16/2.5</td>
<td>67/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays</td>
<td>37/5</td>
<td>15/4.5</td>
<td>29/5</td>
<td>101/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Attends and participates in community meetings and functions</td>
<td>26/4</td>
<td>14/3</td>
<td>16/2.5</td>
<td>94/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticise the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program</td>
<td>21/3</td>
<td>11/2</td>
<td>18/4</td>
<td>56/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the education need of the regional schools</td>
<td>19/2</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>30/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Goal 3: To improve school-community relations*
### Table 12

The relationships between activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of ten goals of school decentralization

**Goal 4:** To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>AT-LARGE</th>
<th>CENTRAL BOARD</th>
<th>BOARD</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Helps schools and community social agencies coordinate services which identify and respond to the needs of the people in the region</td>
<td>16/1</td>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>14/2</td>
<td>58/1</td>
<td>100/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays</td>
<td>37/5</td>
<td>15/4</td>
<td>27/5</td>
<td>107/5</td>
<td>186/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Encourages the development of opportunities for minority students to participate in decision-making groups within the regional schools</td>
<td>26/4</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>19/4</td>
<td>76/3</td>
<td>127/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Conducts studies and presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools</td>
<td>22/3</td>
<td>17/5</td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>59/2</td>
<td>111/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Encourages the use of community-based resources to enrich the curriculum in the regional schools</td>
<td>19/2</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>17/3</td>
<td>86/4</td>
<td>132/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>AT-LARGE</td>
<td>REGIONAL BOARD</td>
<td>REGIONAL BOARD</td>
<td>REGIONAL BOARD</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Requires each principal and staff to annually review student performances on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction in the regional schools</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>14/3</td>
<td>17/2</td>
<td>81/4.5</td>
<td>148/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Provides a program for diagnosing the learning difficulties of regional students and for providing effective remedial instruction</td>
<td>30/1</td>
<td>7/1.5</td>
<td>19/3.5</td>
<td>69/1.5</td>
<td>125/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs</td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>7/1.5</td>
<td>19/3.5</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>109/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Encourages innovative and creative approaches to improving student performance</td>
<td>19/2</td>
<td>15/4</td>
<td>21/5</td>
<td>69/1.5</td>
<td>128/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Conducts continuous evaluations of the instructional program and academic achievement of students in the regional schools</td>
<td>24/3</td>
<td>17/5</td>
<td>14/1</td>
<td>83/4.5</td>
<td>138/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 14

The relationships between activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of ten goals of school decentralization

**Goal 6:** To provide more efficient and effective management of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>AT-LARGE</th>
<th>CENTRAL BOARD</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ensures that plans and actions of regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools</td>
<td>25/3</td>
<td>10/2.5</td>
<td>16/3</td>
<td>69/3</td>
<td>120/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Establishes operating procedures for implementing the policies of the regional board</td>
<td>19/2</td>
<td>10/2.5</td>
<td>12/1.5</td>
<td>52/1</td>
<td>93/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Develops and recommends a comprehensive system of planning in all areas of school operation</td>
<td>14/1</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>12/1.5</td>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>90/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region</td>
<td>31/4.5</td>
<td>18/5</td>
<td>29/5</td>
<td>98/5</td>
<td>176/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Develops policies and criteria to be used in the recruitment, selection and orientation of regional personnel</td>
<td>31/4.5</td>
<td>15/4</td>
<td>21/4</td>
<td>84/4</td>
<td>151/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 15

The relationships between activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of ten goals of school decentralization

**Goal 7:** To regain and retain confidence and support of the schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>AT-LARGE SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD MEMBERS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD MEMBERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Encourages the organisation and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools</td>
<td>14/1</td>
<td>11/2.5</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>70/2</td>
<td>101/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Attends and participates in community meetings and functions</td>
<td>30/4</td>
<td>18/5</td>
<td>20/4</td>
<td>82/3</td>
<td>150/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools</td>
<td>35/5</td>
<td>11/2.5</td>
<td>28/5</td>
<td>97/5</td>
<td>171/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program</td>
<td>19/2</td>
<td>12/4</td>
<td>18/2.5</td>
<td>56/1</td>
<td>105/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Utilizes varied forms of communication to inform people of the region about school problems, activities and achievements</td>
<td>22/3</td>
<td>8/1</td>
<td>18/2.5</td>
<td>89/4</td>
<td>137/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16

**The Relationships Between Activities of Regional Superintendents and the Achievement of Ten Goals of School Decentralization**

**Goal 8: To improve the quality of education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>AT-LARGE SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD MEMBERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reviews student performances on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction of the regional schools</td>
<td>22/3</td>
<td>21/3</td>
<td>98/5</td>
<td>154/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Works with students and their organizations to improve educational programs and the atmosphere within the regional schools</td>
<td>33/4.5</td>
<td>81/4</td>
<td>150/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develops effective staff planning and evaluation procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>12/1.5</td>
<td>87/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provides for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to meet the needs of students</td>
<td>21/2</td>
<td>57/2</td>
<td>98/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Secures and provides supplemental services and resources to aid the instructional program</td>
<td>33/4.5</td>
<td>23/5</td>
<td>144/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ACTIVITIES OF REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS AND THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE GOALS OF SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION

Goal 9: To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professionals directly served and involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>AT-LARGE SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS</th>
<th>REGIONAL BOARD MEMBERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools</td>
<td>17/1</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Works with the citizens of the region to determine expectations for and evaluations of the schools</td>
<td>19/3</td>
<td>13/3.5</td>
<td>14/2.5</td>
<td>70/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools</td>
<td>18/2</td>
<td>16/5</td>
<td>14/2.5</td>
<td>66/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Engages personnel in the regional schools in priority setting and resource allocation.</td>
<td>29/4</td>
<td>13/3.5</td>
<td>27/5</td>
<td>82/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Works with recognized employee representatives to improve the performance and morale of regional employees.</td>
<td>37/5</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>24/4</td>
<td>103/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18
THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ACTIVITIES OF REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS AND THE ACHIEVEMENT OF TEN GOALS OF SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION

Goal 10: To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ensures that plans and actions of the regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT-LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gains the support of the regional board for the educational programs of the regional schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT-LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT-LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT-LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region and disseminates the results to the board and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT-LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent and Regional Board Members (N=38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Chairpersons and Regional Board Members (N=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members (N=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent and Regional Board Chairpersons (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent and At-Large Central Board Members (N=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons (N=10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If there is an entry of .01 or .05, the members of the group in question generally agree with each other on the rank ordering of the five activities related to each goal. An NS indicates that the members of the groups in question do not agree.*
The individuals within a group placed the five activities related to each goal in ranked order from 1 to 5 in terms of importance in the achievement of the goals in question. The individual ranking for each activity were summed in order to determine the ranked order of importance of the five activities related to each goal as perceived by each group and the summed ranks were placed in rank order of importance from 1 to 5. The sets of summed ranks for each activity were then placed in rank order to determine the activity that was perceived by all groups to be most important in the achievement of each goal of school decentralization. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used to determine whether there is significant agreement between the members within each group regarding the rankings given to each activity.
The following goal-related activities of regional superintendents were perceived to be most important in the achievement of the ten goals of school decentralization:

Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.

Develops strategies to help integrate the world of the culturally different student into the life of the regional schools.

Helps schools and community social agencies coordinate services which identify and respond to the needs of the people in the region.

Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs.

Develops and recommends a comprehensive system of planning in all areas of school operation.

Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools.

Develops effective staff planning and evaluation procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region.

Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools.

Ensures that plans and actions of the regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools.

The rank order of the sets of summed ranks assigned to goal-related activities by groups of
superintendents and board members were examined and the following results were determined:

"Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools" was in first place; and "Involves parents in the selection of regional personnel" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 1, "To increase citizen participation in educational decision making."

"Develops strategies to help integrate the world of the culturally different student into the life of the regional schools" was in first place; and "Supports and encourages interracial and intercultural activities sponsored by community organizations" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 2, "To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society."

"Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools" was in first place; and "Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 3, "To improve school-community relations."

"Helps schools and community social agencies coordinate services which identify and respond to the
needs of the people in the region" was in first place; and "Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 4, "To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community."

"Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs" was in first place; and "Requires each principal and staff to annually review student performances on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction in the regional schools" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 5, "To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils."

"Develops and recommends a comprehensive system of planning in all areas of school operation" was in first place; and "Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 6, "To provide more efficient and effective management of schools."

"Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools" was in first place; and "Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools" was in fifth place.
in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 7, "To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools."

"Develops effective staff planning and evaluation procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region" was in first place; and "Reviews student performance on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction of the regional schools" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 8, "To improve the quality of education."

"Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools" was in first place; and "Works with recognized employee representatives to improve the performance and morale of regional employees" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 9, "To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved."

"Presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools" was in first place; and "Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region and disseminates the results to the board"
and to the public" was in fifth place in terms of ranked order of importance in the achievement of Goal 10, "To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program."

Three activities of regional superintendents were related to three different goals of school decentralization and seven activities were related to two different goals of school decentralization.

"Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools" was related to the following goals: Goal 1, "To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making;" Goal 3, "To improve school-community relations; and Goal 9, "To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved." This activity was in first place in terms of ranked order of importance for the achievement of Goals 1 and 3 and was in second place for Goal 9.

"Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program" was related to the following goals: Goal 3, "To improve school community relations;" Goal 7, "To regain and retain confidence in and support of the
"Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools" was related to the following goals: Goal 1, "To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making;" Goal 3, "To improve school-community relations;" and Goal 7, "To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools." The respondents ranked this activity as being first in importance in the achievement of Goal 7 and third in importance for the achievement of Goals 1 and 3.

"Works with the citizens of the region to determine expectations for and evaluation of the schools" was related to the following goals: Goal 1, "To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making;" and Goal 9, "To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved." The respondents ranked this activity second in importance for the achievement of Goal 1 and third in importance in the achievement of Goal 9. Goal 9 was ranked as the second most important goal of school decentralization.
"Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools" was related to the following goals: Goal 2, "To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society;" and Goal 7, "To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools." Respondents ranked this activity as being second in importance for the achievement of Goal 2 and fifth in importance for the achievement of Goal 7.

"Conducts studies and presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools" was related to the following goals: Goal 4, "To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community;" and Goal 10, "To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program." The respondents ranked this activity as being the most important in the achievement of Goal 10 and second in importance in the achievement of Goal 4. Goal 4 was ranked as the third most important goal of school decentralization.

"Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays" was related to the following goals: Goal 3, "To improve school-community relations;" and Goal 4, "To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school
community." Respondents ranked this activity as being least in importance for the achievement of both goals.

"Attends and participates in community meetings and functions" is related to the following goals: Goal 3, "To improve school-community relations;" and Goal 7, "To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools." The respondents ranked this activity fourth in importance in the achievement of both goals.

"Ensures that plans and actions of regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools" is related to the following goals: Goal 6, "To provide more efficient and effective management of schools;" and Goal 10, "To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program." The respondents ranked this activity least in importance in the achievement of both goals.

Within-Group Agreement on the Importance of Goal Related Activities

The rank order of importance assigned to goal-related activities of regional superintendents by individuals in the following groups were analyzed to determine within-group agreement:
Superintendents
At-Large Central Board Members
Regional Board Chairpersons
Regional Board Members

A ranked set of summed ranks for each activity was determined for each group. These are presented in Tables 9 through 18. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was performed to ascertain whether there was agreement between the rankings assigned to each activity by the members within a particular group. All tests were performed at the .05 level of significance. These data are presented in Table 20.

An examination of Table 20 reveals that there is statistically significant agreement among members of the Superintendent group. The members of this group generally agree with each other on the ranked order of importance for each of the five activities related to each goal of school decentralization. The same statistically significant agreement exists among the members of the Regional Board Member group. However, within the At-large Central Board Member group there is statistically significant agreement on the ranked order of importance for each of the activities related to Goal 1, only. The members of this group do not agree with each other on the ranked order of importance for the activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>GOAL 1</th>
<th>GOAL 2</th>
<th>GOAL 3</th>
<th>GOAL 4</th>
<th>GOAL 5</th>
<th>GOAL 6</th>
<th>GOAL 7</th>
<th>GOAL 8</th>
<th>GOAL 9</th>
<th>GOAL 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Central Board Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=4)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Board Chairpersons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=6)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Board Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=24)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If there is an entry of .05 or .01, the members of the group in question generally agreed with each other on the order of importance associated with each of the five activities related to each goal. If an NS appears as an entry, the members of the group in question DO NOT agree on the order of importance associated with each of the five activities related to each goal.
related to the other nine goals. There is statistically significant agreement between the members of the Regional Board Chairperson group on the ranked order of importance for each of the activities related to Goals 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 10. The members of this group do not agree with each other on the ranked order of importance for the activities related to Goals 1, 2, 5, and 8. Agreement regarding these goals was not statistically significant.

There was strong statistical agreement within the Superintendent group and the Regional Board Member group regarding the ranked order of importance of activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization. There was moderate statistical agreement within the Regional Chairperson group. Least agreement was found within the At-large Central Board Member group regarding the ranked order of importance of goal-related activities.

Between-Group Agreement on the Importance of Goal-Related Activities

The rank order of importance assigned to goal-related activities by individuals in the following comparison groups were analyzed to determine between-group agreement:

Superintendents and At-Large Central Board Members
Superintendents and Regional Board Chairpersons

Superintendents and Regional Board Members

At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons

At-Large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members

Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members

A ranked set of summed ranks by each comparison group for the five activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization is the basis used to describe the differences in group perceptions of the importance of goal-related activities in the achievement of school decentralization goals. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was performed to ascertain the level of statistical significant agreement between the mean ranks of comparison groups on each of the five activities related to each of the ten school decentralization goals. These data are presented in Table 20.

There was agreement between the Superintendents and At-large Central Board Members regarding the ranked order of importance of the five activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization. This comparison group did not agree on the ranked order of importance of Goal 9 but there was agreement on the ranked order of the five activities related to this goal.
There was agreement between the Superintendents and Regional Board Chairpersons regarding the ranked order of importance assigned to each of the five activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization. Although the members of this comparison group did not agree on the ranked order of importance assigned to Goals 8 and 10, they did agree on the rank order of importance assigned to each of the five activities related to these two goals.

Superintendents and Regional Board Members agreed on the ranking of the five activities related to all goals except Goal 5. The members of this comparison group agree on the ranked order of importance for Goal 5 but do not agree on the rankings of the activities related to it. The members of these two groups also did not agree on the rankings assigned to Goal 3 and Goal 10. They did agree, however, regarding the ranking of the five activities related to these goals.

There was less agreement between the At-large Central Board Members and the Regional Board Chairpersons than there was between all other comparison groups. This comparison group agreed on the ranked order of importance of the five activities related to Goals 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, but did not agree on the ranked order of importance of the five activities related to Goals 2, 4, 5, and 7. The At-large Central Board
Members and Regional Board Chairpersons did not agree on the ranked order of importance for Goal 5 and Goal 7. They also did not agree on the ranked order of importance for the five activities related to these two goals.

At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members agree on the ranking of activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization except Goal 5. This comparison group agreed on the ranked order of importance for all of the goals, including Goal 5.

Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members agree on the rank order of importance for the activities related to each of the goals except Goal 5. The members of this comparison group agree on the ranking for Goal 5 but do not agree on the ranking of the five activities related to this goal. Although the members of this group did not agree on the ranked order of importance for Goal 2, they did agree on the ranking of the activities related to Goal 2.

There was less statistically significant agreement between comparison groups regarding the ranked order of importance for activities related to Goal 5 than for any of the other ten goals of school decentralization. Only two comparison groups agreed on the rank ordering of activities related to this goal, namely:
Superintendents and Regional Chairpersons and Superintendents and At-large Central Board Members. Four comparison groups did not have statistically significant agreement regarding the rank ordering of activities related to Goal 5, namely: Superintendents and Regional Board Members; Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members; At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members; and At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons. Goal 5 and the activities related to it are listed below:

**Goal 5**: To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils

**Goal-Related Activities of the Regional Superintendent:**

1. Requires each principal and staff to annually review student performance on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction in the regional schools.

2. Provides a program for diagnosing the learning difficulties of regional students and for providing effective remedial instruction.

3. Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs.
4. Encourages innovative and creative approaches to improving student performance.

5. Conducts continuous evaluations of the instructional program and the academic achievement of students in the regional schools.

A possible explanation for the lack of agreement regarding the ranked order of importance for the activities related to Goal 5 is that these activity items are not discrete enough. Each activity could contribute greatly to the achievement of Goal 5 and therefore, it was difficult for the respondents to agree as to which activity was more important in the achievement of this goal than another.

The perceived relationship between the goal-related activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization is shown in Tables 10 through 19. These Tables illustrate the rank order of importance assigned to each activity related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization.

Superintendents perceive Goal 9, "To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved," to be the most important goal of school
decentralization. They perceive that the goal-related activity, "Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools," is the most important activity of regional superintendents related to the achievement of Goal 9.

At-large Central Board Members perceive Goal 5, "To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils," to be the most important goal of school decentralization. They perceive that two goal-related activities: "Provides a program for diagnosing the learning difficulties of regional students and for providing effective remedial instruction," and "Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs" are equally important activities related to the achievement of Goal 5.

Regional Board Chairpersons perceive Goal 8, "To improve the quality of education," to be the most important goal of school decentralization. They perceive that two goal-related activities: "Develops effective staff planning and evaluation procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region" and "Provides for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to meet the needs of
students" are equally important activities of regional superintendents in order to achieve Goal 8.

Regional Board Members also perceive that Goal 8, "To improve the quality of education," is the most important goal of school decentralization. They perceive "Develops effective staff planning and evaluation procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region" to be the most important activity of the regional superintendent in order to achieve Goal 8.

An analysis of all responses reveals that the three goals of school decentralization which were perceived to be most important were in order of importance:

To improve the quality of education.

To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved.

To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community.

The two goal-related activities which were perceived to be most important for the achievement of each of these three goals were in order of importance:

Develops effective staff planning and evaluating procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region.
Provides for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to meet the needs of students.

Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools.

Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.

Helps schools and community social agencies coordinate services which identify and respond to the needs of the people in the region.

Conducts studies and presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools.

Within and Between Group Agreement of the Important Goals of School Decentralization

Superintendents have within-group agreement on the rank ordering of the ten goals of school decentralization. The Superintendents agreed with At-large Central Board Members on the rank ordering of all goals except Goal 9. The Superintendents agreed with Regional Board Chairpersons on the rank ordering of all goals except Goals 8 and 10. The Superintendents agreed with Regional Board Members on the rank ordering of all goals except Goals 3 and 10.

At-large Central Board Members have within group agreement on the rank ordering of the ten goals of school decentralization. At-large Central Board Members
agree with the Superintendents on the rank ordering of all goals except Goal 9. The At-large Central Board Members agree with the Regional Board Chairpersons on the rank ordering of all goals except Goals 5 and 7. The At-large Central Board Members agree with the Regional Board Members on the rank ordering of all ten goals of school decentralization.

Regional Board Chairpersons have within-group agreement on the rank ordering of the ten goals of school decentralization. Regional Board Chairpersons agree with Superintendents on the rank ordering of all goals except Goals 8 and 10. Regional Board Chairpersons agree with At-large Central Board Members on the rank ordering of all goals except Goals 5 and 7. The Regional Board Chairpersons agree with Regional Board Members on the rank ordering of all goals except Goal 2.

Regional Board Members have within-group agreement on the rank ordering of the ten goals of school decentralization. Regional Board Members agree with Superintendents on the rank ordering of all goals except Goals 3 and 10. Regional Board Members agree with At-large Central Board Members on the rank ordering of all goals. Regional Board Members agree with Regional Board Chairpersons on the rank ordering of all goals except Goal 2.
Within and Between Group Agreement on the Important Goal Related Activities

Superintendents have within-group agreement on the rank ordering of the activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization. The Superintendents agree with At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons on the rank ordering of the activities related to each of the goals. Superintendents agreed with Regional Board Members on the rank ordering of the activities related to each goal except Goal 5.

At-large Central Board Members achieved within-group agreement on the rank ordering of activities related to Goal 1 only. At-large Central Board Members agreed with Superintendents on the rank ordering of the activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization. They agreed with Regional Board Members on the rank ordering of activities related to each goal except Goal 5. They did not agree with Regional Chairpersons on the rank ordering of activities related to Goals 2, 4, 5, and 7.

Regional Board Chairpersons did not achieve within-group agreement on the rank ordering of activities related to Goals 1, 2, 5, and 8. They did have within-group agreement on the rank ordering of activities related to Goals 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10. Regional Board Chairpersons agreed with Superintendents on the rank
ordering of activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization. They did not agree with At-large Central Board Members on the rank ordering of activities related to Goals 2, 4, 5, and 7. Regional Chairpersons and Regional Board Members agree on the rank ordering of activities related to each of the goals except Goal 5.

Regional Board Members achieved within-group agreement on the rank ordering of activities related to each of the ten goals of school decentralization. They agreed with Superintendents, At-large Central Board Members, and Regional Board Chairpersons on the rank ordering of the activities for each of the ten goals of school decentralization except for those activities related to Goal 5.

Summary

The findings were presented and analyzed in this chapter. The perceived rank order of importance for each of the ten goals of school decentralization as well as the activities related to these goals were reported. The summed responses for each goal of school decentralization and for each goal-related activity were presented in relation to the questionnaire used in the study. In addition, mean differences and the statistical significance of mean differences in responses were given. In
this analysis the perceived relationship between the activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization was demonstrated. A summary of the investigation will be presented in the following chapter.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER IV


2Ibid., pp. 184-188.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of the findings, the conclusions and
the recommendations are presented in this chapter.

The basic purpose of this research was to
determine the perceived relationship between the ac­
tivities of the regional superintendent and the achieve­ment of important goals of school decentralization. In
addition, the following research questions were formu­lated for investigation:

1) Is there agreement in perceptions within groups of
key actors in a decentralized school system regarding
the importance of goals of school decentralization?

2) Is there agreement in perceptions between groups of
key actors in a decentralized school system regarding
the importance of goals of school decentralization?

3) Is there agreement in perceptions within groups of
key actors in a decentralized school system regarding
the importance of activities related to the achieve­ment of the goals of school decentralization?

4) Is there agreement in perceptions between groups of
key actors in a decentralized school system regarding
the importance of activities related to the achieve­ment of the goals of school decentralization?

5) Is there more agreement within groups than between
groups?

6) What are the implications of the agreement patterns?
The instrument used to obtain data from the superintendents and board members of the Detroit City School District was constructed from existing studies and literature in the field of school decentralization, responses from a panel of judges and suggestions made by members of the thesis committee.

The population consisted of the eight superintendents and the thirty-four board members who returned instruments. These responses represented a return of 77.77 percent.

The two variables used were: goals of school decentralization and goal-related activities of regional superintendents.

The data were analyzed in terms of the summed ranks assigned to goals and activities. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used to determine the association between the within-group rankings given to goals and goal-related activities. This statistic was also used to determine the association of the between-group rankings given to goal-related activities. The Kruskall-Wallis one way analysis of variance by ranks was used to determine the association of between-group rankings given to goals.
Findings Vis-a-Vis The Research Questions

Responses to six research questions were used to determine the perceived relationship between the activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization. Analysis of these data revealed the following:

1) Is there agreement in perceptions within groups of key actors in a decentralized school system regarding the importance of goals of school decentralization?

There is statistically significant agreement in perceptions within groups regarding the importance of the ten goals of school decentralization. The members within each group agreed on the ranked order of importance of each of the ten goals of school decentralization.

2) Is there agreement in perceptions between groups of key actors in a decentralized school system regarding the importance of goals of school decentralization?

There is a high degree of statistically significant agreement in perceptions between groups regarding the ranked order of importance of the ten goals of school decentralization. While significant agreement between groups was not present in each case, no comparison group failed to agree on the ranked order of importance of less than eight of the ten goals of school decentralization.

3) Is there agreement in perceptions within groups of key actors in a decentralized school system regarding the importance of activities which are related to the achievement of the goals of school decentralization?
There is statistically significant agreement in perceptions within the Superintendents' group and the Regional Board Members' group regarding the importance of the five activities related to the achievement of each of the ten goals of school decentralization. The members of these groups agreed on the rank order of importance of each of the five activities related to each goal. There was moderate agreement within the Regional Board Chairpersons' group but practically no agreement within the At-large Central Board Members' group. The Regional Board Chairpersons agreed on the ranked order of importance of activities related to six of the ten goals and the At-large Central Board Members agreed on the five activities related to only one of the goals.

4) Is there agreement in perceptions between groups of key actors in a decentralized school system regarding the importance of activities which are related to the achievement of the goals of school decentralization?

There is statistically significant agreement in perceptions between the Superintendents and At-large Central Board Members and the Superintendents and Regional Board Chairpersons regarding the importance of the five activities related to the achievement of each of the ten goals of school decentralization. With the exception of Goal 5, "To improve the educational program and raise
the achievement level of pupils," the same is true for Superintendents and Regional Board Members; At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Members; and Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members.

The least amount of agreement in between-group perceptions was found in the comparison group of At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons. This group did not agree on the rank ordering of activities related to four goals. There was statistically significant agreement for this group regarding the importance of activities related to the achievement of six of the ten goals of school decentralization.

There was less agreement in perceptions between groups regarding the importance of the five activities related to the achievement of Goal 5 than for any of the other ten goals of school decentralization.

5) Is there more agreement within groups than between groups?

There is considerably more agreement in perceptions within groups on the importance of the goals of school decentralization than there is on the importance of goal-related activities. There is slightly more agreement in perceptions between groups on the importance of goal-related activities than there is on the importance of goals of school decentralization. In general,
there were more instances of agreement in perceptions
between groups than within groups.

6) What are the implications of the agreement patterns?

The degree of agreement regarding perceptions
of the importance of the goals of school decentralization
was remarkably high, both within and between the groups
in question. Such a high degree of agreement in perceptions suggests that, in general, the superintendents
and board members of the Detroit school system have similar perceptions regarding the important goals of school
decentralization and the important goal-related activities of regional superintendents. Such agreement indicates that the board members should be able to propose policies which will be acceptable and understandable to their colleagues and that the superintendents should be able to develop procedures and engage in activities that will be approved by their respective boards. Such cooperative working relationships will increase the potential for solving educational problems and for improving the instructional program for students. It also reduces the potential for conflict and increases the possibilities of conducting school business in a smooth, orderly, productive manner.

Agreement of perceptions on the importance of goals did not always imply agreement of perceptions on the importance of activities related to those goals.
The almost complete lack of agreement within the At-large Central Board Members' group regarding the importance of goal-related activities can be partially explained by the fact that there is little contact between these board members and regional superintendents. At-large Central Board Members are probably not familiar with the activities of the regional superintendent and are not aware of the importance of this position in the implementation of school decentralization. A further explanation for the lack of agreement within this group would be the fact that each At-large Board Member must have a unique approach to educational concerns in order to be elected. In order to attract votes, they must identify concerns that many citizens feel are not being adequately addressed. At-large Central Board Members may tend to disagree because each has a special interest to promote.

The moderate agreement regarding the importance of goal-related activities within the Regional Board Chairpersons' group could be accounted for by the fact that these persons have dual roles; that of members of the Central Board of Education and chairpersons of their respective regional boards. Each Regional Board Chairperson interacts with a different regional superintendent
as well as the General Superintendent. The rankings assigned to goal-related activities by Regional Board Chairpersons are probably influenced by the behavior of the person who occupies the position of regional superintendent in their respective regions. Such rankings may also reflect the problems faced in each region. Regional Board Chairpersons are likely to give priority to activities that are important to the resolution of the particular problems they face.

It is understandable, therefore, that At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons would view the role of the regional superintendent differently. However, since these persons constitute the Central Board of Education, it is important for each one to understand clearly that the regional superintendent is a key component to the successful implementation of school decentralization. An effort should be made by the General Superintendent to develop an understanding among all Central Board Members of the functions the regional superintendents perform and the impact of their performance on the school system.

The fact that all groups agreed that Goal 2, "To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society," is the least important goal of school decentralization confirms the findings of Smith, Aberbach and Walker and others that integration was not an important
goal of school decentralization in Detroit. However, because of a recent court order that required the desegregation of the Detroit Public Schools, much attention, time, fiscal, human, and material resources are being expended in implementing a plan of school desegregation. Since the court has ordered that many steps be taken to improve the instructional program in the desegregated schools, it may well be that the improvement of the educational program in the Detroit Public Schools will now come from court-mandated school desegregation rather than from state-mandated school decentralization.

Comments on the Research Findings

Goal 1, "To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making," is a medium priority goal since all groups in question ranked it in fifth place. This is counter to the findings of LaNoue and Smith that to increase citizen participation in policy making was the "single, dominant purpose in the decentralization movement...." It is interesting to note that the activities ranked least in importance for the achievement of Goal 1 are: "Involves parents in the selection of regional personnel" and "Involves community persons in the selection of instructional and supplementary materials." There is limited authority over the selection of
personnel at the regional level which may account for the low ranking given to this activity. However, regional boards and their superintendents are given almost complete control over curricular matters and the low rank of importance assigned to an activity which would allow citizen involvement in the selection of instructional materials seems to deny a strong commitment to direct citizen involvement in educational decision-making of their elected representatives and superintendents.

The higher ranking assigned to the activities: "Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools" and "Works with citizens of the region to determine expectations for and evaluations of the schools" suggests a willingness on the part of the respondents to accept suggestions and ideas from the public and to involve them in goal and priority setting. However, these activities do not give citizens an opportunity to participate directly in the decision-making process.

Goal 2, "To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society," is ranked the least important of the ten goals of school decentralization. A regional superintendent would not be expected to devote much time in activities which promote school integration. This goal was probably given a low rating because of the
unpopularity of the court decision which resulted in busing. The fact that in most schools the majority of the students are black may also contribute to the fact that a low ranking is given to this goal. Whenever the majority of the student population becomes black, many people believe integration is no longer possible. The low rankings given to activities involving the development of affirmative action programs and participation in intercultural activities sponsored by community organizations may discourage regional superintendents from becoming involved in these activities. The respondents may have been influenced to rate these activities low by memories of the fear and anger that resulted from the demands of militant community groups during the 1960's and early 1970's as well as the recent court order to desegregate the schools.

Although the summed ranks assigned to Goal 2 by both Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members is in tenth place, the differences in the rankings assigned to this goal by the individual members of these two groups was significant at the .05 level. This reflects the ambivalent feelings of the regional board members regarding racial integration. These data also confirm the opinions, cited previously, that integration
was not an important goal of school decentralization in Detroit, despite the integration rhetoric that preceded the passage of decentralization legislation.

Goal 3, "To improve community relations," is a medium priority goal and is not perceived to be of major importance to the respondents. Activities of the regional superintendent perceived to be important for the achievement of this goal were: Maintaining contact with community groups, soliciting help from community groups, and meeting frequently with professionals and lay persons to determine the educational needs of the regional schools. Becoming involved with school observance of racial and ethnic holidays and participating in community functions are not encouraged. This may reflect some concern that such activities may create problems rather than result in solutions to problems. The message to regional superintendents seems to be, "Listen but avoid active involvement."

The difference between the rank order of importance placed on Goal 3 by Superintendents and Regional Board Members may be accounted for by the fact that regional board members view their involvement in the educational process to be a means of improving school-community relations. Since professional educators do not generally welcome "lay interference," they accept this view to a lesser degree.
Goal 4, "To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community," is a high priority goal, ranked in third place. Helping to coordinate social and educational services which identify and respond to needs is an important activity for regional superintendents to be engaged. The regional superintendents should also keep the regional board informed of the educational needs of the regional schools. It may be implied that the regional board will use the resolution of identified needs as a means of evaluating the performance of regional superintendents.

The low ranking assigned to the activities of providing for school observance of racial and ethnic holidays and using community based resources to enrich the curriculum is consistent with previous findings that the superintendent should avoid these activities.

Goal 5, "To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils," is a medium priority goal, in fourth place. The two activities of the regional superintendents perceived to be most important for the achievement of this goal are: "Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs" and "Encourages innovative and creative approaches to improving student performance." The respondents' rankings of these activities reveal their sensitivity to the importance of needs assessment.
procedures and the potential impact of innovative teaching methods. Activities which involve evaluative procedures were ranked low in importance. This may reflect a disenchantment with research studies and a desire for the regional superintendents to mount an attack upon problems rather than to study them *ad infinitum*.

The fact that there is little agreement on the ranked order of importance of the activities related to Goal 5 was discussed earlier. Educators and lay persons alike anxiously await the discovery of a single, viable solution to the problem of poor pupil achievement.

Much publicity has been given to pupil achievement scores throughout the nation. Many citizens equate such scores with educational quality. Since the At-large Central Board Members represent the total community, this emphasis on student achievement may have influenced them to give Goal 5 a higher priority than Regional Board Chairpersons. Regional Board Chairpersons are probably more aware of other factors that must be improved at the local level in order to improve the overall quality of education and, therefore, do not rank pupil achievement as high as their fellow central board members.

Goal 6, "To provide more efficient and effective management of schools," is a low priority goal. "Develops and recommends a comprehensive system of planning in all areas of school operations" and "Establishes operating
procedures for implementing the policies of the regional board," are perceived as important activities in which regional superintendents should engage in order to achieve this goal. Activities which involve financial and personnel concerns are ranked low. This is probably due to the fact that these activities are primarily controlled by the Central Board of Education and not by regional superintendents. It may also be possible that the lower ranking for Goal 6 reflects satisfaction with school management. One of the goals of school decentralization identified by Ornstein and others was more efficient management of schools. It may be that this goal has been achieved during the twenty years that administrative decentralization has been in operation in Detroit.

Goal 7, "To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools," is a low priority goal. The following activities are ranked as being very important in the achievement of Goal 7: "Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools: and "Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program." The activities of regional superintendents considered to be least important in the achievement of this goal are: "Attends and participates
in community meetings and functions" and "Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools." An activity which involved communicating with the community by a variety of means was given a higher ranking than the one which involved attending and participating in community meetings. This could also be a reaction to the hostility shown to educators by community representatives prior to state-mandated school decentralization. The respondents may be fearful that the regional superintendent might be subjected to severe criticism and abuse in a community meeting. Both sets of respondents may be concerned that the regional superintendent not accept direction from someone other than the elected representatives of the community.

At-large Central Board Members and Regional Board Chairpersons do not agree on the ranked order of importance of Goal 7. At-large Central Board Members do not have the frequent contact with citizens that Regional Board Chairpersons do. However, At-large Central Board Members are keenly aware of budgetary problems and the importance of public support of school issues which could explain their higher ranking of Goal 7. Regional Board Chairpersons may have given Goal 7 a lower ranking because of their perception that
confidence in and support of the schools will increase when other goals which are more important, in their opinion, are achieved.

Goal 8, "To improve the quality of education," is perceived as the most important goal of school decentralization by these respondents. The most important activities of regional superintendents which are related to the achievement of Goal 8 are: "Develops effective staff planning and evaluation procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region" and "Provides for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to meet the needs of students." The high rankings assigned to these two activities indicate that the respondents recognize the importance of staff involvement in planning and evaluation. The teachers need to be involved in planning for educational improvement. The respondents also indicate a knowledge of the importance of curricular materials which are designed to meet identified needs of students. The emphasis given to efforts to improve the quality of education provided in the Detroit Public Schools illustrated by the Superintendent's Achievement Program is probably a contributing factor in the agreement that Goal 8 is the number one goal.5

A low ranking assigned to the activity which involves the superintendent in an evaluation of
instruction may be due to the fact that the respondents see the reviewing of test results as a fruitless effort unless it is tied to a remedial process. The lower ranking assigned to involving students in efforts to improve the educational program reflects what seems to be a reluctance on the part of the respondents to involve other citizens and students in educational decision-making. Although some advocates of school decentralization would agree that active involvement of nonprofessionals was a major goal of decentralization, the responses of the participants in this study show that they do not agree. Regional superintendents in Detroit could risk censure by their boards if they encourage such involvement by parents, teachers or students.

Superintendents and Regional Board Chairpersons do not agree on the ranked order of importance of Goal 8. Since they are educators, superintendents may assume that the goal of improving the quality of education is the major goal of all educational efforts and take the importance of this goal for granted. They would probably rank Goal 8 in first place if it were listed among general goals of education, but they do not see this as a primary goal of school decentralization. It seems to be the perception of Superintendents that the two most important goals of school decentralization are those which involve both citizens and educators in educational
decision-making and in the sharing of accountability for educational programs. Regional Board Chairpersons, however, perceive the improvement of the quality of education as the primary goal of school decentralization. As parents and taxpayers they want good schools and high academic achievement regardless of the organizational or political structure of the school system. They are not as concerned nor as knowledgeable of the way such structures might impinge upon the educational process as are superintendents.

Goal 9, "To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professionals directly served and involved," is perceived as the second most important goal of school decentralization. The two activities perceived to be most important for the achievement of this goal are: "Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools" and "Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools." In general, goal-related activities which suggested that regional superintendents involve citizens and professionals in educational decision-making were given low rankings. The higher ranks given to the activities listed above seem to suggest that the
respondents favor activities of regional superintendents which encourage active involvement by educators and citizens in efforts to improve the educational program at the building level while they do not approve such involvement at the system-wide level.

Although the respondents approve cooperative efforts involved in determining educational needs of the regional schools, they continue to disapprove activities of regional superintendents which provide direct involvement in decision-making. This is evidenced by the fact that the two activities which were considered least important in achieving Goal 9 were: "Engages personnel in the regional schools in priority setting and resource allocation" and "Works with recognized employee representatives to improve the performance and morale of regional employees." Involvement in decision-making by citizens seems to be preferable to that of employees of the school system. The inference seems to be that the board members will take care of the decision-making responsibility for citizens. The reluctance to involve employees in decision-making may be due to some bitter feeling against employees which remains from the strike of 1973.

The Superintendents ranked Goal 9 in first place, indicating their perception that citizen involvement
in educational decision-making is the major goal of school decentralization.

The lower ranking of Goal 9 by At-large Central Board Members, who represent the entire community, represents a strong community desire for improved educational program, improved academic achievement by pupils and more responsive educators. The At-large Central Board Members join with Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members in ranking these goals higher than Goal 9 which emphasizes citizen and staff involvement in educational decision-making.

It is interesting to note that the educators perceive Goal 9 to be the major goal of school decentralization and the board members disagree. This may be due to the fact that board members feel that their participation brings educational decision-making closer to the community served.

Goal 10, "To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program," is a medium priority goal. The respondents assigned a high rank of importance to the activities of regional superintendents which involved informing the regional boards of educational needs and maintaining contact with community groups in order to solicit their help in improving the educational
program. Activities of regional superintendents which monitored the actions of employees or monitored the use of funds were not considered to be very important for the achievement of shared responsibility and accountability by citizens and educators. This confirms the conclusion reached by this investigator that many of the respondents are not anxious for regional superintendents to share responsibility and accountability with lay citizens. The Superintendents may fear a loss of authority and more community control if decision-making authority is shared and the board members may fear that the educators will use the concept of sharing as an excuse for poor pupil achievement. There seems to be consistency of agreement among the respondents that citizen involvement should remain at the information sharing stage rather than in active involvement in decision-making activities.

Superintendents did not agree with Regional Board Chairpersons nor Regional Board Members regarding the rank order of importance of Goal 10. The recent controversy over the question of accountability likely accounts for this lack of agreement. The high ranking by Superintendents reflects the feeling of educators that they, alone, are not responsible for the success or failure of the educational program, but share this burden with the general public. A somewhat high ranking of Goal 10
by Regional Board Members reflects their desire to become involved with the educators in assuming the responsibility for the educational program in their respective regions. Regional Board Chairpersons’ lower ranking of Goal 10 is possibly due to the fact that in their dual role of regional board member and central board member, they are less concerned with sharing responsibility for the educational program as they are in making decisions which insure that quality education is provided for all pupils.

Smith concluded that the sharing of responsibility and accountability for the educational program was the only legitimate goal of school decentralization in Detroit. However, the results of this study do not support this conclusion.

Fantini suggests that in small homogeneous communities the school board adequately represents the community. Apparently these respondents feel that the board members are the vehicles of participation for the regional school communities and adequately represent them.

Conclusions

Taking into consideration the delimitations of this investigation, several conclusions are advanced.
These statements are drawn from the data applied to the research questions. Based on these findings it is clear that some goals of school decentralization are perceived to be more important than others. The three goals perceived to be most important were:

To improve the quality of education.

To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved.

To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community.

A second conclusion is that some goal-related activities of the regional superintendent are perceived to be more important in the achievement of school decentralization goals than others. These activities were:

Develops effective staff planning and evaluating procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region.

Provides for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to meet the needs of students.

Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools.

Meets frequently with parents, citizens and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.

Helps schools and community social agencies coordinate services which identify and respond to the needs of the people in the region.
Conducts studies and presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools.

A third conclusion is that there is a high degree of agreement within and between groups of superintendents and board members in the Detroit school system regarding the relationship between the activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of the important goals of school decentralization. The slightly higher degree of agreement between groups suggests that it should not be too difficult to develop a job description for the regional superintendent which sets priorities on those activities which facilitate the achievement of important goals.

A fourth conclusion is that the important goals of school decentralization are those which deal with responding to the educational and social needs of people at the community level. The goals and activities that received the highest importance rankings indicate that the purpose of decentralization in the Detroit Public Schools is to improve the quality of education through the responsive actions and decision-making of educators and elected representatives of the community.

A fifth conclusion is that the least important goals of school decentralization are those which deal with racial integration and school management.
A sixth conclusion is that the most important activities of the regional superintendent are those which involve citizens and educators in discussions of school concerns and consist of information collection and reporting.

A seventh conclusion is that the least important activities for the regional superintendent are those which involve citizens other than regional board members in an active role of decision-making such as selecting personnel or selecting instructional materials.

A final conclusion reached by this investigator is that despite the fact that high rankings of importance were given to goals which provided for citizen participation in educational decision-making, low rankings were given to activities which would have involved parents, teachers or students in decision-making activities. The responses of superintendents and board members in this study indicate that they are unwilling to share decision-making authority with others.

Preconditions to Effective School Decentralization

The findings of this study and the research conducted by Smith and Barlow suggest that the following sets of conditions would help to successfully implement a plan of school decentralization:
1. A cross section of community, staff, student and parent representatives should determine the educational goals for the school system.

2. An intensive educational campaign should be conducted to inform the community about the various forms of school decentralization.

3. A cross section of community, staff, student and parent representatives should recommend a decentralized organizational structure which will best achieve the educational goals established for the school system.

4. The objectives to be achieved through school decentralization should be clearly defined and widely disseminated.

5. A cross section of community, staff, student and parent representatives should develop decentralization guidelines that are consistent with the educational goals of the school system.

6. Powers, authority and decision-making responsibility of various policy-making or advisory groups should be explicit and consistent with the objectives of school decentralization.

7. Duties of educational personnel should be reordered and clearly defined in terms of responsibility for the achievement of the objectives of school decentralization.
8. A cost analysis of a decentralized reorganization should be made on the basis of the goals, guidelines, staff roles and policy-making functions.

9. Evaluation procedures should be developed so that the various components of school decentralization can be evaluated in terms of their contributions to the achievement of the educational goals of the school system.

10. Provisions should be made for periodic reassessment and modification of the goals and procedures of school decentralization.

Implications and Recommendations

This investigation has shed some light on the process of school decentralization in the Detroit school system through an analysis of the perceptions of those persons who are vested with the legal responsibility of operating the Detroit Public Schools. Their perceptions of the important goals of school decentralization and the important activities related to the achievement of those goals provide insights which can be helpful in assessing the value of decentralization as an organizational innovation in educational administration. Such insight can also serve to indicate areas in need of improvement within the educational program and to
provide a better understanding of the role of the regional superintendent.

With the constant public outcry for accountability as demonstrated by the demands for competency-based diplomas and the defeat of many school financial levies across the country, it is important that the merits of school decentralization be shown. Based on these findings, it can be implied that there are important goals of school decentralization which can be achieved through specific acts of the regional superintendents, such as: staff planning, curriculum revision, program evaluation, curriculum material selection, identifying educational needs, leadership development, effective communication, and coordination of educational and social services. Furthermore, these findings suggest that superintendents and board members generally agree on the order of priority in which important goals of school decentralization and goal-related activities should be placed.

This study was limited to a survey of the Superintendents, At-large Central Board Members, Regional Board Chairpersons and Regional Board Members of the Detroit Public Schools. The findings may not be generalizable to other school districts, or to other groups of persons associated with that school system.
It is recommended that a study be conducted to determine the perceptions of principals, teachers, parents, and students of the Detroit school system regarding the relationship between the activities of the regional superintendent and the achievement of school decentralization goals to discover whether there is system-wide agreement regarding these variables.

An additional area recommended for further research is an investigation of the extent to which regional superintendents actually engage in activities perceived to facilitate the achievement of important goals of school decentralization and the results of such efforts.

There should be a periodic assessment of the important goals of school decentralization in Detroit to determine any changes that may occur as a result of significant social, political, economic or educational events.

We further recommend that a job description be developed for the regional superintendent position in Detroit. The job description should reflect as much as possible the role of the regional superintendent in facilitating the achievement of school decentralization goals.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER V


2The specific proposals for improving the quality of education in the Detroit Public Schools which have been incorporated in recent court orders are most thoroughly described in "Brief of Respondent Board of Education for the School District of Detroit," on Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, in the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1976, No. 76-447.


6Calvert Smith, op. cit. p. 19.
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APPENDIX B

1. Cover Letter

2. Identification of Important School Decentralization Goals Questionnaire
October 20, 1975

Dear Panel Member:

Upon recommendation of my dissertation committee consisting of Dr. Walter Hack, Dr. Ronald Muth, Dr. Richard Snyder and Dr. Luvern Cunningham, I am in the process of pretesting a survey instrument to be used to identify some important goals of school decentralization.

Through a survey of the literature I have identified twenty school decentralization goals. In order to identify the most important of these goals to include in my research instrument, I would like to have your opinion of the relative importance of each item and the relative difficulty you have in attributing importance to it.

I am soliciting your cooperation as one who is familiar with school decentralization in general and with school decentralization in Detroit in particular. Your cooperation and contribution to this research effort is deeply appreciated. Upon completion of the research I will be pleased to share the results with you.

Sincerely yours,

Marie B. Stinson
INSTRUCTION SHEET

From a review of the literature we have identified twenty goals of school decentralization. We are soliciting your help in ranking these goals in terms of their importance. Please complete the following tasks:

1. Read each goal statement carefully.

2. Rate each goal statement according to its ideal importance by checking the appropriate column on the Importance Scale.

3. Rate each goal statement according to the degree of difficulty you experience in deciding upon its relative importance by checking the appropriate columns on the Degree of Difficulty scale.

4. Make any comments, additions and/or suggestions directly on the instrument or the blank sheets of paper provided.
**IDENTIFICATION OF IMPORTANT SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION GOALS**

**DIRECTIONS:**

1. Please rate each item included under School Decentralization Goals according to its ideal importance using the importance scale to the right.

2. Please rate each of the above items according to the degree of difficulty you have in deciding upon its relative importance using the degree of difficulty scale to the right.

3. Please make any comments, corrections, additions, and/or suggestions directly on the instrument or on the blank sheets of paper provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Degree of Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making.
2. To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society.
3. To improve school-community relations.
4. To provide more efficient and economical management of schools.
5. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community.
6. To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils.
7. To reduce bureaucratic overlap and waste through smaller more viable units of school government and administration.
8. To enable various ethnic, racial and religious groups to control the schools in neighborhoods where such groups are in the majority.
9. To provide greater articulation and continuity in the instructional program for grades K-12.
10. To provide more effective management of schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION GOALS</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>DEGREE OF DIFFICULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. To provide more relevant curricula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To make educators more accountable to the community for the academic achievement of pupils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To provide for increased school integration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To improve the delivery of educational services and materials to the classroom teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To enable a local teacher and administrator to have a greater voice in decisions that directly affect them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. To improve the quality of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To give citizens of the local school community greater control over the curriculum, personnel, and finances of the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To bring the educational decision-making process as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

1. Cover Letter

2. School Decentralization Goals as Related to Specific Activities of Regional Superintendents Questionnaire
April 2, 1976

Dear Panel Member:

I am most grateful to you for your cooperation in my research. Thanks to your participation in phase one of my research process, I have isolated ten goals which were determined to be important to school district decentralization. I have now compiled a list of activities which are believed to be essential for regional superintendents to perform in order to achieve the goals of school district decentralization.

In phase two, the final phase as far as your involvement is concerned, you are being asked to relate activities to goals by completing the enclosed instrument. Your participation in phase two is essential for the successful completion of my study.

Please complete the instrument and use the self-addressed, stamped envelope to return it as soon as possible.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Marie B. Stinson
Principal
INSTRUCTION SHEET

Please relate activities of regional superintendents to school decentralization goals by completing the following tasks.

1. Read each goal related activity statement carefully.

2. Review the list of school decentralization goals listed at the top of the page, noting the abbreviated form.

3. Decide which goals are supported and/or achieved upon completion of the activity. (Activity/goal relationship)

4. Place the goals related to each activity in ranked order of importance to a maximum of five. Assign a 1 to the goal to which an activity is most strongly related. Assign a 2 to the next strongest activity/goal relationship, etc. Among the five activity/goal relationships identified as being the strongest, a 5 would be assigned to that goal to which an activity is least strongly related.

For example:

|   | A | B | C | D | E
|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 1. Provides a program for use of volunteers in the regional schools. | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 |   
| 2. Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays. | 3 | 2 | 1 |   |   

In the first example the respondent would be indicating that there were five (or more) goals which were supported and/or achieved upon the completion of activity No. 1. However, when placed in ranked order of importance from 1 to 5, the respondent indicates that the strongest activity/goal relationship is between Activity No. 1 and Goal E (Instruction). The weakest activity/goal relationship is between Activity No. 1 and Goal C (Community Relations). The activity/goal relationships of Goals D, H and C are ranked 2, 3 and 4 respectively.
In the second example, the respondent indicates that only three goals are supported and/or achieved upon completion of the activity. The strongest activity/goal relationship is between Activity No. 2 and Goal B (Integration). The next strongest activity/goal relationship is between Activity No. 2 and Goal D (Responsiveness). Of the three goals selected the respondent indicates that the weakest activity/goal relationship is between Activity No. 2 and Goal G (Confidence).

5. Repeat the above tasks for each goal related activity statement.

6. Please use the blank sheet provided to add any important activity performed by a regional superintendent which I may have omitted.
SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION GOALS AS RELATED
TO SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES OF REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS

**GOALS**

A. To increase student participation in educational decision-making. (participation)
B. To promote the integration of instruction into the wider society. (instruction)
C. To improve school-community relations. (comm. relations)
D. To make educators more responsive to the needs and needs of the local school community. (respondence)
E. To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils. (instruction)
F. To provide more efficient and effective management of schools. (management)
G. To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools. (confidence)
H. To improve the quality of education. (educ. quality)
I. To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the student and professional staff (diversity served and involved). (relevance)
J. To provide an opportunity for students and educators to share responsibility and accountability for the educational program. (accountability)

**ACTIVITIES**

| 1. Works to improve planning and problem solving ability of the local school board. |
| 2. Reviews student performance on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction of the regional schools. |
| 3. Encourages the organization and active development of parent groups in the regional schools. |
| 4. Establishes close supportive contact with principals in order to keep informed of their needs and to make available to them his advice and leadership. |
| 5. Provides a program for use of volunteers in the regional schools. |
| 6. Assists the regional board in interpreting the objectives and policies of the central board of education. |
| 7. Provides educational programs within the regional schools which provide guidelines students with the assistance needed for job placement, technical training and/or higher education. |
| 8. Provides for school observances of special days and educational holidays. |
| 9. Provides for the diagnosing and remediation of educational needs and providing educational remedial instruction. |
| 10. Evaluates the efficiency of the instructional program of regional schools and recommends activities to improve instruction. |
| 11. Provides opportunities for minority students to participate in decision-making groups within the regional schools. |
| 12. Interprets regional board policies and procedures to local school employees and citizens. |
| 13. Serves and provides supplemental services and resources to aid the instructional program. |
| 14. Develops strategies which facilitate the achievement of educational objectives approved by the regional board. |
| 15. Encourages principals to develop programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools. |
## Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. To increase student participation in educational decision-making. (participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. To encourage the integration of minorities into the school system. (integration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. To improve school-community relations. (comm. relations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community. (responsiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils. (instruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. To provide more efficient and effective management of schools. (management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. To report and review confidence in and support of the schools. (confidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. To improve the quality of education. (educ. quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the students and professional staff directly served and involved. (relevance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. To provide an opportunity for students and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program. (accountability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Makes policy recommendations to the regional board for review, modification and/or approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Attends and participates in community meetings and functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Works with students and their organizations to improve the educational programs and atmosphere within the regional schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Works to involve parents in the selection of regional personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Works with recognized employee representatives to improve the performance and morale of regional employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Works with local groups to determine bases for student evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Maintains an effective working relationship with central office staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Ensures that plans and actions of the regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Develops strategies for maintaining racial balance within the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Establishes operating procedures for implementing the policies of the regional board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Meets with other regional superintendents to exchange information which has systemic value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Responds to the need for social services within the region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Conducts an comprehensive evaluation of the instructional program and the academic achievement of students in the regional schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Provides programs to assist teachers in their adjustment to schools where another racial or ethnic group is in the majority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Measures the performance of regional personnel on a systematic basis and recommends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Develops and recommends a comprehensive system of planning in all areas of school operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOALS

A. To increase student participation in educational decision-making. (participation)
B. To promote the integration of students into the wider society. (integration)
C. To improve school-community relations. (comm. relations)
D. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community. (responsiveness)
E. To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils. (improvement)

F. To provide more efficient and effective management of schools. (management)
G. To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools. (confidence)
H. To improve the quality of education. (edu. quality)
I. To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the students and professional staff directly served and involved. (relevance)
J. To provide an opportunity for students and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program. (accountability)

--

33. Presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs.
34. Provides effective human-resource programs and experiences for students and personnel of regional schools.
35. Works with the parents of the region to determine expectations for the schools and evaluation of the schools.
36. Serves as an interpreter of regional school policy and as arbitrator of the regional school problems.
37. Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs.
38. Builds an effective relationship with staff, students, parents and citizens of the regional community.
39. Develops and recommends an annual budget for regional board review and/or approval.
40. Attends professional meetings and seminars for the purpose of professional improvement.
41. Grants the support of the regional board for the educational programs of the regional schools.
42. Encourages innovative and creative approaches to improving student performance.
43. Seeks to understand the political factors within the region which affect the regional schools.
44. obtains and coordinates in-service education and professional growth experiences for regional personnel.
45. Assists in the development of the regional schools.
46. Encourages the use of community-based resources to enrich the curriculum in the regional schools.
47. Develops and maintains effective reciprocal relationships with parents and various community groups within the region.
**GOALS**

A. To encourage citizen participation in educational decision-making.
   (participation)
B. To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society.
   (integration)
C. To improve school-community relations. (comm. relations)
D. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of
   the local school community. (responsiveness)
E. To improve the educational program and raise the achievement
   level of pupils. (instruction)
F. To provide more efficient and effective management of schools.
   (management)
G. To renew and retain confidence in and support of the schools.
   (confidence)
H. To improve the quality of education. (edu. quality)
I. To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the
   citizens and professional staff directly served and involved. (relevance)
J. To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the
   responsibility and accountability for the educational program.
   (accountability)

---

48. Develop strategies to help integrate the world of the culturally different students into
the life of the regional schools.

49. Disseminate the awareness and auditing of internal accounts within the region.

50. Develop effective staff evaluation procedures which promote improvement.

51. Develop a program for obtaining funds and assistance from governmental agencies, private,
   business and non-profit organizations.

52. Maintain close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational
   program in order to enlist their help in improving the educational program.

53. Assign personnel in the regional schools in priority writing and resource allocation.

54. Utilize varied forms of communication to inform the people of the region about school
   problems, activities and achievements.

55. Develop a program for measuring and evaluating behavior of regional personnel in
   dealing with members of different racial and ethnic groups within the regional schools.

56. Provide an educational program within the regional schools which develops skills,
   training, or knowledge required for jobs and/or professions.

57. Meet frequently with parents, citizens, and professionals to determine the educational
   needs of the regional schools.

58. Develop policies and criteria to be used in the recruitment, selection, and assignment
   of regional personnel.

59. Develop desegregation and/or integration plans for regional schools involving both
   students and personnel.

60. Provide for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to fit
    the needs of students.
APPENDIX D

School Decentralization
Rating Scale
School Decentralization Rating Scale

This School Decentralization Rating Scale was designed to secure responses in two areas relative to the relationship between the activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of important goals of school decentralization. These two areas are:

(a) importance of school decentralization goals.

(b) importance of goal related activities in the achievement of school decentralization goals.

The scale consists of ten school decentralization goals and fifty goal related activities of regional superintendents. It would be impossible to include all of the important goals and goal related activities of school decentralization in which regional superintendents are engaged and still make it possible to organize a data collection effort. Thus, a number of area superintendents and academic specialists have participated in the development of this instrument; their participation has helped to identify the key goals and goal related activities associated with school decentralization, and with your assistance, a more precise definition of the important goals and goal related activities will result.
INSTRUCTIONS

Your task in completing this scale will be three-fold:

First, you are asked to complete a personal data sheet. This information will be helpful in interpreting the other parts of the questionnaire, will facilitate follow-up interviews and will enable the investigator to send each participant a brief report when the study is completed.

In reporting the results of the study, however, neither the names of participants, their schools, nor their regions will be identified.

Second, you are asked to rank ten goals of school decentralization in the order of their importance to you. The goal ranked 1 will be the goal which you think is the most important. The goal ranked 10 will be the goal which you think is least important.

Third, you are asked to rank the five goal-related activities listed for each goal in the order of their importance in the achievement of that goal. The goal related activity ranked 1 will be the activity you think is most important in the achievement of the goal. The goal related activity ranked 5 will be the activity you think is least important in the achievement of the goal.

(In the pilot test of this instrument, respondents indicated that it was helpful to read the entire instrument before responding to individual items.)
PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Name ________________________________________________________________

Region Number _______________________________________________________

Position: 
Regional Supt. ___________________________________ General Supt. _________
Regional Board Member ___________________________ Central Board Member At-Large __
Regional Board Chairman _____________________________

Age ____________________ Sex ____________________ Race __________________ 

Education: High School Graduate _______ Attended College ____________
College Grad ___________ Master Degree ____________ Ph. D. ____________
Other ____________________________

Number of years in present position: ____________________________

For Superintendents:
Number of years employed by the school district ____________________________

For Board Members:
Number of years actively involved with schools (PTA, etc.) ____________________________

To be completed by Regional Superintendents only.
Total number of students in the Region Schools ____________________________

Ethnic Composition of Region (approximate percentages):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Category</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Professional Employees</th>
<th>Classified Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(approximate percentages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish surname</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male-Female composition of Region (approximate percentages):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Professional Employees</th>
<th>Classified Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(approximate percentages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio Economic Status of Region:
High _______ High-Middle _______ Middle _______ Low Middle _______ Low _______
SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION GOALS

1. To increase citizen participation in educational decision-making.
2. To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society.
3. To improve school-community relations.
4. To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community.
5. To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils.
6. To provide more efficient and effective management of schools.
7. To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools.
8. To improve the quality of education.
9. To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved.
10. To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program.

GOAL 1: To increase citizen participation in educational decision making.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Involves community persons in the selection of instructional and supplementary materials.
2. Meets frequently with parents, citizens, and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.
3. Works with the citizens of the region to determine expectations for the schools and evaluations of the schools.
4. Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools.
5. Involves parents in the selection of regional personnel.

GOAL 2: To promote the integration of minorities into the wider society.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools.
2. Develops strategies to help integrate the world of culturally different students into the life of the regional schools.
3. Develops desegregation and/or integration plans for the regional schools involving both students and personnel.
4. Develops and monitors affirmative action programs to insure equal employment opportunity within regional schools.
5. Supports and encourages inter-racial and inter-cultural activities sponsored by community organizations.
GOAL 3: To improve school-community relations.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools.
2. Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays.
3. Attends and participates in community meetings and functions.
4. Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program.
5. Meets frequently with parents, citizens, and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.

GOAL 4: To make educators more responsive to the concerns and needs of the local school community.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Helps schools and community social agencies coordinate services which identify and respond to the needs of the people in the region.
2. Provides for school observance of special racial and ethnic holidays.
3. Encourages the development of opportunities for minority students to participate in decision-making groups within the regional schools.
4. Conducts studies and presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools.
5. Encourages the use of community-based resources to enrich the curriculum in the regional schools.

GOAL 5: To improve the educational program and raise the achievement level of pupils.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Requires each principal and staff, to annually review student performances on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction in the regional schools.
2. Provides a program for diagnosing the learning difficulties of regional students and for providing effective remedial instruction.
3. Initiates the development of instructional programs which respond to student needs.
4. Encourages innovative and creative approaches to improving student performance.
5. Conducts continuous evaluations of the instructional program and the academic achievement of students in the regional schools.
GOAL 6: To provide more efficient and effective management of schools.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Ensures that plans and actions of regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools.
2. Establishes operating procedures for implementing the policies of the regional board.
3. Develops and recommends a comprehensive system of planning in all areas of school operation.
4. Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region.
5. Develops policies and criteria to be used in the recruitment, selection and orientation of regional personnel.

GOAL 7: To regain and retain confidence in and support of the schools.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Encourages the organization and active involvement of parent groups in the regional schools.
2. Attends and participates in community meetings and functions.
3. Develops strategies for minimizing racial conflicts within the schools.
4. Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program.
5. Utilizes varied forms of communication to inform people of the region about school problems, activities and achievements.

GOAL 8: To improve the quality of education.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Reviews student performances on standardized tests as part of the general evaluation of the instruction of the regional schools.
2. Works with students and their organizations to improve educational programs and the atmosphere within the regional schools.
3. Develops effective staff planning and evaluation procedures which promote improvements in the quality of education in the region.
4. Provides for the revision of curriculum and the selection of curricular materials to fit the needs of students.
5. Secures and provides supplemental services and resources to aid the instructional program.
GOAL 9: To bring educational decision-making as close as possible to the citizens and professional staff directly served and involved.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Encourages principals to provide leadership with staff and community representatives in developing programs best suited to the particular requirements of their schools.
2. Works with the citizens of the region to determine expectations for and evaluations of the schools.
3. Meets frequently with parents, citizens, and professionals to determine the educational needs of the regional schools.
4. Engages personnel in the regional schools in the priority setting and resource allocation.
5. Works with recognized employee representatives to improve the performance and morale of regional employees.

GOAL 10: To provide an opportunity for citizens and educators to share the responsibility and accountability for the educational program.

GOAL RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:

1. Ensures that plans and actions of the regional employees are consistent with the laws and regulations which govern regional schools.
2. Gains the support of the regional board for the educational programs of the regional schools.
3. Presents oral and written reports to inform the regional board of the educational needs of the regional schools.
4. Maintains close contact with community groups that support or criticize the educational program in order to solicit their help in improving the educational program.
5. Directs the supervision and auditing of internal accounts within the region, and disseminates the results to the board and the public.
APPENDIX E

1. Letter to Assistant Superintendent, Research Planning and Evaluation

2. Letter from the Department of Research and Evaluation

3. Letter to the Department of Research and Evaluation
Dr. Stuart Rankin  
Assistant Superintendent  
Research and Planning  
Detroit Public Schools  
5057 Woodward Avenue  
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Dear Dr. Rankin:

My advisor, Dr. Cunningham, informed me that he talked with you on yesterday, November 2, and that you approved my conducting a study of school decentralization in the Detroit Public Schools. I am most appreciative of your assistance in this regard and I am enclosing copies of my research instrument for distribution to the study population.

The total population of the study is fifty-four, consisting of the superintendent of schools (1), the regional superintendents (8), the chairpersons of the regional boards of education (40), and the members-at-large of the central board of education (5).

The purpose of this study is to further clarify the important goals of school decentralization and to determine the relationship between some activities of regional superintendents and the achievement of school decentralization goals.

In the pretest of the instrument, it was determined that twenty minutes was average time for completion; therefore, I would appreciate having all instruments completed by November 19, 1976.

This will give me an opportunity to analyze the data and prepare an interview guide which I plan to use.
with one-third of the population during January and/or February. I will, of course, submit the interview guide and schedule for your approval.

We regret the defeat of the Detroit school levy and realize that this places an additional strain on your energies and resources. Perhaps at a time when priorities and alternatives must be evaluated and examined, the results of this study will prove helpful.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my office at 614/225-2837 or at home at 614/258-4510.

Sincerely yours,

Marie B. Stinson
Principal

MBS/mer

Enclosures
December 15, 1976

Ms. Marie B. Stinson
Principal
Central High School
75 South Washington
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear Ms. Stinson:

Dr. Stuart Rankin has contacted me about your questionnaire related to desegregation in the Detroit schools and requested that I contact you about implementing the study. Accordingly, I am sending you a copy of a statement of policies and procedures for conducting research in the Detroit schools and a copy of the forms to be submitted when approval to conduct a research study is requested. If you will complete the form and return it to me as soon as possible I will implement the approval procedures.

If you have any questions you may call me at (313) 931-0650.

Sincerely yours,

John R. Lindsey

Enc.
January 12, 1977

Mr. John R. Lindsey
Detroit Public Schools
Research & Evaluation Department
10100 Grand River, Room 300
Detroit, Michigan 48204

Dear Mr. Lindsey:

Thank you very much for sending the application materials to me. The completed application is enclosed. I would appreciate any assistance you can give in expediting the delivery and return of the completed research instruments. It will be impossible for me to meet graduation requirements for winter quarter but I would like to make the June deadlines.

There are only fifty-four participants in this study: the general superintendent (1), the regional superintendents (8), the regional board chairpersons (8), the board members at large (5), and the regional board members (32). It is, therefore, imperative that a high percentage of return is obtained.

If I can assist in any way, please feel free to call me at 614/225-2637 or 614/258-1510. I can be available to do whatever needs to be done, including making a trip to Detroit.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]
Principal

Enclosure
APPENDIX F

Research Study Approval Form
SUBJECT: Approved Research Study

Research Study No. 76064

FROM: Robert S. Lankton, Divisional Director
Research and Evaluation Department, Detroit Public Schools

TO: Mrs. Marie B. Stinson

DATE: January 18, 1977

The research study identified below has been reviewed and approved by the Research and Evaluation Department subject to authorization to conduct the study by the Region Superintendent and the principal, in accordance with the statement of policy in the Administrative Handbook and the Guidelines of October 26, 1970, p. 17. Participation by individuals or by schools in this project is entirely voluntary.

If you desire further information, please call Dr. John R. Lindsey of the Research Department, 931-0650, Stevenson Building, Room 300.

Name of Research Worker

Marie B. Stinson, Ph.D. Candidate, The Ohio State University

Title of the Project

The Relationship Between the Activities of the Regional Superintendent and the Achievement of School Decentralization Goals

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to identify the key factors in a decentralized system relative to goal related activities and goal achievement.

Personnel to be Involved

The total personnel asked to participate in the study consists of the general superintendent, the eight region superintendents, the chairpersons and members of the eight regional boards and the five members at-large of the central board of education.

Starting Date

The starting date of the project is January, 1977.
A school decentralization rating scale will be distributed to each of the participants. The participant is asked to complete the rating scale and mail it to the research worker in a stamped self-addressed envelope provided for that purpose. An interview by the research worker may possibly be used to add depth to the data obtained from the rating scale if such a need is indicated by the analysis of the rating scale data.

Participants' Action

Complete and mail the rating scale using the stamped envelope provided for that purpose. If you are unable or unwilling to participate, please return the materials to the Research and Evaluation Department, Room 300, Stevensbn Building.

dcw

Enclosure

cc: General Superintendent
    Region Superintendents
    Region Board Members
    Central Board Members At-Large
    Committee
    Research Worker
APPENDIX G

Cover Letter to Members of the Research Population
January 19, 1977

Dear Participant:

This important inquiry is a part of my graduate work at Ohio State University. We in education have a continuing interest in school decentralization. We believe it is a viable means of school district organization. However, we need the perspective of those who are actively involved in the school decentralization process to complete our research.

I am grateful to you for taking time from your busy schedule to participate in this study which will identify some important goals and functions associated with school decentralization.

Sincerely yours,

Marie B. Stinson
APPENDIX H

Follow-up Letter to the Research Population
APPENDIX H

Follow-up Letter to the Research Population
February 28, 1977

Dear Participant:

I know how busy you are and perhaps you have not had time to complete the School Decentralization Rating Scale I sent to you several weeks ago.

I am now in the process of tabulating the data from the responses of your colleagues. My study would not be complete, however, without your input. Will you please take a few moments to complete this document so that I can have the benefit of your thinking.

Please use the self-addressed envelope to return the completed instrument to me as soon as possible -- before March 11 would be most helpful.

Sincerely yours,

Marie B. Stinson, Principal

MBS/rc

Enclosures(2)
APPENDIX I

Letter to Responders to the
School Decentralization
Rating Scale
March 15, 1977

Mr. Herman L. Davis
Regional Board Chairman
Region Five
5057 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Dear Mr. Davis:

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to you for your response to my research instrument. I hope I do not offend you by making an additional appeal to your generosity.

Despite the fact that I have sent a second request, I have had a response from only one other person of the Region Five Board of Education. As you know, I cannot complete the requirements for a doctorate degree unless I complete my research study. To do this, I need the cooperation of the research population.

I would be most grateful if you would use your influence to encourage your fellow board members to return the completed instrument to me as soon as possible. If you would not care to do this, but could suggest some action on my part which would be successful, I would appreciate any assistance you can give in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

Marie B. Stinson
Principal
Central High School

MBS:r